



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

Organisation des Nations
Unies pour l'alimentation
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Hundred and Twenty-seventh Session

Rome, 4-8 November 2019

Evaluation of FAO's private sector partnership strategy

Queries on the substantive content of the document may be addressed to:

Masahiro Igarashi
Director, Office of Evaluation
Tel. +39 06570-53903

*This document can be accessed using the Quick Response Code on this page;
an FAO initiative to minimize its environmental impact and promote greener communications.
Other documents can be consulted at www.fao.org
MZ848e*



PC 127

Thematic evaluation series

Evaluation of the FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2019

Required citation:

Author (corporate or personal). Year of publication. *Publication title*. [Series.] Place of publication, Publisher (if different to author). Number of pages (total including preliminary pages). Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, [insert year]



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: “This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition.

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

Contents

Acknowledgments.....	v
Acronyms and abbreviations.....	vi
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation	1
1.2 Scope and objectives	1
1.3 Methodology.....	2
1.4 Limitations.....	2
2. Description of the FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector	3
2.1 The Strategy.....	3
2.2 The Strategy implementation arrangements.....	4
2.2.1 The Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS).....	4
2.2.2 Implementation mechanisms.....	4
2.2.3 Due diligence process for approval of partnerships.....	5
2.2.4 Resources.....	5
3. Findings.....	6
3.1 Strategic relevance.....	6
3.2 Effectiveness and contribution to results.....	10
3.3 Efficiency of partnerships development modalities and approaches.....	16
3.4 Integration of cross-cutting themes.....	19
4. Conclusions and recommendations	23
4.1 Conclusions.....	23
4.2 Recommendations	25
References.....	31
Bibliography	32
Appendix 1. People interviewed.....	39
Annexes	47

Acknowledgments

The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) would like to thank all those who contributed to this exercise.

The evaluation was carried out with the excellent cooperation of the management and staff of the Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS).

The Office is grateful to the Assistant Director-Generals, FAO Representatives, Partnership Officers and other FAO staff who provided invaluable insights and support to our team, especially during the missions to the Regional Office for Africa, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, and selected country offices. The Office also extends its sincere gratitude to the representatives from the governments, academia, development agencies, private sector and FAO staff who responded to our enquiries during this exercise.

We would also like to extend our gratitude to OED management and staff who took the time to identify, share and discuss evaluation-related findings and insights, particularly Masahiro Igarashi, OED Director, and Olivier Cossee, Senior Evaluation Officer (OED).

The evaluation team was led by Serdar Bayryyev, Senior Evaluation Officer (OED). The evaluation team was composed of Mikal Khan and Enika Bushi, both from the Office of Evaluation, and three external independent evaluators: Brian Baldwin, Raul Guerrero and Victor Malca. Finally, the administrative support provided by Martin Corredoira proved invaluable in arranging extensive missions.

Acronyms and abbreviations

AMR	Antimicrobial resistance
AMU	Antimicrobial use
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CFS-RAI	CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems
COAG	FAO Technical Committee for Agriculture
COFI	FAO Technical Committee on Fisheries
COFO	FAO Technical Committee on Forestry
DPI	FAO Investment Centre Division
DPS	Partnerships and South-South Cooperation Division
FFF	Forest and Farm Facility
FLEGT	FAO-EU Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade Programme
GAIN	Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFSP	Global Food Safety Partnership
ICN	International Conferences on Nutrition
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFAH	International Federation for Animal Health
IFAJ	International Federation of Agricultural Journalists
IFAP	International Federation of Agricultural Producers
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IFIF	International Feed Industry Federation
IISD	Institute for Sustainable Development
IMS	International Meat Secretariat
IPC	International Poultry Council
IPM	Integrated pest management
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
LEAP	Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance Partnership
LEG	Legal and Ethics Office
LOA	Letters of Agreement
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation
PRAI	Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment
PRONACA	National Food Processing
PSM	Private Sector Mechanism
PSP	Partnership Division
PSPS	Private Sector Partnerships Team
RAP	FAO's Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
REU	Regional Office in Europe and Central Asia
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SMEs	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
SubCom-RFA	Sub-Committee for Review of Financial and other Agreements
UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNIDROIT	International Institute for the Unification of Private Law
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

1. This report outlines the main findings and conclusions from an evaluation of the FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector. This evaluation was requested at the 125th session of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Programme Committee (November 2018) (FAO, 2018).
2. The main purpose of this evaluation is to provide an objective assessment of the progress made by FAO towards implementing its Strategy for partnerships with the private sector, and examine the extent to which the Strategy has contributed to FAO Strategic Objectives through the promotion of partnerships with the private sector.

