

Thematic Evaluation Series

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

Sector level study in disaster risk reduction/management (DRR/M)

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2021**

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose, scope and objectives	1
1.2 Methodology.....	2
1.3 Limitations	2
2. Key conceptual background	3
3. Main findings	4
References.....	22

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose, scope and objectives

1. This is a sector study on disaster risk reduction/management (DRR/M), which is part of the independent evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) contribution to Sustainable Development Goal 13 (SDG 13) on climate action¹ and an assessment of the implementation of the FAO Strategy on Climate Change (2017). Because of the strong relationship between the SDG 13 targets and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the study also includes FAO's contribution to the commitments of the Paris Agreement (UN, 2015) and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR).²
2. The overall objective of the evaluation of FAO's contribution to SDG 13 is to assess the extent to which FAO has adopted an effective, coherent and transformative approach to its work in support of SDG 13 and the Paris Agreement in 2015–2020. It assesses the relevance, effectiveness and emerging impacts of FAO's work on climate change, covering all delivery channels and partnerships at country, regional and global level. This sector study on DRR/M served as one of the thematic areas of FAO's work in climate change. The DRR/M key products and services relevant to climate action were sampled and reviewed as one of the key inputs in evaluating FAO's contribution to SDG 13.
3. This DRR/M sector study responded to the three overarching evaluation questions, which were developed from extensive consultations with FAO management and staff, as well as external stakeholders:
 - i. Is FAO positioning itself to offer relevant support to countries in achieving their SDG 13 targets?
 - ii. To what extent is FAO transforming its delivery mechanisms and programmes (or should transform them) to better support countries in achieving SDG 13 targets?
 - iii. How is FAO collaborating with others to support countries in achieving their SDG 13 targets?
4. This DRR/M sector study covers the period from January 2015 to January 2020 (interventions that started before 2015 but ended in 2015–2020 are also covered) and builds on the Evaluation of FAO's contribution to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation (FAO, 2015) and the Evaluation of FAO Strategic Objective 5: Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises (FAO, 2016a). This sector study covers FAO's efforts to support developing countries to set and achieve their SDG 13 targets related to DRR/M, building on FAO's Strategic Framework, programmes, roles and typologies. Due to the interconnected and indivisible nature of the 2030 Agenda, the evaluation also examines FAO's efforts to support the achievement of targets related to other SDGs but directly linked to SDG 13.

¹ In line with SDG 13, climate action is needed to combat climate change and its impacts. Hence, climate action comprehends climate change mitigation and adaptation. Good adaptation leads to resilience and therefore, the report considers 'adaptation' and 'resilience' as part of the same process and where climate action is mentioned, this can be understood as all deliberate actions that lead to climate change adaptation, mitigation and resilience.

² [The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030](#) outlines seven targets and four priorities for action to prevent new and reduce existing disaster risks: i) understanding disaster risk; ii) strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk; iii) investing in disaster reduction for resilience and; iv) enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response, and to "Build Back Better" in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.

1.2 Methodology

5. This sector study follows the methodologies described in the main evaluation report. Specifically, this sector study involved:
 - i. *Quantitative content analysis.* DRR/M project documents and evaluation reports of FAO projects that were directly or indirectly linked (through other SDGs) to SDG 13 targets and were processed and analysed with the support of quantitative content tools (MAXQDA) to scope particular themes and results.
 - ii. *Desk review of background materials.* This comprised internal FAO documents (such as key documents identified through quantitative content analysis) and relevant publications by FAO and other stakeholders. It included, but was not restricted to: FAO strategy documents, project and programme descriptions, reports and evaluations, policy papers, technical papers, tools, statistical products, news stories, public speeches, FAO's website and opinion pieces.
 - iii. *Interviews with FAO stakeholders* at the global, regional, and country levels. Interviews were semi-structured to maintain the relationship with the evaluation questions, but allowed interviewees to speak freely on related issues.
 - iv. *Stakeholder consultations through online workshops.* Several elements of the evaluation required an interactive process with key stakeholders both within FAO. A series of facilitated workshops was organized (online) to discuss the evaluation process and deliverables, from conceptual phase to validation of findings, conclusions and recommendations. Appendix 2 includes a list of all participants in the consultations.
 - v. *Information processing.* All information (from interviews, data gathering, background information, country studies) was labelled, linked to the deliverables and evaluation questions and triangulated as necessary.

1.3 Limitations

6. The sectoral study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. Restrictions on travel and movement limited the Evaluation Team's capacity to make field visits. All interviews with FAO stakeholders at global, regional and sub-regional level were conducted online, as were many country-level interviews. Stakeholder workshops and meetings were also held online.
7. Due to the late start of the DRR/M sectoral study, the interviews were limited to FAO personnel. Efforts to interview external stakeholders did not materialize. For instance, the time frame for interviewing key government partners in the Philippines coincided with a succession of super typhoons, which demanded the priority of the FAO country office and the national government.
8. A considerable portion of FAO's work is related to DRR, in line with targets 13.1. and 2.4. Many climate-related disasters can be linked to short-term effects of climate change, such as more frequent severe floods, more frequent extreme droughts and more frequent intense hurricanes. FAO's work on DRR is broader than just climate change, however, covering other natural disasters (seismic and volcanic) and human-induced emergencies. Lastly, there is a group of natural disasters that may or may not be climate change related, such as locust plagues and disease outbreaks; these were not included for feasibility reasons. In addition, this study did not cover emergency preparedness and response.

2. Key conceptual background

9. FAO uses the SFDRR definition of DRR as “A policy objective aimed at preventing new risk and reducing existing disaster risk and managing residual risk, all of which contribute to strengthening resilience and achievement of sustainable development” (FAO, 2017a). Disaster Risk Management (DRM) refers to the “legal, institutional and policy frameworks and administrative mechanisms and procedures related to the management of both risk (*ex ante*) and disasters (*ex post*), therefore including also the emergency management elements”. DRM as a continuum is referred to as “actions are aimed at strengthening the capacities and resilience of households and communities to protect their lives and livelihoods, through measures to avoid (prevention) or limit (mitigation) adverse effects of hazards and to provide timely and reliable hazard forecasts” (Baas *et al.*, 2008).
10. As the recurrence of disasters and crises undermine poverty eradication and the achievement of the SDGs, FAO focuses on assisting “countries to increase the resilience of households, communities and institutions to more effectively prevent and cope with threats and disasters that impact agriculture, food security and nutrition....People who rely on farming, livestock, forests or fishing for their food and income – around one-third of the world’s population – are often the most vulnerable and affected” (FAO, 2021a). Climate change, in particular extreme weather-related shocks, slow onset events are part of the systemic risks. With increasing complexity and interaction of human, economic, political and natural systems, risk becomes increasingly systemic.³
11. As an active member of the UNFCCC’s Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action’s Climate Resilience Network (UNFCCC, 2021a), FAO supports that climate risk management interventions need to build climate resilience across sectors and systems (combines disaster risk reduction and management (including emergency preparedness and response) and climate change adaptation approaches. Resilience is defined as “the ability of individuals, households, communities, cities, institutions, systems and societies to prevent, resist, absorb, adapt, respond and recover positively, efficiently and effectively when faced with a wide range of risks, while maintaining an acceptable level of functioning without compromising long-term prospects for sustainable development, peace and security, human rights and well-being for all”.⁴
12. Throughout this study, the term ‘climate adaptation’ is used for the process adjusting ecological, social, or economic systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli and their effects or impacts (UNFCCC, 2021b). In this concept, good adaptation leads to building resilience. Therefore, the study considers ‘adaptation’ and ‘resilience’ as part of the same process and where climate change adaptation and mitigation (CCAM) or climate action is mentioned, this is understood as climate change adaptation, mitigation and resilience. Where useful and necessary for understanding, particularly in the context of DRR, the term ‘resilience’ will be used separately.
13. For the purposes of this study, agriculture and food systems refer to all agricultural sectors (crops, livestock, fisheries and aquaculture, and forestry) and all stages along the food supply chain from production to consumption and disposal, unless otherwise specified.

