

**Thematic Evaluation Series**

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

**Executive Summary of the Final Evaluation of the project  
"Integrating Agriculture into National Adaptation Plans  
Programme (NAP-Ag)"**

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

## Executive summary

1. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with financial support from the International Climate Initiatives (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB, now BMU), launched the programme *Integrating Agriculture into National Adaptation Plans Programme* (UNFA/GLO/616/UND) (hereinafter, NAP-Ag). NAP-Ag was initiated in 2015 and completed on 31 December 2020. The objective is “to integrate climate change concerns as they affect agriculture sector-based livelihoods into associated national and sectoral planning and budgeting processes”.
2. The total budget of the programme was USD 17 910 034.61 (EUR 15 million). The project was first implemented in three least developed countries and five developing countries , namely Uruguay in Latin America; Kenya, Uganda and Zambia in Sub-Saharan Africa; and Nepal, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam in Asia. In mid-2015, request for additional funds to enhance activities under the programme was submitted to BMUB and the agreement was amended in December 2015 to include an additional EUR 5 million. This brought the initial total resources of EUR 10 million to EUR 15 million. Three additional countries - Colombia, Gambia and Guatemala - joined the project, and additional activities, especially focused on gender, were included. Activities in these three new counties started in 2017.
3. This final evaluation was conducted during 2020 and mainly focused on assessing the relevance, results and sustainability of the programme, adopting a qualitative approach. It covered the whole programme implementation, all countries and the global work. It included an in-depth view on six countries (Colombia, Nepal, Viet Nam, the Philippines, Kenya and Uganda). This evaluation was entirely conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, which imposed limitations to the data collection, in particular.

## Relevance

4. NAP-Ag is highly relevant to the targeted countries. Its design was strongly based on partnership; it was flexible to accommodate countries’ priorities, strengths and weaknesses, and built on countries’ capacities and existing institutions, structures, plans and policies. The global design promoted knowledge sharing, participation in several international fora, uniform methods for trainings, reduction of costs, risk management and benefits from the pool of national and international experts and resources. This increases efficiency and effectiveness.
5. NAP-Ag was in line with the countries’ national programmes, policy frameworks, and existing capacities and needs. FAO and UNDP shared responsibilities and built on each other’s specific expertise, comparative advantage, strong networks and long experience in the countries. NAP-Ag also directly contributed to the implementation of the current FAO Strategy on Climate Change (2017) and UNDP’s Strategic Plan (2018-2021).

6. NAP-Ag also responded to specific concerns of global partners such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The programme helped the countries to improve reporting to UNFCCC on progress of NAP formulation and implementation and to accomplish the work outlined by the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), the Adaptation Committee of UNFCCC, to the NAP technical working groups and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 13 on Climate Action. It informed the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA) on the importance of adaptation and NAPs.
7. Targeting of countries was adequate: least developed and developing countries are highly dependent on agriculture. They are the most impacted by climate change due to their vulnerability to climate variability, and are less prepared to face its consequences, requiring support to formulate evidence-based policies and plans.
8. The programme's theory of change was appropriate to reach the proposed goal and objectives and the results framework was flexible to address country's selected programmes as per their needs. Some indicators were ambitious considering the programme time frame and budget.

## Effectiveness

9. The NAPs endeavoured to be holistic and include interconnected enablers that have the potential to reverse gains made in agricultural climate concerns, if not addressed. To achieve this, NAP-Ag involved and convened multiple stakeholders, which resulted in effective consolidation of inputs from the interdependent sectors and identification of policy entry points to integrate agriculture in the NAPs and in the sectoral planning and budgeting processes. The programme was catalyst towards enabling target countries to advance in their respective NAP processes by supporting them to develop supplementary documents and tools, since not all countries were at the same stage of development.
10. The programme's results contribute directly to the SDG 13 (Climate Action) goal and specific targets, and to the implementation of the Paris Agreement; as well as to the implementation of the FAO Strategy on Climate Change (2017) and the UNDP's Strategic Plan (2018-2021). It contributes indirectly to other SDGs, in particular SDGs 5 (Gender Equality) and 2 (Zero Hunger).
11. **Outcome 1.** NAP-Ag strengthened countries' capacity on several topics needed to advance NAP process and to scale-up adaptation through tailored trainings and sensitization workshops. These included gender mainstreaming, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), cost benefit analysis (CBA), vulnerability assessment and evidence-based planning and budgeting. It also contributed to improved institutional environment by establishing inter-sectoral coordination/cooperation and facilitating important policy and planning transformation. The programme facilitated South-South cooperation which helped to exchange knowledge, and catalysed the sharing of lessons at regional, national and international platforms.
12. **Outcome 2.** The programme was able to pave the way to integrate climate change adaptation into development policies and strategies through training and knowledge

sharing interventions that were foundational for strengthening individual and institutional capacities on adaptation planning in the agriculture sector. As a result, target countries were able to integrate adaptation planning into their national policies and processes.