1.2 Scope and objectives

3. The evaluation examines the appropriateness of the design of the Strategy and its approaches to partnerships, assesses the Strategy's implementation modalities and reports on the achievements resulting from private sector partnerships. In addition, the evaluation provides an analysis of the reasons why the expected results of the strategy did or didn't occur. The period covered by the evaluation is 2013-2019, i.e. the period since the adoption of the Strategy. The evaluation scope will encompass all FAO processes, mechanisms and other arrangements for implementation of the Strategy, including Country Programming Frameworks (CPFs), relevant guidance, tools, capacities and resources deployed. The results achieved are assessed at the global, regional and country levels, under the key categories of private sector contributions defined in the Strategy.
4. The evaluation applies the definitions of 'partnerships' and 'private sector' used by FAO in its Strategy. This focuses the scope on the partnerships formalized through a legal agreement such as Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Partnership Agreements and Exchange of Letters. The other numerous collaborations that FAO has with private sector entities, especially at country level, are not assessed in their entirety as they are not directly linked to the Strategy's implementation and their coverage is beyond the scope of this evaluation. However, some examples of such collaborations are analysed in the report in as much as they contribute to answering the evaluation questions, and can provide valuable lessons for FAO.
5. The evaluation focuses on three overarching questions:
 - **Strategic Relevance:** To what extent has the formulation and implementation of the Strategy responded to the global development priorities, needs of member countries and provided strategic direction and guidance to FAO units?
 - **Effectiveness and contribution to results:** To what extent have FAO partnerships with the private sector contributed to results (Strategic Framework results, results at regional and country level)?
 - **Efficiency of partnership development modalities:** Does the strategy and its implementing mechanisms provide coherent framework to promote private sector partnerships?

1.3 Methodology

6. The evaluation was conducted by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) with the support of a team of external consultants with thematic expertise. The evaluation benefitted from insights from the Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) and other FAO units throughout the evaluation process. Further information on the methodology is available in the Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) in Annex 1.
7. The evaluation relied on multiple sources for data collection and mixed-methods: document review, comparator study, administrative data analysis,¹ meta-analysis of evidence from the Office of Evaluation and other evaluations;² and interviews with over 200 stakeholders at global, regional and country levels. In addition to interviews with FAO representatives in selected country offices, the following countries and regional offices were also visited during the evaluation process:
 - Africa: Ghana (Regional Office), Kenya, Tanzania
 - Asia and the Pacific: Thailand (Regional Office)
 - Latin America and the Caribbean: Chile (Regional Office), Argentina, Ecuador

1.4 Limitations

8. In defining its scope, the evaluation focused on the private sector partnerships according to FAO's definition of "private sector" and "partnerships", as described in the Strategy. However, the evaluation teams faced challenges as these definitions are perceived differently within FAO. In view of these challenges, the evaluation drew the boundaries for the evaluation's enquiry and focused its analysis on partnerships formalized through legal arrangements such as Memorandum of Understanding, Partnership Agreements and Exchange of Letters, which were referenced in the progress reports submitted to the FAO Governing Bodies. During the evaluation, a large number of other collaborations with the private sector were noted, including those emerging from FAO investment support services and partnerships with major international financial institutions, and while these were not the main focus of the analysis, examples of these collaborations have been flagged and reported in view of the potential lessons for FAO's future engagement with the private sector. The evaluation team also faced challenges in compiling and obtaining the primary documentation related to the progress in implementing formalized partnerships, and in some cases was not able to retrieve the signed agreements. The evaluation does not pretend to be exhaustive in its description of achieved results.

¹ Please refer to References and Bibliography sections for a full list of documents consulted.

² Please refer to Bibliography section for a full list of Evaluation Reports consulted.