³ UN Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies: Final Advance Draft - September 2020

⁴ UN Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies: Final Advance Draft - September 2020

3. Main findings

EQ 1. Is FAO making a relevant and effective contribution to globally agreed climate-action targets?

EQ 1.1. What have been FAO's main contributions to SDG 13 (directly or indirectly through other SDGs) and the Paris Agreement, and how relevant are these contributions?

Finding 1. According to institutional reporting, FAO has contributed to DRR/M in relation to agreed climate action targets in many countries, in line with SDG 13 targets, the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR) (UNDRR, 2015). It has supported the formulation of a number of national and regional policies, which have been translated into national disaster risk reduction plans. To address the need for coherence and mutual reinforcement of the United Nations' resilience-building efforts and to ensure the implementation of a risk-informed and integrated approach to the SDGs, FAO has coordinated and reported its contribution under the umbrella of the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience (Target 13.1, resilience to disasters).

14. FAO sees SDG 13, the Paris Agreement and the SFDRR as the nexus of sustainable development, DRR and climate change adaptation (CCA), creating an opportunity for integrated actions, greater coherence and consistency between DRR and CCA planning and implementation (Bojić *et al.*, 2019). In line with FAO's Strategy on Climate Change (FAO, 2017b), FAO's work on DRR/M is anchored in: i) mainstreaming DRR within agricultural development planning, ii) strengthening capacities for Early Warning Early Action (EWEA) and disaster impact monitoring in agriculture;⁵ and iii) promoting coherence between DRR and CCA processes. With the increasing frequency and severity of climate-related hazards, FAO has prioritized DRR as an entry point to climate adaptation for resilience (FAO, 2017a). FAO's work contributes to SDG targets 13.1 and 13.2 as well as to other risk -related SDG targets and indicators.⁶ FAO's work on DRR and CCA also contributes to the Paris Agreement, specifically, Articles 7.1 and 8.1 and targets B, C, E and G of the SFDRR.
15. FAO has assisted in creating capacity to mainstream DRR and EWEA and to promote coherence between climate adaptation and DRR, as well as for DRR/M performance monitoring in dozens of countries. In 2018–2019, FAO reported having exceeded its targets, with some 43 countries and three regional institutions having formulated strategies and plans for risk reduction and crisis management (FAO, 2020a). FAO reported that a total of 52 countries and five regions had improved their risk monitoring systems to enhance early warning, while 34 countries and two regions had improved their capacity for resilience and vulnerability analysis. Technical measures for risk prevention and reduction were implemented in 37 countries, while 33 countries applied socioeconomic measures to reduce the vulnerability of communities exposed to threats and crises. Some 41 countries benefited from FAO's support in adopting standards, guidelines and practices for emergency preparedness. In addition, FAO reported providing timely and gender-responsive emergency assistance in 38 countries and regions affected by a crisis impacting agriculture and food security (FAO, 2020a).

⁵ For the purpose of this document agriculture sectors comprise crops, livestock, fisheries and aquaculture and forestry. When 'agriculture' is mentioned, it refers to all these sectors until otherwise specified.

⁶ SDG target 2.4 SDG indicator 1.5.2 and SDG indicator 1.5.3.

16. These figures and the corresponding impact studies⁷ demonstrate the effectiveness of FAO's EWEA support for countries and how it protects the lives and livelihoods of the most vulnerable through targeted social protection measures. FAO is the lead agency responsible for reporting on SFDRR indicator C-2 and SDG indicator 1.5.2.⁸ As an indicator of the high quality of FAO's tools and services, a significant number of countries, 42 in total, applied FAO's methodology for reporting under SFDRR indicator C-2. FAO is co-chair of the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).⁹ FAO contributed to the CADRI processes in nine countries and territories, in addition to the global-level consolidation of data for monitoring and trend analysis.

Finding 2. FAO has successfully assisted in mobilizing public climate financing for the projects it executes, including disaster risk reduction activities. FAO has been less active and successful in mobilizing private-sector financing and investments. Public climate change funding initially originated largely from bilateral sources, but in recent years, the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) have dominated (target 13.a on climate financing). Nevertheless, as FAO studies have shown, at a global level, there remains very limited core funding investments in DRR.

17. Mobilizing climate financing is a key target of SDG 13, to which FAO has contributed by developing projects on mitigation and adaptation. According to the FAO Climate Change Strategy Action Plan Results Framework 2018–2019, the amount of finance mobilized with FAO's support, regardless of source, targeting CCAM in food and agriculture totals USD 1.2 billion. This is unlikely to be a complete figure, because of the difficulty in categorizing projects according to their relationship to climate change. Climate finance mobilized is in support of both FAO and nationally executed projects and of FAO operations to support countries' activities. However, specific figures for financing for DRR/M projects were not directly available. It is known that for the work of the FAO Office of Emergencies and Resilience (OER), two personnel are funded from FAO's core budget and the rest from several projects. At regional levels, many reported a substantive budget shortfall and the dependency on project-based funding.
18. In line with the Sendai framework, FAO has provided data to raise awareness of the impact of climate-related disasters and the associated damage and loss to the agricultural sector. However, FAO studies also show that 92 percent of all agriculture-related overseas development assistance for DRR/M from 2004 to 2016 was allocated to emergency response. Only 5 percent went to agriculture-related relief, recovery and rehabilitation measures and just 3 percent was allocated to prevention and preparedness (FAO, 2019a).

Finding 3. FAO has made some meaningful contributions to SDG 13, related SDGs and globally agreed climate action targets with regard to mainstreaming gender and women-specific issues. FAO's inclusion of other societal groups has been variable. FAO is particularly attentive in small islands developing states (SIDS), highlighting specific challenges for supporting climate action here (target 13.b).

⁷ FAO carried out impact studies on EWEA (i.e., 2018 Horn of Africa; 2019 Colombia; 2020 The Philippines)

⁸ Direct agricultural loss attributed to disasters in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP).

⁹ CADRI is a global partnership composed of 20 organizations working to achieve the SDGs by providing countries with capacity-development services to help them reduce climate- and disaster-related risk.

19. All the interviewed FAO sub-regional offices have integrated vulnerability assessments into its disaster risk reduction and management work, so that gender and social inclusion of the most vulnerable groups, such as indigenous peoples and migrants, are part of its interventions. Social protection is linked to its DRR/M and CCA strategies. These have shown promising results, such as targeting cash transfers to vulnerable groups as part of anticipatory actions (FAO, 2018), but have yet to be mainstreamed and scaled up. Community vulnerability assessments have also been an integral part of FAO's work on climate change in fisheries and aquaculture.
20. FAO has had no focus on people living with disability. Yet, FAO, as part of its role in co-hosting the United Nations Climate Resilience Initiative A2R, has implemented a global crowdsourcing contest on innovative ideas for anticipatory action. The winning proposal promoted the idea of developing a specific early warning sign language for deaf people in the Philippines. Based on the winning proposal, FAO and A2R partners lead by UNDP initiated a process for the development of a regional project for Asia, to be presented to the Adaptation Fund with the aim to mainstream disability into climate action.
21. In agro-pastoral production systems, FAO has helped countries to integrate resilience measures by developing the Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP) tool.¹⁰ In addition, EWEA impact studies in Africa have shown it to be useful to livestock pastoralists in times of recurring and severe drought, ensuring that pastoralist families do not herd their weak and exhausted livestock vast distances in search of water and grazing.
22. In crop-based farming, the distribution of e.g., seeds are often part of anticipatory intervention. This has shown positive results in EWEA impact studies, following FAO guidelines to ensure that it does no harm. Nevertheless, seeds distribution per se is not sustainable. The link to FAO's expertise and networks had not been leveraged to ensure climate resilient seed systems at local to national levels (see Paragraph 38).
23. Among countries with specific vulnerability, FAO is particularly attentive in Small Islands Developing States (SIDS). Approximately 7 percent of the mapped FAO-GEF portfolio on climate change included SIDS countries. FAO focused particularly on the climate adaptation capacity in 11 SIDS Caribbean countries. FAO is supporting a number of SIDS¹¹ to integrate agricultural hazards into national plans; in establishing EWEA systems and reporting the damages and loss to agriculture resulting from disasters. Part of the support is addressing the lack of data sets. In January 2020, empowering women in food systems and strengthening the local capacities and resilience of SIDS in the agriculture and food sectors was launched under the Resilient and Sustainable Food Systems Program, to be implemented in Barbados, Comoros, Sao Tome and Principe, Samoa, Palau and Saint Lucia. The project aligned with the Commitments of the SAMOA Pathway (Small Island Developing States Accelerated Modalities of Action). Interviewed FAO personnel working in SIDS highlighted the specific difficulties for FAO in these countries because of the small offices, long distances and low number of technical personnel in country government agencies.