13. **Outcome 3.** Evidence base on adaptation options was improved by developing stocktaking exercises, several studies and assessments, development of guiding tools and many other activities. Acquiring and transferring knowledge and experiences to other related initiatives was facilitated. The evidence generated was shared in the format of lessons learned from different activities and captured in knowledge products. The evidence generated was also basis for the development of the Strategic Plans for Climate Change and/or, NAP-Ag roadmaps and action plans.
14. **Outcome 4.** NAP-Ag supported the consolidation of a knowledge base on national adaptation planning by convening a series of advocacy and knowledge sharing events, capacity enhancement activities, development of guidelines and a monitoring mechanism with standard indicators and information from the case studies, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of climate actions in the agriculture sector. An online knowledge tank consolidated several knowledge products that are now available for ample and free access and use, currently integrated in the FAO Climate Change Knowledge Hub, launched in late 2020.

## **Gender**

15. The programme design explicitly recognized the pivotal role women play in inadvertently enabling acceleration of climate change if alienated, or slowing down its impact if involved. The design delineated areas for inclusion of women, among which the collection of gender-disaggregated data, emphasis/focus on gender in trainings, gender-focused case studies and gender-specific indicators.
16. The programme ensured, monitored and reported on women's participation in trainings, developed knowledge products, provided capacity building in gender mainstreaming in adaptation, and was able to influence the inclusion of gender aspects adaptation options in many countries. However, the adaptation options adopted do not expressly address inequities in rights or differential power relations. The uptake of gender mainstreaming varied among countries and was constrained by the varied degree of interest and uptake from country representatives.

## **Efficiency and coordination**

17. NAP-Ag was a collaborative initiative between FAO and UNDP. The management arrangement and governance structure of the programme worked well. Implementation was overall effective, and management was able to navigate and adapt to challenges. The programme management worked in close coordination with the government counterparts and support was provided for countries by regional and global teams. Multi-stakeholder steering committees helped to address issues faced by the programme at country level.

18. The programme effectively leveraged strategic partnership typologies with multi-sector stakeholders in the countries that provided valuable contributions from partners. Government was also involved directly in implementation. This strategy increased relevance of the intervention, ownership and sustainability of results of NAP-Ag.
19. The programme's M&E framework established regular monitoring at the programme, regional and country level to provide immediate feedback to improve programme implementation. M&E and support provided was effective and relevant for decision-making and learning. Some mid-term review recommendations helped to address issues and improve implementation, but some were not relevant, partially relevant or not implemented due limitation of time and/or fund.

## **Sustainability**

20. NAP-Ag built sustainability by laying the foundations for continuation of the work through i) capacities, knowledge and skills transferred to the national stakeholders; ii) institutional strengthening and coordination; iii) assimilation of programme outputs into national overarching initiatives and integration of the NAPs into statutory processes; iv) the following programme initiatives; and v) different resource mobilization achievements.
21. Programme sustainability could be threatened by staff turnover in government and other relevant institutions, lack of financial and technical support to implement the NAP roadmap, lack of funding for piloting M&E indicators and updating data, and diseases like COVID-19.

## **Progress towards impact**

22. The programme created momentum towards impact by strengthening the foundations upon which the capacities and agency in climate change adaptation options are connected for their effective identification, analysis, formulation and implementation. While the likelihood of contributing to future impact can be inferred from results achieved, it is too soon to measure impact.
23. The agriculture sector adaptation plans developed by the programme included measures to reduce the agro-ecological stress; thus it is expected that, when recommended actions or suitable adaptation options are implemented, irrigation, food production and other activities would become more resilient, ultimately leading to positive improvements to reduce the burden on the agro-ecological system.
24. NAP-Ag developed a protocol to estimate losses and damage due to extreme weather events. While this protocol does not prevent impacts in itself, it allows for better estimates that can strengthen public policy design, help design risk transfer tools and disaster preventive development plans.