2. Description of the FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector

2.1 The Strategy

9. The FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector (hereinafter referred to as Strategy) was endorsed by FAO Governing bodies in 2013. FAO's intergovernmental status, its charter and the thrust of its work on policy engagement and institutional capacity development to realize food security and nutrition objectives, calls for FAO to primarily work with state entities. However, the Strategic Framework identifies partnerships as one of FAO's core functions and has called for a broadening of FAO's engagement with government ministries other than its traditional counterpart, departments of agriculture, as well as other development agencies and the private sector. Thus, while FAO's "main interlocutors are the members," FAO partners with the private sector with the understanding that "the basic texts, rules, procedures or composition of FAO's Governing Bodies will not be affected" (FAO, 2013). In particular, FAO's Basic Texts (2017) defines the relationship with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and observer status, and ensures the procedures and policies for the involvement of private sector in FAO's standard-setting processes.
10. Recognizing the private sector as a key stakeholder in the fight against food insecurity, malnutrition and rural poverty, FAO has strived for better coordination and collaboration between the public and private sectors to engage and scale up successful programmes for better results in transforming agricultural production and meet future food and employment demands. Therefore, FAO Strategy for Partnership with the Private Sector called for an open and proactive approach to optimize the benefits of closer collaboration. Within these parameters, the Strategy indicates the rationale for FAO cooperation with the private sector, ensuring adequate safeguards. Special attention is given to the assessment of mutual benefits of partnerships and to risks that could potentially affect the intention of FAO to be an impartial forum and knowledge-based intergovernmental organization.
11. Strategy highlights the joint, cooperative and coordinated nature of the interactions and related activities defining partnership as "cooperation and collaboration between FAO units and external parties in joint or coordinated action for a common purpose. It involves a relationship where all parties make a contribution to the output and the achievement of the objectives rather than a solely financial relationship." (FAO, 2013). Partnerships may involve both financial and non-financial contributions from the private sector. Partnerships with the private sector can be formalized through existing legal arrangements and instruments used by FAO. The Strategy identifies the following main areas of engagement with the private sector: development and implementation of technical programmes, policy dialogue, norms and standard-setting, advocacy and communication, knowledge management and dissemination, and mobilization of resources.
12. The Strategy was to be achieved through four primary objectives (FAO, 2013):
 - support governments in enhancing collaboration with the private sector;
 - support FAO achieve its Strategic Objectives at local, national and international levels;
 - increase the involvement and participation of the private sector, as an observer in international fora related to FAO's mandate; and

- enhance the participation of the private sector through financial and non-financial contributions in FAO's activities.

2.2 The Strategy implementation arrangements

2.2.1 The Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS)

13. The responsibility for the Strategy implementation rests with the Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) within the former Partnerships and South-South Cooperation Division (DPS). In January 2019, DPS was integrated into the new Programme Support and Technical Cooperation Department (PS) and rebranded as Partnership Division (PSP). PSPS's mandate includes initiating proposals in coordination with technical divisions and Regional and Country Offices; vetting proposed partners through a due diligence process; and then submitting proposals to the Sub-Committee for Review of Financial and Other Agreements and exceptionally to the Partnership Committee for approval.
14. PSPS's database includes 52 partnerships with the private sector since the adoption of the strategy. Of these, 28 are active, 8 are inactive and 16 are in the talks for a possible renewal. PSPS has established an informal operational cap on the number of all partnerships with non-state actors that the Organization can have at any one time (150) to limit them to a number the division believes it can effectively manage with current resources. Key performance indicator (KPI) for PSPS: 30 strategic partnerships brokered and sustained by end 2019 and 30 for the period ending 2021.

2.2.2 Implementation mechanisms

15. Arrangements for the implementation of the Strategy were first established for the 2014-15 biennium and complemented by a set of principles and operational guidelines for partnering with the private sector. In 2015 FAO adopted the Guidelines for Partnerships and Collaboration with the Private Sector. Also, the FAO Logo Policy and Guidelines are relevant to regulate the conditions under which the FAO Logo can be used within the framework of partnerships with the private sector.
16. FAO's intention has been to rely on a network of Partnerships Focal Points to support engagement with the private sector and ensure coherent and effective implementation of the Strategy across the Organization (FAO, 2013). For partnerships at global level, discussions are held between Partnership Division (PSP) and the Strategic Programmes (SPs) in the course of the annual planning processes, and reflected in service agreements with each SP. FAO's Partnership Focal Points³ in technical divisions at headquarters and Partnership Officers in the regional centres guide decentralized offices in identification and submission of all proposals for partnerships with non-state actors (FAO, 2013). At the national level, Strategic Programme managers and FAO representations are to determine if prospective private sector partners can help leverage the delivery of specific Country Programming Framework outputs (FAO, 2013).
17. The Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) has established a system for monitoring the implementation and achievements of partnerships in line with the SP framework, which is

³ All partnership proposals from Decentralized Offices or non-technical headquarters units, need to be cleared by the technical division concerned at headquarters for consistency with corporate technical strategies or policies. Once partnerships become operational, the technical Divisions concerned should maintain an oversight role. In many cases, however, this division would provide support to the Responsible Officer and Supervising Director. See in detail FAO, *FAO Guidelines for Partnership and Collaboration with the Private Sector*, Rome, 2016, pp. 22-23.