EQ 1.2. Is the climate agenda mainstreamed across FAO's portfolio of programmes and projects to ensure enhanced relevance and coherence with FAO's mission on climate action, SDG 13, the Paris Agreement and the evolving international climate agenda?

¹⁰ <http://www.fao.org/in-action/sharp/background/en/>

¹¹ Saint Lucia, Barbados, Fiji, Haiti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Timor-Leste, Guinea-Bissau, Trinidad and Tobago

Finding 4. There is a fragmentation of DRR/M and CCAM at global level, which is also reflected in the FAO portfolio. Although the negative effect of this silo was raised in the 2015 Evaluation of FAO Strategic Objective 5, and despite reported requests by FAO country offices for coherence between OER and the Office of Climate Change, Biodiversity and Environment (OCB), the silos remain. Even so, initial cooperation on governance has been promising.

24. DRR/M for climate resilience is an adaptation priority in all regions, particularly in eastern and Southeast Asia and Oceania, southern Asia, central America and sub-Saharan Africa (Crumpler *et al.*, 2020). According to FAO global analysis, 84 percent of 134 countries referred to DRR/M in their nationally determined contributions (NDCs) (FAO, 2016b). However, disaster risk governance is rarely addressed at the sectoral level in NDCs. Project work on DRR and resilience is not fully coordinated with other FAO divisions, particularly at headquarters. According to personnel, projects in other divisions make the link to DRR/M and climate change, but still do not consider it in activities. The distinction made between climate- and non-climate-related risks tends to create unnecessary divisions. The silos tend to be influenced by the type and drivers of risk. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has shown the systemic nature of risks and the importance of a multi-hazard approach. Climate change contributes to exacerbating systemic and multiple risks and how they interrelate. The Evaluation Team also observed missed opportunities to leverage expertise and knowledge products from the crops, livestock, fisheries and forest sub-sectors for long-term resilience to disasters.
25. After the recent restructuring of FAO, the themes of climate change and disaster reduction and management are represented at office-level, but OCB and OER have not yet a clearly identified role. There is generally a growing consensus between OER and OCB that, to link DRR/M and CCAM and mainstreaming them into resilient agriculture and associated sectors, sectoral boundaries and institutional parallelism must be overcome. Here, governance is key (see also finding 14). In 2019, OER and OCB jointly published guidelines to support policy practitioners and planners in examining opportunities and constraints for convergence from a governance perspective, in addition to integration DRR/M and CCA action on agriculture. More recently, they have been advocating for good governance when it comes to managing multi-hazard, multisectoral systemic risk. This work is in the early stages and it remains unclear how OER and OCB will jointly pursue it.
26. OER together with OCB are actively engaged with the Marrakesh Partnership for Global Climate Action (MPGCA) and the UN Climate Resilience Initiative (A2R). Both these partnerships are important to reduce the global fragmentation in climate change responses and to deliver coherent and convergent climate action across and within sectors and at scale to immediately lower emissions and increase resilience against climate impacts forge a common narrative for driving. The FAO and A2R supports the MPGCA climate resilience pathways and along the same lines, also promotes a shared narrative around key climate risk management action for the agri-food systems. The cooperation of OER and OCB is necessary for internal coherence with FAO and for the needed multi-sectoral coordination at the national and global levels.

Finding 5. Climate-risk safeguards are not being systematically applied across FAO's programming and operations and so far, have tended to be limited to GEF and GCF projects. FAO is working to support FAO practitioners by updating its Environmental and Social Management Guidelines (ESMGs) to include climate risk screening, standards and practices.

27. To manage climate trade-offs and avail of synergies, project risk screening needs to have a climate dimension. Social and environmental safeguards need to be implemented throughout the project cycle, something lacking to date. Currently, most of the social and environmental safeguards applied to FAO initiatives are donor driven. GEF and GCF require the inclusion of safeguards, including on climate change, and both the FAO GEF and GCF Units work closely with the OCB to ensure that climate risks are adequately addressed in its projects.
28. FAO is reviewing its ESMGs and introducing a new Standard on Climate and Disaster Risk. The document sets out new mandatory elements that must be integrated into FAO's project cycle, including reporting through the Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS).¹² Under the revised ESMGs, Environmental and Social Standard (ESS) 3 on climate change and disaster risks acknowledges greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from agriculture and food systems as a significant cause of climate change in parallel with the vulnerabilities of the agricultural sector. ESS 3 requirements include GHG emission and carbon sinks and adaptation to climate change and disaster risks.
29. In 2020, FAO-GEF produced a detailed guidance note, together with the OCB Climate Risks Team, to support FAO practitioners in climate risk screening and assessments over the FAO-GEF project cycle.¹³ The climate risk screening includes hazard identification, exposure and vulnerability assessments, as well as adaptive capacity and climate resilience assessments. Gender, poor and vulnerable groups are taken into account. Fisheries are included in the assessment of specific risks (acidification, salinity, sea surface temperature and sea-level rise). Diseases risks (such as COVID-19 and malaria) are also considered. The guidance note provides links to tools to estimate GHG emissions from agriculture, including the FAO Ex Ante Carbon-Balance Tool (EX-ACT) and Farm Carbon Calculator. Fisheries practices are not specified, however, as the note is focused on Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use. It also does not seem to include post-harvest emissions. FAO-GEF and OCB are currently piloting the climate change screening on the entire FAO-GEF portfolio and more than 60 projects have already been screened by team members at FAO headquarters. In 2021, FAO-GCF will also develop a guidance note for its projects.

EQ 1.3. What types of initiatives have been or are likely to be most effective in achieving significant and sustainable results and why (for example, policy advisory, governance and institutional development, data, information and knowledge management, direct assistance to stakeholders, South-South and triangular cooperation, farmer organizations, traders, schools and resource mobilization)?

Finding 6. In line with the UNFCCC's Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action's Climate Resilience Network, FAO has provided demand driven, high quality support to countries on DRR/M planning, information service and capacity building, using high quality tools for evidenced based planning and decision making for the agricultural sector. Although most of the interventions are highly promising and parts are integrated in e.g., regional resilience plans, these have yet to be fully implemented as a coherent climate resilience programme within FAO at scale.

30. FAO's work on resilience supports countries to: i) govern risks and crises through understanding the nature and dynamics of risks and the programming, implementation

¹² For the purposes of these Guidelines, "programming" is generally understood as supported activities with defined results and resources over which FAO has significant organizational influence. "Projects" and "programmes" are typically the entry points at which environmental and social safeguard policies and procedures are applied.

¹³ GEF Guidance Note: Climate Risk Screening and Assessments. Climate Risks Team. FAO OCB. Sept 7, 2020

and support of legal, policy and institutional systems, including coordination mechanisms and resource mobilization for risk reduction and crisis management; ii) watch to safeguard by producing and communicating early warning against potential, known and emerging threats, as well as promoting standards for analysing structural causes of food and nutrition crises; iii) reduce risk and vulnerability at household and community level; and iv) prepare and respond to disasters and crises.