## Conclusions

25. The NAP-Ag programme was highly relevant to the targeted countries. Due to vulnerability and food security importance, the need of including this sector in the NAP process was recognized at the UNFCCC. The programme was also timely, since the NAP process had started or was about to start in the selected countries.
26. The global programme design was adequate to achieve its objectives and flexible enough to address countries' needs and priorities. The objectives, components and outputs in the results framework are clear and appropriate to the issues, but some of the indicators were ambitious considering the programme time frame (when delayed in some countries) and budget.
27. The country-driven, multi-sector and multi-level approach allowed for ample engagement of stakeholders, contributed to establishing coordination mechanisms and promoted ownership of results. In most of the NAP-Ag countries, it is possible to identify changes in policies, plans and budgeting at national and subnational level. The programme enhanced knowledge to integrate adaptation concerns in planning, budgeting and monitoring frameworks of the target countries and was able to consolidate a knowledge-base on NAP-Ag. Ultimately, NAP-Ag supported countries to accomplish the work outlined by UNFCCC.
28. Programme design and implementation had significant emphasis in gender mainstreaming in adaptation. As a result, NAP-Ag was able to influence the inclusion of gender aspects adaptation options in many countries, but gender mainstreaming achieved different levels of results according to countries' interest and willingness, or related to political or cultural reluctance. There was youth-focused work in Uganda, but overall, the programme did not advance much in intentional partnerships with youth as stakeholders, problem solvers or agents of change in their communities, or of explicit reaching of extreme impoverished groups.
29. The management arrangement and governance structure of the programme was well planned with clear division of responsibilities between organizations. The programme created environment by strengthening the foundations upon which the capacities and agency in climate change adaptation options are harnessed for their effective identification, analysis, formulation, implementation and result impacts.
30. The approach adopted built ownership and sustainability. Strengthened capacity of multi-sector stakeholders, development and approvals of proposals for additional funds to scale up or build upon its outcomes and commitments by certain countries to carry over programme results are positive signs. Risks for sustainability include changes of the government's priorities, decrease in public finance in agriculture sector, transfer of staff, lack/limitation of technical/financial support to implement the roadmaps, weak inter-institutional coordination, difficulties in harmonizing M&E framework in government's M&E system.

## Recommendations

**Recommendation 1.** Future programmes should consider developed country-specific result frameworks reflecting actual activities and their respective targets, thus allowing for improved tracking of achievements and contributions from each target country.

**Recommendation 2.** Future programmes should apply a results-based management approach where activities and programme products are treated as a means to an end; and not the achievement of the desired change. This enables reporting on transformative changes that can be directly attributed to the programme's interventions and efforts.

**Recommendation 3.** Development of needs assessments was not uniform across countries (e.g. it worked in Nepal, the Philippines and Thailand while others used different types of stocktaking). While countries self-selected the activities to undertake, the global results framework was the same for all. Subsequent similar programmes design should include need and capacities assessment of each country so that country-specific activities and institutional capabilities will be reflected in the programme document.

**Recommendations 4 and 5.** Continue lobbying with the relevant government partners to adopt programme outcome in their system. Mobilize more financial support to scaling up lessons learned from NAP-Ag and further support pilot adaptation options identified by the programme.

**Recommendation 6.** There was little evidence of involvement of the private sector, yet some of the climate adaptation options proposed in the NAPs-Ag, for example on irrigation technologies, require the input of the private sector. Hence, in future programmes, involvement of private sector in such activities should be considered.

**Recommendation 7.** NAP-Ag programme outcomes mainly addressed the formulation of adaptation planning instruments in countries; however, real implementation of these roadmaps and planning instruments was not considered (including public expenses, human resources, institutional arrangements, technology, among others). In future programmes, the implementation process in countries need to be identified and considered in the design of such instruments.

**Recommendation 8.** To strengthen gender mainstreaming in adaptation options, future programming should continue to promote gender and youth specific and inclusive adaptation options and engage strategic stakeholders to support gender mainstreaming efforts to push for inclusion of aspects that guarantee access to rights and opportunities.

Project summary table				
<b>Project title:</b>	Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)			
<b>Atlas Award ID:</b>	<b>00072738</b>		<b>at endorsement (USD)</b>	<b>at completion (USD)</b>
<b>Project ID:</b>	<b>00093171</b>			
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 5246	BMUB financing:	17 910 125.19	17 910 125.19
Countries:	<b>Asia:</b> Nepal, the Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam  <b>Africa:</b> Gambia, Kenya, Uganda, Zambia  <b>Latin America:</b> Colombia, Guatemala, Uruguay,	in kind:	-	-
Focal area:	Climate change/agriculture	Other:	-	-
Operational programme:	Integrating climate change adaptation in NAP	Total co-financing:		
Executing agency:	UNDP (executing agency)  FAO (responsible party)	<b>Total project cost:</b>	7 910 125.19	17 910 125.19
PAC Meeting Date:	12 January 2014	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		1 August 2015
Management arrangement	DIM	(Operational) closing date: 31/12/2020	Proposed: 31/12/2018 then extended to 31/12/2020 as per Board recommendation	Actual: 31/12/2020
Implementing partner	National Climate Change focal points, Ministries of Agriculture, Planning and Finances; Line Ministries (water, public works, energy, environment, health, women affairs and forestry.			