applied across the Organization in liaison with the Responsible Technical Officers (RTO) (FAO, 2013). RTOs prepare annual progress reports for the partnership(s) for which they are responsible. Subsequently, the PSP consolidates these reports into an annual report to FAO's Governing Bodies (FAO, 2013). Further, since 2018 PSP has maintained a corporate database of past and ongoing partnerships that serves as a repository of accumulated experience of working with the private sector. It is a primary tool used to guide and facilitate the development of partnerships by technical units and decentralized offices and to report on progress and added value of partnerships (FAO, 2013) (See Figure 1 – Organization Enablement in Annex 2 Synthesis p. 10.)

2.2.3 Due diligence process for approval of partnerships

18. FAO established mechanisms to identify and manage potential risks that could affect FAO's intergovernmental character and its independence and impartiality. The risk management and due diligence function aims to provide data and metrics to assess risks and as such support organizational informed decision-making on engagements with the private sector.

2.2.4 Resources

19. The human resources devoted to the FAO's team at headquarters responsible for private sector partnerships have been mostly stable since 2012. In 2019, another team in the division, responsible for the CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (CFS-RAI) was merged with the private sector team. The unit currently has a team leader at P-5 level, four professional staff, one long-term consultant and an additional consultant devoted specifically to Responsible Agricultural Investment. The team also had non-staff resources for travel, short-term consultants and other initiatives, which amounted to around USD 345 000 in 2019.

3. Findings

3.1 Strategic relevance

Finding 1: At the time of adoption and in the initial years of implementation, the Strategy directly responded to the call from Member States and senior FAO management for initiating a more proactive and open collaboration with the private sector.

20. In view of FAO management and staff, the Strategy, at the time of its adoption, represented a well-thought and well-designed framework calling for more open and proactive collaboration with the private sector entities with appropriate procedures for risk management. This was considered to be a major step forward in opening the organization for engagement with the private sector, particularly considering that according to the evaluation conducted before the adoption of the Strategy, FAO “[...] has neglected (or avoided) the private sector, both the big multinational corporate enterprises that span the global agricultural arena and the smaller private companies that are the key to increasing value added and jobs in FAO’s member countries” (FAO, 2013).
21. In the initial years of Strategy implementation, FAO has made progress in strengthening its institutional framework for managing partnerships and establishing necessary capacities for engaging with the private sector, including through allocation of dedicated human and financial resources to the Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) and formation of the regional network of partnership officers, complemented by the partnerships focal points in technical units at headquarters and in decentralized offices. It has also invested in development and dissemination of guidance for the development of collaboration and partnerships, complemented by online training courses.
22. Partnership agreements signed in 2013 with Rabobank Foundation, Spanish Exporters and Investors Club, and Grameen Foundation demonstrated FAO’s new approach towards the private sector as a partner in core areas of development work, focusing on supporting smallholders in sustainable agricultural production and food security, improving farming innovation exchange and generating global knowledge on food loss and waste reduction. The 2011 Save Food partnership initiative with Messe Düsseldorf GmbH was formalized in May 2013, and culminated in a global Partnership Event for the Private Sector and Civil Society at FAO headquarters in Rome in 2013. In subsequent years, a series of FAO private sector partnership forums were conducted to bring the private sector representatives for discussion on areas for potential collaboration.
23. By 2015, the number of partnership initiatives and thematic areas of engaging private sector have increased, reflecting the efforts made by the organization in promoting private sector participation in development work, including through participation in both the Committee for Agriculture (COAG) and FAO Conferences with observer status. These developments responded to the Member States requests for taking up partnerships and

implementing the strategy, and the key performance indicator of 30 strategic partnerships brokered and sustained by 2019 was effectively reached already in 2015.

Finding 2: In light of the new Strategy, FAO has also been promoting more active participation of the private sector in international fora related to the Organization's mandate. This has been mostly in global fora rather than at regional or country levels.