31. FAO's DRR/M portfolio of services includes: i) assist countries to develop or update their sectoral DRR/M in agriculture (depending on specific country request this may or may not be climate related disaster); ii) integrate community base DRR/M into community development plan; iii) cost benefit analysis, mainstreamed into institutional planning, used also for evidence to support anticipatory action; iv) use of social protection mechanisms to finance the most vulnerable; v) assisting countries to report and monitor Sendai C-2 indicator (damage and loss) used also for evidence to support anticipatory action; vi) Early Warning Early Action (EWEA) - anticipatory action contingency planning for the acute emergencies, including monitoring systems for multi-hazard; vii) emergency response as a way to phase preventive action and Build Back Better; viii) mainstreaming gender and social inclusion; ix) governance; and x) knowledge management.

Finding 7. Whilst many governments and donors recognize the importance of preventative climate action, they remain politically more inclined to invest in disaster response than DRR/M. Therefore, FAO has produced evidence-based policy support on the cost benefits of DRR/M investments. The results to date are highly dependent on specific country contexts and levels of engagement and ownership. There are good examples of country partners taking up and translating the outputs into tangible results. However, pathways for upscaling and resilience outcomes still need to be developed and achieved.

32. FAO has supported the development of EWEA systems in about 39 countries facing (multiple) hazards, such as drought, floods, cyclones, hurricanes and typhoons, to their crop, livestock and fisheries sectors. The results have varied depending on the country in question. An impact study of EWEA intervention in La Guajira, Colombia, for example, showed that drought was going to exacerbate a major food crisis for indigenous peoples, such as the Wayúu, on top of a migrant crisis from neighbouring Venezuela (FAO, 2019b). FAO's resilience index measurement and analysis (RIMA) tool showed that families benefiting from FAO's rapid recovery model for agricultural production became significantly more resilient within the year of intervention and that the intervention had a high return on investment at household level (for every USD spent, the return was USD 2.6). The Philippines, meanwhile, with long experience of managing multiple hazards, is a prime example of how to embed an agricultural resilience plan that involved long-term FAO support. Its NDC and National Adaptation Plan (NAP) have solid governance structures and implementation mechanisms, are reasonably resourced with operational results-based monitoring and evaluation system. These achievements are based on an iterative process of adjusting plans. In the case of Paraguay, adjustments are being made to its national four-year multi-sub-sectoral DRR/M and CCA plan. According to the FAO Subregional Office for Mesoamerica, the country has not yet managed to fully respond to the complexity of climate change. The plan was too ambitious, lacked flexibility and did not fully reflect human, technical and financial capacities. However, a social protection scheme is being implemented (FAO, 2019c).
33. Not all countries with early warning are able to conduct early action, and not all early interventions may be equally effective. EWEA applicability across countries depend on institutional readiness/capacity. Early action is only effective when supported by strong

real-time evidence or early warnings that are targeted to agriculture sectors and developed in coordination with users. While FAO made significant progress in both early warning and response actions, support to countries linking early warning to early action systems are still fragmentary. Technically, complex information needs to be put together to identify triggers and indicators to define early action. Politically, some countries may hesitate to take early action and/or declare a state of emergency.

EQ 2. Is FAO fit for purpose to make a significant contribution to globally agreed climate action targets?

EQ 2.1. To what extent are FAO's strategic objectives, results framework and strategies (current and forthcoming) aligned with global policies and strategies, such as the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement?

Finding 8. Climate change is a cross-cutting theme in FAO's Strategic Framework and its targets are aligned with SDG 13. However, FAO Strategic Framework guidance remains more advisory and aspirational than operational. The real impetus for FAO's work often comes from national governments, donors, statutory committees and international climate change-related conventions, processes and decisions, such as the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

34. The way climate change is addressed by FAO's Strategic Results Framework has evolved over time. The reviewed Strategic Framework 2010–2019 introduced FAO to a new way of working, through a conceptual framework with cross-sectoral, interdisciplinary approaches to interconnected challenges, as expressed by the SDGs and the Paris Agreement. The Strategic Framework has five strategic objectives (SOs), plus a sixth objective on technical quality, statistics and cross-cutting themes (climate change, gender, governance and nutrition) (FAO, 2017c). Being included as a cross-cutting theme in the Strategic Framework implies that climate change should be considered in and across all of FAO's activities, programmes and policies.
35. Climate change is also explicitly addressed in two SOs: SO2 (to increase and improve the provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner) and SO5 (to increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises). FAO's Medium Term Plan 2018–2021 established a set of indicators to track global trends at SO level, aligning its results framework with the SDGs. However, initially, the Strategic Framework did not reflect climate change-specific targets or policy and strategy elements that would be crucial to assessing the agency's achievements on climate change. The formulation of a dedicated climate change strategy and the results framework tried to address these shortcomings.
36. The presence of the FAO Strategy on Climate Change, combined with the SO structure, provided an opportunity to realize cross-sectoral, integrated approaches. However, as the Evaluation of FAO's Strategic Results Framework (FAO, 2019d) highlighted and the SDG 2 Evaluation confirmed (FAO, 2020b), the matrix structure, which should have suited multidisciplinary approaches, did not percolate down to subregional and country office levels nor help FAO overcome the silos. This has led to the sub-optimal dissemination of climate change guidance and a lack of coordination throughout the Organization. The Strategic Framework is all encompassing and sufficiently general to fit most FAO initiatives, including the cross-cutting climate change work. However, there is a dearth of guidance on how to put the cross-cutting aspect into practice. Also, while the Strategic Framework sets out FAO's high-level aspirations, many personnel develop initiatives based on donor priorities or Country Programming Frameworks (CPFs). Lastly, continued strategic guidance

comes more from the statutory committees, in addition to the international climate change-related conventions, such as UNFCCC.

Finding 9. The new organizational structure (June 2020) and the establishment of OCB present a key opportunity to put climate change on a par with the rest of the Organization (in terms of technical divisions, operations and finance), to elevate it at global, regional and country level and to stimulate mainstreaming and coordination between the various technical divisions. However, as yet there is limited coordination with the DRR/M work under OER, and OER has limited links with other technical division within FAO, which is a missed opportunity in resilience building.

37. FAO is currently engaged in a strategic thinking process that will lead to the formulation of a new Strategic Framework 2020–2029. To this end, FAO has presented a new organizational structure (FAO, 2021b). Among other things, this will elevate the position of the Climate and Environment Division (CBC) to that of an Office (Climate, Environment and Biodiversity Office), giving it official status as a cross-cutting function within the Organization. In addition, among the seven sectoral offices, two others are relevant to this evaluation: OER and the Office for SDGs. In June 2020, FAO initiated the strategic planning for the future Office of OCB as a participatory process involving headquarters and the decentralized offices. The results of the present evaluation aimed at informing these planning processes.
38. The Office structure aims to ensure new ways of working and coordinating between technical divisions and levels. In the view of the Evaluation Team, this provides a good opportunity to elevate climate change to a truly cross-cutting level in all areas of the natural resources, socioeconomic, partnerships and outreach streams. The technical divisions within these work streams house FAO's technical, economic and social expertise or provide enabling operational and logistical support. OCB could thus integrate all climate change work and divisional support, including the development and application of technical solutions as well as normative work and policy support. It is not yet clear how this communication or coordination will function in practice, or how coordination with other (related) offices will work, in particular with OER. An important aspect of OCB is that it hosts the GEF, GCF and Adaptation Fund offices, so the major climate financing capacity rises in the FAO hierarchy. With this in mind, FAO is currently drafting an FAO–GEF strategy.
39. There are no structural relations between FAO's DRR/M, climate adaptation and resilience work with other technical divisions such as fisheries, livestock, crops and forestry. This is not only a missed opportunity in tapping into the technical expertise and knowledge products within FAO, this is also a missed opportunity in tapping into the natural and political capital that is accessible within FAO. For instance, under OCB, FAO hosts the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (FAO, 2021c). The Treaty has 147 signatory countries, all of which are FAO Member States, under which about two million accessions of the most important crops for food and agriculture are governed through its multilateral systems of access and benefit sharing. The Treaty's Benefit Sharing Fund had resulted into multi-sectoral partnerships in several countries that enabled the access, use and development of a likely unprecedented number of climate resilient cultivars for the climate adaptation of vulnerable small-holder farmers in highly diverse agro-ecologies.¹⁴ For the EWEA seeds distribution of FAO, establishing linkages to the Treaty

¹⁴ Forthcoming FAO OEDD. Evaluation of the third project cycle of the Benefit Sharing Fund of the International Treaty on the Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture

and the respective countries, could bring about mutually transformative change in resilience building. Except for Scaling up Climate Ambition on Land Use and Agriculture through NDCs and National Adaptation Plans (SCALA) (FAO, 2021d), despite plant genetic resources being recognized as important for climate adaptation in the FAO Climate Change Strategy, there is very limited linkage with the Treaty, which is illustrative of the silos within FAO.