24. For the first time FAO has actively engaged the private sector in a global debate on nutrition organized in June 2014 in Rome in the preparation for the Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2). The FAO Director General welcomed the private sector's input and noted that "the participation of non-state actors is critical for the success of any development process".⁴ Similar FAO-led global events provided opportunities for the private sector representatives to engage in policy discourse in other thematic areas, including the "International Symposium on Agroecology for Food Security and Nutrition" (Rome, 18-19 September 2014), and the "International Symposium on The role of Agricultural Biotechnologies in Sustainable Food Systems and Nutrition" (Rome, 15-17 February 2016). The third and fourth FAO private sector partnerships forums organized in Rome in 2014 and 2015, have attracted increasing number of private sector delegates.
25. FAO has also organized multi-stakeholder capacity assessment events in 2015-2017 to identify the needs and priorities of relevant stakeholders within the framework of its Umbrella Programme Supporting Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems.⁵ More recently, the organization engaged with the private sector in soliciting innovation ideas relevant to FAO's development interventions, for example through the FAO Innovation Symposium (Rome, November 2018), or within the framework of FAO Symposium on the Future of Food (Rome, June 2019), where the private sector not only participated as invitees but as speakers sharing their experiences and proposing innovative ideas on sustainable food systems and healthy diets.
26. Building upon its longstanding partnerships within the framework of the services provided through its Investment Centre Division (DPI), FAO has also partnered with international financial institutions in co-organizing forums for discussions with the private sector's on most pertinent issues. Jointly with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), FAO organized the "Private Sector Forum in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean Region" (Barcelona, May 2015), and Global Forum in Morocco (October 2018) to discuss the opportunities and challenges in enabling responsible private sector investments in food and agriculture.
27. FAO has also been engaging the private sector in regional multi-stakeholder initiatives, however this has not been in a leadership role and has generally not resulted concrete and strategic collaborations. In Ghana in December 2018, FAO facilitated a discussion between private companies working in the agricultural sector and the government, also in collaboration with the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA); however, with limited follow-up and partnership opportunities identified to date. In the Asia-Pacific region, the Sustainable Rice Platform (SRP) is the multi-stakeholder partnership platform led by UN Environment and the International Rice Research Institute, to promote resource efficiency and sustainability throughout rice value chains. The alliance works with over 100 institutional partners in the public and private sectors as well as international organizations, NGO and the international research community to promote climate-smart best practices in

⁴ <https://www.uscib.org/fao-engages-private-sector-in-runup-to-international-nutrition-conference-ud-4768/>

⁵ <http://www.fao.org/in-action/responsible-agricultural-investments/umbrella-programme/en/>

key rice-growing countries. In Pakistan and India, SRP partners with Helvetas, Mars Food, Rice Partners Ltd and WWF-Pakistan in implementing a CHF 6.6 million project on water management in rice and cotton, funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. In Cambodia, the International Finance Corporation (IFC), Mars Food and Battambang Rice Investment Co. Ltd. launched a partnership in 2018 to promote sustainable development of Cambodia's rice industry. To date, FAO is not an official member of SRP which would have allowed FAO, among other initiatives, to advance integrated pest management (IPM) approaches and the sustainable intensification of rice production in the region. FAO's participation in the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Inclusive sustainable Rice Landscape initiative in partnership with both UN Environment and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development illustrates the potential of such platforms and dialogues.

28. A further example is provided by Global Initiatives (GI) and its two major (global) Responsible Business Forums. The first, on Sustainable Development, focuses on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (as co-convenor) and the other Forum focusses on Food and Agriculture. Forums have been held in Indonesia, Philippines and Viet Nam. Similarly, the Global Food Safety Partnership (GFSP) led by the World Bank, with support from New Zealand, the Netherlands and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) offers FAO the opportunity to be a part of the technical committee at global level.

Finding 3: While the Strategy stimulated development of a number of important partnerships with the private sector, the Organization has not yet effectively integrated partnership development activities within FAO programmes and workplans.

29. The large majority of FAO staff interviewed still share a perception that the Strategy and its principles are not integrated into the core work of their units, as can be seen from the minimal consideration of the private sector in the workplans and in the Country Programming Frameworks. There is a range of diversity as some offices and divisions engage more with the private sector, such as technical units and the FAO Investment Centre Division (DPI), partially due to their specific focus and the nature of their work. FAO staff noted that active engagement with the private sector at the country and regional levels require different approaches, and highlighted the areas of potential improvements, including possible delegation of authority to regional offices to approve partnership arrangements; greater sharing of practical experiences between decentralized offices and the private sector partners, including mutual secondments of staff; provide greater clarity and more explicitly communicate FAO's concerns for reputational risks and better advise private sector on how to address and mitigate both FAO and private sector risks; analyse and adopt, where appropriate, processes and procedures for engagement used by other UN agencies (UNDP, United Nations Environment Programme - UNEP, United Nations Children's Fund - UNICEF) and other international organizations; and provide accessible "seed funding" to support initial partnership work with private sector.
30. While the Strategy recognizes that "in many cases collaboration starts at field level, building on local needs", the decentralized units do not see partnerships with non-state actors as their priority, and view the private sector from perspective of resource mobilization or inclusion in project activities after the CPFs and interventions have been designed and rolled-out. Similarly to the situation prevailing before adoption of the Strategy, the CPF-level outputs have been limited to the references to involvement of private sector entities mainly as part of value chain or agri-businesses development, with limited indications to their engagement in other development aspects. In the Viet Nam CPF, Output 3.3 includes