EQ 2.2. Does FAO have clear and articulated institutional strategies and plans to support climate action?

Finding 10. The FAO Climate Change Strategy is aligned to SDG 13 and refers to the Paris Agreement, three Rio Conventions and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. The strategy is comprehensive in nature and establishes links to the work of most technical divisions and thematic priorities of the organization as they relate to the international agenda and the need for enhanced coordination. This strategy has been used as the framework for the NDC work at global and national level; it is FAO's general framework for climate change work planning and reporting and is regarded as useful also in communicating to donors and international partners on FAO's commitment to climate change.

40. The FAO Climate Change Strategy, operational since 2017, aimed at enhancing institutional and technical capacities of Member States, including DRR/M (outcome 1), improving integration of food security, agriculture forestry and fisheries within the international climate agenda (outcome 2) and internal coordination and delivery of FAO's work (outcome 3). Its plan of action, under outcome 1, includes different work streams, currently implemented mainly under CBC/OCB leadership but also by other divisions such as OER. This includes: i) implementing NDCs, integrating agriculture and food considerations and climate in national policies; ii) support for disaster risk reduction, increasing knowledge and technical support to countries on climate-smart agriculture (CSA); iii) promoting access to climate financing for food and agriculture sectors; iv) organizing technical and policy exchanges; v) producing normative work in support of food, agriculture and climate; and vi) building institutional capacity to generate, collect and use data to enhanced ability to address CCAM and tools for dissemination and reporting. Through this, the FAO Strategy on Climate Change connects with the work of most of FAO's divisions. The strategy cross-references its action plan with the (then) Strategic Programme for coherence.
41. Through its second outcome (improved integration of food security and nutrition, agriculture, forestry and fisheries considerations within the international agenda on climate change through reinforced FAO engagement) the Strategy describes FAO's role in contributing not only to UNFCCC but also to the Convention on Biodiversity and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, as well as FAO's work on climate action with donors, in international forums with strategic partner organizations (within and outside the agriculture and climate sector) making specific reference to youth involvement. This shows the integration of FAO's Strategy on Climate Change with different global conventions and its inclusiveness and collaboration with partners. The Climate Change Strategy has a strong focus on country support and therefore, it speaks to the development of NDCs, integration in policies, and improving capacities, including for financing. Because it is presented as FAO's general framework for climate change work planning and reporting, it is regarded as useful by donors and international partners to communicate on FAO's commitment to climate change.

Finding 11. The FAO Climate Change Strategy is poorly aligned with the transformational dimension and interconnected and indivisible nature of the 2030 Agenda. It lacks a solid theory of change to connect FAO's climate-related work either horizontally or vertically. It does not address important areas of FAO's work on climate change in relation to climate risks and food systems, nor make explicit reference to trade-offs. Its outcome indicators and targets are weak. The absence of a clear reference to transformational change in the context of the 2030 Agenda reduces its utility, visibility and viability.

42. The FAO Climate Change Strategy has no theory of change to explain what change FAO foresees, how it plans to achieve and/or contribute to them and what its assumptions are with a view to bringing about such change. Thus, the Strategy does not align with the transformational dimension of the 2030 Agenda. While the Strategy was a good framework for FAO's work on the NDCs, the NAPs, climate financing and all other "pure" climate change-related actions, it does not provide a good framework for cross-fertilization of sectors and overlooks the potential to mainstream climate change in areas of FAO's work.
43. The FAO Climate Change Strategy prioritizes the agricultural sectors in relation to climate change, rather than climate change as such. Its language is agriculture-centred, for instance, concentrating on NDCs in food and agriculture sectors, climate financing for those sectors and the integration climate change-related issues into the agricultural and food sectors. The Strategy fails to look at how climate change interacts with food, agriculture and other related sectors (directly or indirectly). While agroecology and agroforestry are recognized as integrated and holistic approaches to climate change adaptation and mitigation, the Strategy actions do not refer to these. The Strategy also needs to tackle the interaction of climate with other sectors, such as employment, migration, transport and trade. There is only one mention of FAO engaging in forums that do not specifically deal with agriculture. This lack of connection does not chime with the interconnected and indivisible nature of the SDGs.
44. The results framework of the FAO Climate Change Strategy lacks quantitative indicators and impact statements linked to a theory of change. Outcomes and outputs are mostly activity oriented (number of countries supported, new tools developed, workshops organized, etc.) rather than result or impact oriented. The third outcome, for example, is to strengthen coordination and delivery of FAO's work on climate change, but does not say how this should be done. Output indicators cite number of personnel, budget, partnerships and climate-specific outputs. There are no operational changes or official coordinating structures and climate change is not vertically or horizontally connected. Also, while the strategy talks of prioritizing most divisions that work on climate change (food security and nutrition, agriculture, forestry and fisheries and aquaculture, rural livelihoods and natural resource management and conservation), it fails to mention areas clearly connected with climate change, such as climate risk, food systems and trade-offs. Moreover, reporting on the FAO Climate Change Strategy only began in 2019, using only adaptation and mitigation policy markers to track the climate change portfolio, so this reporting is incomplete.¹⁵ This limited reach and detail reduces the Strategy's visibility and utility.
45. The Climate Change Strategy does not address the fragmentation in climate change undertakings, policy framework and financing across the national and international systems, including the United Nations (UN). For instance, the UN Common Guidance on

¹⁵ There was no peer review of climate change policy markers, so projects tagged with adaptation and mitigation policy markers could not estimate correctly the climate change portfolio for 2018–2019. Taking a random sample of 40 projects, the evaluation estimated that only 12 percent of projects were correctly tagged with climate markers.

Helping Build Resilient Societies¹⁶ pointed to the challenges of the continued separation of humanitarian, development, human rights and peace and security action; and how the fragmentation impedes building resilience for the whole of society, and realizing the SDGs. In this regard, the work of FAO through the Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action's Climate Resilience Network, A2R and CADRI are important towards addressing the fragmentation (See EQ2 on partnership).

46. Whilst the strategy recognized the interconnectedness of the impacts of climate change on food and agriculture across environmental, social and economic dimensions, the strategy does not provide an approach on managing the multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral aspects of systemic risks. The strategy does not prepare for the necessary large-scale coordinated response to the increasing frequency and virulence of transboundary climate hazards. Nor does the strategy capitalized on FAO's comparative advantage of coordinating anticipatory response to transboundary risks. Moreover, the strategy does not provide comprehensive and prescient food-crisis insights into potential simultaneous and consecutive crop failures and the cascading risks from a humanitarian–development–peace perspective, and for immediate and long-term perspective.

Finding 12. Aside from the Climate Change Strategy, FAO has other strategies and plans that directly or indirectly target climate change. FAO played an active role to address climate change in United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNSDCFs) where it had a recognised role in climate change. Many regional climate agendas and CPFs, particularly in countries that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disasters, have included climate action early on and dedicate significant resources to it. While these are not always aligned or coordinated globally, they guide FAO's work on climate action.

47. At national and regional level, FAO has other strategic documents that guide its climate change work, including regional initiatives. Of the 148 countries with reframed CPFs, 81 cited climate change as a key priority (23 in previous CPFs, prior to 2015), while 28 indirectly address adaptation and mitigation strategies to build resilience to climate change events. The majority of these countries are in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and Asia-Pacific. All Regional Offices and their Member countries have developed regional initiatives that specifically target climate change and DRR/M. Country case studies showed a number of earlier CPFs that included climate change as a priority, even before the Paris Agreement, the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture or the FAO Climate Change Strategy, underscoring that country demand for climate work preceded the FAO's strategies.
48. In countries where FAO already has a clear recognized comparative advantage in climate action, FAO actively contributed to define the climate change priorities under the UNSDCF. For example, in Uganda, FAO as co-chair of the UNSDCF development team contributed to shaping the UNSDCF Strategic Priority II Outcome 2.2 on climate change and disaster risk.
49. FAO strategic documents (CPF and regional initiatives) are well aligned with the incipient UNSDCF. For example, in the case of SIDS, FAO is an active signatory of the UNSDCF for the Pacific (2018–2022). The UNSDCF is a five-year framework for the collective response of the UN system to the development priorities of the 14 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs), including Fiji. This response is tailored to each country's priorities, responding to Pacific leaders' call to the UN to align their work programmes and operations to support internationally agreed obligations, including the SDGs. The UN Pacific Strategy has six outcomes with climate change being the focus of Outcome 1 – Climate Change,

¹⁶ UN Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies: Final Advance Draft - September 2020

Disaster Resilience and Environment Protection. Twenty-three UN agencies are signatories to the document. The FAO Pacific Multi-Country Programming Framework (CPF) for 2018–2022 is in line with the UN Strategy for the Pacific.

EQ 2.3. How is FAO's mission on climate action reflected in the Organization's governance and operating structure?

Finding 13. Aside from FAO's technical capacity in developing and adapting high quality DRR/M tools, the main strength of FAO is its machinery to pull together information and convene stakeholders within the agricultural sector for informed decision making. With a relatively strong analytical team, FAO can anticipate shocks and trigger actions. Furthermore, FAO can follow programmes across scales and across countries. These are highly relevant considering the transboundary nature of many climate related disasters and risks. For DRR/M, there are good examples of coordination between FAO's operating structures on the vertical and horizontal work of climate action. However, beyond DRR/M there seems to be little coordination or communications with other divisions.

50. The evaluation of the 2016–2017 El Niño induced drought in southern Africa found that FAO's early warning system and delivery mechanisms were effective for the magnitude of the crisis; and well-coordinated across FAO. FAO declared a Corporate Surge Support¹⁷ to the region. The FAO Southern Africa Resilience Hub (SFS-REOSA) in collaboration with the FAO Regional Office for Africa (RAF), and the Emergency and Rehabilitation Division (TCE) at FAO headquarters, and as the concerned countries in southern Africa, developed a full response plan. FAO mobilized USD 44.4 million (41 percent of the funding appeal) to complement government actions. In Malawi, Lesotho and Zimbabwe, FAO made relevant contributions to the three priority areas: i) reduce the food gap and improve access to nutritious food in the short term through off-season crop and vegetable production, and supporting farmers in the main 2016/17 season; ii) protect and enhance livestock production at country level; and iii) strengthen coordination with in the region and at FAO headquarters, information and analysis relating to El Niño.
51. The evaluation of FAO's subregional response to the El Niño induced severe drought as highly relevant whereby FAO coordinated closely with the Southern African Development Community (SADC) on the regional response action plan. This ensured that the objectives and design of the FAO regional response plan were fully aligned with regional priorities and commitments, as stipulated in the SADC appeal (SADC, 2016) and in the Regional Inter-agency Standing Committee El Niño response plan (RIASCO, 2016). Furthermore, the existence of the SADC appeal and the RIASCO Action Plan for southern Africa was useful as it formed the basis and provided the strategic direction/framework for SADC, UN agencies and its partners to develop a common vision and priorities in responding to the 2015/16 El Niño induced drought, and all subsequent actions in southern Africa. The SADC response and RIASCO were the main guiding framework for all subsequent programme planning and implementation at the regional and country level.
52. However, the evaluation of the 2016–2017 El Niño induced drought in southern Africa also found significant gaps in the delivery mechanisms that hinder the full effectivity of FAO in the southern Africa region. At programme level, although all three CPFs have pillars addressing resilience building and disaster risk reduction, there were no explicit mechanisms in the respective CPFs to allow for programme flexibility and adaptiveness: no

¹⁷ Level 3 Corporate emergency response to the subregion.

defined scenario-based risk analysis, contingency allocation or provision to allow for realignment or redirection of funds. The mobilization of the surge funds through the Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA) mechanism to cover the cost of technical support staff and needs assessment worked very well. Beyond SFERA, there were no mechanisms in place nor immediate availability of funds for FAO country offices to access emergency programme funds for immediate response.

53. Integrated, cross-sectoral work was easier in decentralized offices when there was adequate human resource capacity. For instance, the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific and the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean have a Natural Resources and Environment Group that works in an integrated manner, with SDG 13 as its main topic. The GCF and GEF project development groups are placed within the Natural Resources and Environment Group to support countries in accessing financing to scale up their CSA, CCAM and DRR efforts in the agricultural and land sectors. At subregional level, FAO has shown added value by facilitating South-South cooperation and the pooling of expertise to tackle climate related transboundary issues such as crops and animals' pest and diseases, water management, and be sensitive to resulting conflicts. The regions found that a good advantage for each country to use the same standard of measurement for regional comparison, with a strong value added following global level reporting obligations.

EQ 2.4. How relevant and adequate are FAO's delivery mechanisms, human and financial resources and monitoring systems when it comes to addressing country or regional needs and planning, budgeting, monitoring and communicating FAO support in achieving the SDG 13 and Paris Agreement targets?

Finding 14. FAO's work on climate action is highly valued for the competency of its personnel, and the excellence of the tools and resources it can deploy at country level. Its lack of human and financial capital, however, is widely seen as the main constraint on vertical and horizontal expansion and on the impact of FAO's work.

54. The Evaluation Team for FAO's contribution to SDG 13 found many decentralized offices to be struggling to deliver high-quality support and climate change proposals for lack of capacity. The Evaluation of Strategic Objective 5 highlighted the implications of a minimal core budget for DRM/M (FAO, 2016c). To this day, this issue has not been sufficiently addressed and there are significant budgetary shortfalls at subregional and country levels.

Finding 15. A number of FAO climate-related programmes have proven good delivery mechanisms for country support and global reach on international conventions. The same goes for regional work, including the regional initiatives on climate change. However, FAO's lack of a programmatic approach and its heavy reliance on implementation through individual donor grant funded projects, including at regional level, hampers its ability to be more strategic and to tactically link medium-term achievements to long-term and transformative outcomes or impact.

55. According to their external evaluations and impact studies, country office, regional office and headquarters-led projects that pilot and analyse technical options for DRR at regional, national and local levels have proven to be effective. Policy support and normative work have also been implemented through individual projects. However, funding for such initiatives is substantially lower. Making a project approach the key method of implementation, without lack of a programmatic approach and coordination through separate projects, leads to inconsistent coordination and a lack of cohesion, as well as to the suboptimal utilization of

specialized resources (human, technical and financial).¹⁸ Short-term project-based approaches, coupled with (overly) ambitious commitments, have weakened FAO's capacity to deliver transformative outcomes and link to countries' longer-term processes and policies. The project-based delivery model (ultimately determined by the rules of extra-budgetary donors) challenges FAO's capacity to contribute to change at scale and to promote the replication of successful pilots. This is down to a combination of limited duration and scope (most are one-off, single-country, field-based climate change-focused projects), even when initiatives are folded into longer-term, multi-country programmes. Some of these projects have a policy support component and a research and knowledge management component, but most target field-based, local interventions. Moreover, the limited duration is generally not enough to influence changes in policy or plans with transformational potential. This was found to be a limitation to DRR. Transformational change and paradigm shift are explicitly discussed in just a few project design documents, largely linked to capacity development, but there is far less on scaling and the creation of enabling conditions.