value chains, business linkages, branding and marketing, but no reference to private sector as a partner. In the CPF for Indonesia 2016-20, the outputs include more inclusive food systems and value chain development with the private sector as an implementing partner. The CPF for Ethiopia 2016-2020 refers to the private sector as a potential partner only in connection with one output – Output 3.1. Capacity for natural resources management enhanced.

31. On the other hand, some of the representatives of the private sector perceived FAO's overall approach as primarily focusing on collaborating with government entities and funding partners, while other UN agencies or international development organizations actively focus on development of productive partnerships with the private sector. For instance, Nestlé's office for Central and West Africa has an extensive engagement with USAID, Dutch Cooperation and the World Cocoa Foundation to improve production capacity and quality standards of several thousand smallholder farmers and despite having interacted with FAO, did not perceive the interest for more substantial engagement.

Finding 4: While acknowledging the potential role of the private sector in contributing to the Organization's work towards the achievement of SDGs, global commitments and emerging development priorities, FAO, in comparison to other UN agencies, has not yet adequately positioned its partnership development efforts to fully utilize these potential contributions.

32. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other international agreements (e.g. Paris Agreement and Addis Ababa Action Agenda)⁶ accentuated the potential role of the private sector in contributing to the achievement of sustainable development goals. These agreements raised high expectations for the UN agencies in developing new partnerships and the partnership strategies developed in their aftermath have referred strongly to these agreements and the SDGs. UNDP's Private Sector Strategy (2016–2020)⁷ aims to position UNDP as a partner of choice for the private sector and foundations in SDG implementation, while maximizing the impact of the private sector and philanthropy on sustainable development. In its recent report, UNDP explicitly demonstrated how partnerships with the private sector contribute to SDGs,⁸ and launched the SDG Philanthropy Platform⁹ to foster engagement in the global development agenda. The International Labour Organization (ILO) updated its Development Cooperation Strategy, recognizing that partnerships, including those with the private sector, are now shifting to more directly and explicitly incorporate elements of the 2030 Agenda. Similarly, the Executive Board of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)¹⁰ approved the updated Private Sector Engagement Strategy for 2019-2024, and WFP held an Informal Consultation on this topic in April 2019. WFP,¹¹ in its proposed new approach to partnerships, aims at leveraging private sector partnerships to facilitate the transfer of expertise and funding for SDG2 solutions. Private sector entities have also been increasingly integrating development

⁶ Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development.

⁷ UNDP Private Sector Strategy. http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/partners/private_sector/OurStrategy.html

⁸ https://www.undp.org/content/dam/geneva/docs/UNDPGeneva_UNDP_PrivateSector_Report.pdf

⁹ <https://www.sdgphilanthropy.org/>

¹⁰ IFAD Private Sector Engagement Strategy, 2019-2024. For Approval Executive Board — 127th Session Rome, 10-12 September 2019. <https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/127/docs/EB-2019-127-R-3.pdf>

¹¹ WFP Private Sector Partnerships and Fundraising Strategy (2020–2025). Informal Consultation 23 April 2019.

objectives into their lines of business, focusing on issues of sustainability and development impact. Finally, the World Health Organization (WHO), in its Framework of engagement with non-State actors of 2016, replaced previous Guidelines on interaction with commercial enterprises to achieve health outcomes, which provided greater thrust and an updated framework for engagement with the private sector.

33. Amidst these important developments, FAO, in its publications and reports, has been referring to the importance of the private sector contributions towards SDGs,¹² but has not elaborated any specific guidance on how to tap into these potential contributions. As concluded in the Evaluation of FAO's contribution to inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems (SO4), and again reiterated by staff in regional offices "Market-based development involves the private sector, and FAO needs to work more closely with the private sector than it has before. However, FAO's policy on private sector partnerships, which is well articulated, is perceived as being overly conservative and deters the pursuit of opportunities especially in decentralized offices". Although the FAO Strategy was intended to be a living document, as was requested by Member States at the time of its adoption in 2013, it has not been updated since, to reflect upon emerging global trends in development aid architecture, and potential connections with the SDG Agenda. Lack of effective partnerships, including with the private sector, was also cited in the recent assessment of FAO's SDG Readiness among potential risks that can limit FAO's ability to support Member States in their pursuit of the SDGs.¹³

3.2 Effectiveness and contribution to results

Finding 5: While generally limited in scope, geographical coverage and magnitude, the evaluation found some examples of outcome-level contributions from private sector partnerships towards Strategic Results and supporting the achievement of FAO's Strategic Objectives.