56. Limited project duration also stymies FAO's capacity to assess post-project DRR outcomes. As the case of the Philippines demonstrates, DRR outcomes need to be viewed from a long-term, non-linear perspective. FAO is unable to fully monitor and report on the extent of its cumulative achievements. The same can be said of FAO's capacity to monitor resilience of DRR/M and CCA at subregional and country levels, where such operations tend to lack consistency and coherence on the monitoring front.

EQ 3. Does FAO engage in partnerships that optimally leverage the effects of its work on climate action to ensure they generate impact?

EQ 3.1. Do FAO's collaborations with its main (public and private) development partners (United Nations and otherwise) successfully build on FAO's comparative strengths in climate change-related areas?

Finding 16. FAO draws legitimacy from its role as a neutral, factual and technical partner, whose guidance is grounded in scientific analysis and best practices. On DRR/M, FAO collaborates primarily with governmental bodies such as the ministries of agriculture and regional bodies. There are a number of promising examples where FAO supported partnerships and made progress from reactive to anticipatory actions. However, so far there seem to be few conceptual, methodological and operational links to transform anticipatory actions into coherent climate resilient food and agriculture outcomes.

57. In the Africa region, FAO works in partnership with national governments, the African Union Commission (AUC), regional economic commissions (RECs), the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the Africa Solidarity Trust Fund (ASTF), the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), civil society organizations, research institutes, UN agencies, the World Bank and donors. The initiative supports and facilitates exchange of resilience, good practices and knowledge in the region. The regional initiative also seeks to support countries in meeting one of the key commitments of the

¹⁸ See, among others: GEF: Adding Value and Promoting Higher Impact through the GEF's Programmatic Approach https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Programmatic_Approach_3.pdf; World Bank: Multiphase Programmatic Approach <https://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/203081501525641125/pdf/MPA-07192017.pdf>; Serrador, P. & Turner, R. (2015). The relationship between project success and project efficiency. *Project Management Journal*, 46(1), 30–39

- Malabo Declaration on reducing the number of people in Africa vulnerable to climate change and other threats.
58. FAO southern Africa's partnership with SADC resulted in the SADC's regional DRR strategy and a number of member states. SADC member states have succeeded in establishing disaster risk management legislation, policies, institutions, strategies and national plans. However, few sectoral policies have integrated disaster risk reduction. There has also been limited progress in allocating resources to implement these strategies and plans or to reduce underlying risk drivers.
 59. Working with the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative (AGIR) in the Sahel and West Africa, FAO is part of a multi-sector partnership that collaborates in supporting 17 countries in the region to formulate a five-year country resilience planning including social protection to secure livelihood. FAO is working with CILSS to strengthen country technical capacities in resilience measurement and analysis, using resilience index measurement and analysis (RIMA) to better inform and enhance the impacts of resilience initiatives in the region (FAO; 2016d).
 60. FAO is working with its partners to promote climate risk insurance to smallholder farmers as well as encouraging the establishment of regional or multi-country insurance funds, such as the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility (CCRIF) and the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility. CCRIF represents a paradigm shift in the way governments treat risk and pre-disaster planning. Since the establishment of the fund in 2007, the facility has made 41 pay outs to 13 member governments covering USD 152 million.
 61. FAO is supporting South-South cooperation for the preparation of the Intersectoral Regional Agenda for Social Protection and Productive Inclusion of the Central American Integration System (SICA). It was approved by the different secretariats and member states in April 2018. The agenda is a reference document in the coming years for the implementation of policies, plans, programs and projects at the national and territorial level in Central America and the Dominican Republic.
 62. Through the Regional Committee on Hydraulic Resources (CRRH) of SICA, FAO developed a system of agricultural drought monitoring for the Central American Dry Corridor. Using satellite information, the system detects agricultural areas where there are conditions of high probability of drought. The CRRH and SICA are supported by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and FAO, generate data to raise alerts about risks that may affect crops which are essential for food security.
 63. In Asia, FAO works with the respective governments of the Philippines, Myanmar, Cambodia and Viet Nam for developing guidelines on social protection systems for disaster response to increase resilience.

Finding 17. FAO collaborates well with national partners through the NDCs and the NAPs and is effective in promoting and participating in international and global agendas and partnerships on climate action related to DRR/M. These initiatives could sow transformational seeds.

64. FAO's 2016 analysis of (intended) NDCs, showed 90 percent of countries referring to the agricultural sectors. Therefore, FAO made its support for countries' NDC implementation a priority of its work under the framework of its Climate Change Strategy. A common framework was developed for analysing agriculture and land use in the NDCs (FAO, 2020c). FAO's global analysis of NDCs established that 84 percent of the countries who referred to agriculture included DRR/M in East and southeast Asia and Oceania, southern Asia, Central America and sub-Saharan Africa (Crumpler *et al.*, 2020). Most of the countries that mentioned DRR/M in their NDCs are in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). Countries in SSA often

referred to investing in DRR/M for resilience, enhancing disaster preparedness and early warning systems (FAO, 2016b).

65. The evaluation confirms the usefulness of all the materials and tools that FAO has produced to support national partners' work on NDCs and NAPs and their potential for transformational change. The majority of stakeholders interviewed at global and national level consider FAO's work on NDCs to be among its most relevant. Sixty-five percent of respondents to the external survey said that NAP- and NDC-related projects and programmes would lead to transformational change. Similarly, in interviews, partners and donors appreciated FAO's contribution to unpacking the NDC and NAP processes at national level.

Finding 18. On DRR/M, FAO also engages in partnership with a number of international organizations, especially at the UN. FAO is taking considerable efforts to break the silos in resilience work especially at the global and regional levels.

66. FAO's strong partnerships are evident in its many collaborations in the climate action arena. FAO personnel cited the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), UNDP, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank CGIAR, and humanitarian organizations, such as the International Federation of the Red Cross as its most frequent collaborators. Also, FAO OER together with OCB have supported the MPGCA¹⁹ and the UN Climate Resilience Initiative-A2R.²⁰ Both these partnerships are important to reduce the global fragmentation in climate change responses and to deliver coherent and convergent climate action across and within sectors and at scale to immediately lower emissions and increase resilience against climate impacts forging a common narrative for driving. The FAO and A2R supports the MPGCA climate resilience pathways and, along the same lines, also promotes a shared narrative around key climate risk management actions for the agri-food systems. The cooperation of OER and OCB is necessary for internal coherence with FAO and for the needed multi-sectoral coordination at the national and global levels.
67. FAO is co-chairing the CADRI partnership together with UNDP. CADRI²¹ is a global partnership composed of 20 organizations working towards the achievement of SDG 13 by providing countries with capacity development services to help them reduce climate and disaster risks. FAO contributed to the CADRI processes in Afghanistan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Fiji, Namibia, Timor-Leste, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Occupied Palestinian Territory. In addition, FAO also supported Mauritius, Togo and Comoros.
68. FAO has also formed other collaborations and partnerships with UN entities and academia on climate action, such as its 2017 memorandum of understanding with the WMO to engage in technical cooperation, joint programmes and project development on issues such as climate services in agriculture. One of the results of this arrangement is FAO's contribution (on climate-related risks and impacts) to the WMO Statement on the State of the Global Climate in 2019 (WMO, 2020).
69. Another important result of FAO's international collaboration is the flagship publication of the 2018 State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World, which highlighted the effect of climate change and the need for DRR/M (FAO *et al.*, 2018).

¹⁹ <https://unfccc.int/climate-action/marrakech-partnership-for-global-climate-action/>

²⁰ <http://www.a2rinitiative.org/new-blog/2020/1/9/a2r-tracking-progress-study>

²¹ <https://www.cadri.net>

EQ 3.2. To what degree has FAO's collaboration with Members, development or multilateral partners been effective in leveraging climate action at national and global level?

Finding 19. Whilst the partnerships are important and have brought good results as described in this sector study, most of the partnerships follow the traditional piecemeal, fragmented project approach, which tend to limit FAO's capacity to expand, adapt, replicate and scale as an agent of transformational change towards low-emissions development pathways.

70. FAO's key areas for collaboration with partners at the national level are in many of the DRR/M core functions: capacity strengthening, improvement of knowledge, improvement of access to information, testing of adaptation strategies, community vulnerability assessments, support to develop and strengthen community organizations and social inclusion programmes. These national-level partnerships have provided frequent opportunities for mutual learning and for ensuring the sustainability of the activities. This evaluation confirms that most of FAO's climate change interventions would benefit from a more integrated approach to break down silos and link sectoral efforts. FAO's piecemeal approach to projects raises transaction costs and weakens the impact of interventions. As the evaluation of FAO's Strategic Results Framework observed, FAO's new resource mobilization strategies are an attempt to move towards a more programmatic approach (FAO, 2019d).

EQ 3.3. Is FAO forging and embracing new, innovative partnerships to support SDG 13 (for example, in financing, know-how, technologies, research and advocacy) and are these showing concrete results?

Please see Findings in EQ 3.1 and EQ 3.2.

EQ 3.4. Is FAO using its internal implementation modalities to effectively achieve globally agreed climate action targets by sharing knowledge, best practices and experiences and by adapting, replicating and scaling up CCAM technologies?

Finding 20. Many of FAO's knowledge products, normative tools and guidelines are highly valued for their objective reporting, in-depth coverage and accessibility. FAO's knowledge and best practices tools are popular at country level and appreciated and widely used by development partners, including UNFCCC, to cross check national data. Apart from within the FAO Investment Centre, FAO's DRR/M work are available in two knowledge platforms. However, there is still limited internal dissemination and regular use of these tools, which is a sign of FAO's limited capitalization on its knowledge and resources.

71. FAO is promoting an inventory of these good practices and technologies through the Technologies and practices for small agricultural producers (TECA)²² and the Knowledge Sharing Platform on Resilience (KORE)²³, which are online, knowledge sharing platforms hosted by FAO. KORE aimed to inform programming and interventions to strengthen the resilience of agriculture-based livelihoods. The platform provides an overview of tools, approaches, programmes, analyses and methodologies and knowledge products on resilience implemented by FAO and other key partners in different contexts. KORE serves as an integrated and action-oriented platform on resilience-related initiatives,

²² <http://www.fao.org/in-action/kore/home/en/>.<http://www.fao.org/teca/en/>

²³ <http://www.fao.org/in-action/kore/home/en/>

policy and field good practices on resilience building across the agri-food systems. However, FAO does not have a clear strategy to monitor the uptake of its tools or to engage in systematic learning from its experiences on DRR/M, and there is currently no plan in place to scale up its actions.

References

- Baas, S., Ramasamy, S., Dey de Pryck, J. and Battista, F.** 2008. *Disaster Risk Management System Analysis. A Guide Book*. Rome: FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/i0304e/i0304e.pdf>)
- Bojić, D., Baas, S. and Wolf, J.** 2019. *Governance challenges for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation convergence in agriculture. Guidance for analysis*. Governance and Policy Support. Discussion paper. Rome. FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/ca5389en/ca5389en.pdf>)
- Crumpler, K., Gagliardi, G., Meybeck, A., Federici, S., Campos Aguirre, L., Bloise, M., Slivinska, V., Buto, O., Salvatore, M., Holmes, I., Wolf, J. & Bernoux, M.** 2020. *Regional analysis of the nationally determined contributions in Latin America: Gaps and opportunities in the agriculture and land use sectors*. Environment and natural resources management working paper No. 81. Rome, FAO. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4060/ca8249en>
- FAO.** 2015. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation*. Rome. p. 2. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/bd903e/bd903e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2016a. *Evaluation of FAO Strategic Objective 5: Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/bq613e/bq613e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2016b. *The agriculture sectors in the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions: Analysis*. Environment and Natural Resources Management Working Paper No. 62. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5687e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2016c. *Evaluation of FAO Strategic Objective 5: Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/bq613e/bq613e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2016d. *Social Protection in the Sahel and West Africa: Strengthening Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/i6226e/i6226e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2017a. *Strategic work ok of FAO to Increase the Resilience of Livelihoods*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/i6463e/i6463e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2017b. *FAO Strategy on Climate Change*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/i7175e/i7175e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2017c. *Reviewed Strategic Framework*. FAO Conference, Fortieth Session. Rome, 3–8 July 2017. C 2017/7 Rev.1. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ms431reve.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2018. *Horn of Africa: Impact of Early Warning, Early Action. Protecting pastoralist livelihoods ahead of drought*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/ca0227en/CA0227EN.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2019a. *Agriculture-related investments in disaster risk reduction and management*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/ca4417en/ca4417en.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2019b. *Colombia, Impact of Early Warning Early Action. Boosting food security and social cohesion on the frontline of the migration crisis*. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/ca6818en/CA6818EN.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2019c. *Disaster risk reduction at farm level: Multiple benefits, no regrets*. Rome. 160 pp. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/ca4429en/ca4429en.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2019d. *Evaluation of FAO's Strategic Results Framework*. Rome. (<http://www.fao.org/3/ca6453en/ca6453en.pdf>)

- FAO.** 2020a. *Programme Implementation Report 2018-19. Forty-second Session. Rome, 12-16 July 2021.* Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/nc390en/nc390en.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2020b. *Evaluation of FAO's Support to Zero Hunger (SDG 2), Phase 1.* Rome. (<http://www.fao.org/3/nc852en/nc852en.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2020c. *A common framework for agriculture and land use in the Nationally Determined Contributions.* Rome. (also available at www.fao.org/3/cb1589en/cb1589en.pdf)
- FAO.** 2021a. Resilience. In: FAO. [online]. Available at <http://www.fao.org/resilience/background/en/>
- FAO.** 2021b. FAO Organizational chart. In: FAO. [online]. Available at <http://www.fao.org/about/org-chart/en/>
- FAO.** 2021c. International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. In: FAO. [online]. Available at <http://www.fao.org/plant-treaty>
- FAO.** 2021d. Scaling up Climate Ambition on Land Use and Agriculture through NDCs and National Adaptation Plans (SCALA). In FAO. [online]. Available at <http://www.fao.org/climate-change/programmes-and-projects/detail/en/c/1273079/>
- FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO.** 2018. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2018. Building climate resilience for food security and nutrition.* Rome, FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/I9553EN/i9553en.pdf>)
- RIASCO.** 2016. *Regional Inter-Agency Standing Committee (RIASCO) Action Plan for Southern Africa: Response Plan for the El Niño-Induced Drought in Southern Africa.* (also available at <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/RIASCO%20Action%20Plan%20Draft%20Document%20PDF%20version.pdf>)
- SADC.** 2016. *Southern African Development Community (SADC) Regional Humanitarian Appeal June 2016.* (also available at https://www.sadc.int/files/9614/6832/6657/SADC_Regional_Humanitarian_Appeal_June2016_2016_0712.pdf)
- United Nations (UN).** 2015. *Paris Agreement.* UNFCCC. Bonn, Germany. (also available at https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/convention/application/pdf/english_paris_agreement.pdf)
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR).** 2015. *The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.* (also available at https://www.preventionweb.net/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf)
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).** 2021a. Marrakech Partnership for Global Climate Action. In: UNFCCC. [online]. Available at <https://unfccc.int/climate-action/marrakech-partnership-for-global-climate-action>
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).** 2021b. What do adaptation to climate change and climate resilience mean? In: UNFCCC. [online]. Available at <https://unfccc.int/topics/adaptation-and-resilience/the-big-picture/what-do-adaptation-to-climate-change-and-climate-resilience-mean>
- World Meteorological Office (WMO).** 2020. *Statement on the State of the Global Climate in 2019.* Geneva, Switzerland. (also available at https://library.wmo.int/doc_num.php?explnum_id=10211)