34. The FAO strategy was specifically designed to assist the Organization in achieving its Strategic Objectives at local and global levels. However, the FAO management and staff interviewed were of the opinion that the development of partnerships with private sector was not effectively aligned towards potential contributions to Strategic Objectives. While most of the partnerships are linked to the Strategic Framework results (outcomes and outputs), these linkages were perceived to be not well-planned or anticipated. It was a common view, supported by findings from the recent internal audit, that the development of partnerships was not generally accompanied by clear evidence of potential contributions towards specific Strategic Objectives or guidance on how to effectively plan these contributions. In most cases, these originated from private entities' expressions of interest and individual staff/FAO Representatives' initiatives, rather than specifically planned as contributions towards strategic results. Recent evaluations of FAO's Strategic Objectives highlighted challenges in partnering with the private sector, which have led to missed opportunities, including a degree of caution among decentralized offices, ambiguity as to the definition of partnerships and a lack of distinction between one-off transactional engagements and more structured corporate initiatives (FAO, 2019). In the evaluation of

¹² For instance through the FAO publications: Transforming food and agriculture to achieve the SDGs - 20 interconnected actions to guide decision-makers (2018), Results Partnership Impact Report (2018), Food and Agriculture: Driving Actions Across the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2017), Aquaculture and the 2030 Agenda (2016).

¹³ Assessment of FAO's SDG Readiness in support of implementation of 2030 Agenda (July 2018).

Strategic Objective 4, FAO's corporate due diligence in partnership agreements and lengthy procurement processes have been cited as constraints on the effective delivery of partnership initiatives, prompting decentralized offices to be reluctant to and excessively cautious in pursuing partnerships (FAO, 2017).

35. For example, in the Latin America and the Caribbean region, of the 11 formalized partnerships that have regional and local interventions, only 6 partnerships have been perceived by the regional office and respective country offices to be actually contributing towards the Strategic Objectives: FAO's work with Unilever and the Spanish Investors Club on advocacy and awareness campaigns; partnership with Grameen Foundation on policy dialogues; Boulder Institute of Microfinance on knowledge transfer; COFIDES on resource mobilization; and with Telefonica on the development of new technologies in agriculture.
36. The interventions related to the partnership between FAO and the Mars Inc. company are reported as being linked to Strategic Objective 4, in view of their focus on food safety and reduction of risks related to contamination by micro-toxins. While this is an excellent example, the partnership itself materialized mainly due to the commitment of Mars Inc. management, who continued to advocate for this engagement, notwithstanding overly lengthy FAO processes of formalizing the partnership and related financial contributions for micro-toxin research.
37. Since 2013, the partnership with Rabobank Foundation in four countries in the Africa region contributes to the intended results of Strategic Objective 1. The partnership focused on the joint design and implementation of projects aiming to improve capacities of smallholder farmers to access finance and investments in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania, which however faced several implementation challenges related to the issues in the selection of the target areas, the poor maintenance of the irrigation infrastructure, and constraints in allocation of financial contributions due to delays in approvals and lack of clarity on applicable FAO administrative procedures; hence the results on the ground were limited. While the scope of this partnership has primarily focused on Africa, this institution has recently partnered with another UN agency - United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to establish a USD 1 billion fund offering grants and loans to businesses investing in sustainable farming practices and sustainable forest and landscape management in the Latin America and the Caribbean and the Asia-Pacific region. The interviews at the Regional Office in Asia-Pacific have implicitly suggested that this could have been an excellent case of partnership in support of FAO's work in the Asia-Pacific region, with potential contribution towards Strategic Objective 2, which focuses on sustainable food and agriculture practices.
38. The recent partnership between FAO and COFIDES presents a case of potential contribution towards Strategic Objective 1 and 4, aiming at channelling funds from private banks towards green credit lines to agribusinesses in Ecuador through the Smart Climate Livestock project. The MOU between FAO and Kühne-Stiftung (Kuehne Foundation) provides a framework for collaboration in humanitarian logistics, aiming at the optimization of food supply chains and food loss reduction, contributing to Strategic Objective 5. FAO's partnership with Fertitecnica Colfiorito, an Italian company specializing in processing, selection and packaging of legumes and cereals, aimed at linking smallholder farmers in Latin America to markets in Europe, and provides an example of contribution to potential results towards SO3 and SO4.

Finding 6: Evaluation also found good examples of partnerships at the country, regional and global levels, formed within project-level interventions and reacting to the emerging needs, rather than planned through Country Programming Frameworks or strategic work areas.

39. The interviews with decentralized offices and technical divisions indicate that partnerships with the private sector are mostly established during programme implementation and not planned in advance during strategic planning or design of Country Programming Frameworks. These private sector partnerships arise during identification of implementing partners and are generally not based on a long-term strategic shared vision between FAO and the private sector. Furthermore, the level of proactiveness of FAO staff in seeking private sector engagement varies depending on the staff's own level of understanding and interest in working with the private sector, as well as, at country-level, on the vitality of the country's private sector in overall development efforts.
40. While these partnerships generate positive results, there is a potential for FAO to have a greater role in contributing to the SDGs, both by engaging directly with the private sector in a more strategic way, and also by engaging with partners such as governments, line department and smallholders, to promote an enabling environment for private investments, steering them towards the achievements of SDGs and national priorities. In this regard, lesson can be learned from FAO's promotion of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGTs) and the CFS-RAI discussed in Finding 13. Furthermore, there are positive examples of some decentralized offices making efforts to proactively plan and identify private sector partnerships in a more systematic and strategic way in Country Programming Frameworks. For instance, the FAO Regional Office for Latin American is aiming at incorporating private sector partnerships in the region's work plan 2020-2021, through online surveys and consultations with country offices (FAO, 2019). Early indications of this approach point to such consultations triggering country-level discussions between FAO and private sector actors around the 2030 Agenda. For instance, in Argentina, topics such as information and communication technologies and private sector inclusion were identified as potential areas of collaborations among national stakeholders (FAO, 2019).

Country level examples

41. Illustrative examples can be found in **Morocco, Laos and Myanmar**, where FAO has not established formalized partnerships as defined in the Strategy, but has engaged effectively with the private sector. In Morocco, FAO involved the national agricultural bank, Crédit Agricole du Maroc, in providing training to farmers served by FAO projects, while also promoting joint events and knowledge sharing on sustainable agriculture. In Laos and Myanmar, FAO successfully linked smallholder farmers to regional buyers and developed their production capacities and certification schemes to ensure better incomes. This kind of engagement occurred based on the highly relevant content of the collaboration (i.e. sustainable production in Morocco and agribusiness development in South-East Asia), the proactive efforts of FAO staff in engaging partners, and the conducive country context.
42. There are also examples of projects where FAO's engagement with the private sector occurs within initiatives funded by International Financial Institutions. Similarly to the cases above, these partnerships emerged as responses to specific implementation and programmatic issues, and have been effective in their intent. In **Afghanistan**, the IFAD-funded Dairy Industry Development project developed linkages between dairy sector independent service providers such as milk producer cooperatives, marketers/private Veterinary Field Units and AI technicians, for the implementation of the project activities. FAO's technical

expertise contributed to the strengthening of production and processing capacity through the establishment of a 30 MT/day capacity ultra-high temperature (UHT) milk and multi-product pasteurized milk dairy plant and the creation of the Afghanistan Dairy Producers Association (ADPA) - a platform for all stakeholders in the dairy sector. Similar private sector linkages have been facilitated by the USAID-funded Value Chain West project, which was conducive to increasing women's incomes and increasing production of safe pasteurized milk. Similarly, in **Egypt**, through a project of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, FAO facilitated the transfer of knowledge from the private Ukrainian company Nibulon, to Egyptian companies, on areas of grain production, transportation and export. These examples further indicate that FAO engages effectively with the private sectors, either directly or as in a facilitating role, without necessarily linking to the Strategy and its implementation modalities.

43. The evaluation also noted some examples, such as in Ecuador and China, of positive country-level results arising from partnerships established under the auspices of the Strategy. In **Ecuador** the project regional "Climate Smart Livestock" was the most notable one as it led to the implementation of the formal partnership agreement with COFIDES and a financial contribution agreement with Ordeño and BanEcuador that were conducive towards strengthening local farmers' capacities and productive development of small and medium livestock systems in pilot areas. Through BanEcuador, a public bank, with which FAO partnered under FAO Ecuador's guidance and as part of the Climate Smart Livestock project, FAO assisted in the establishment of the bank's new line of green microcredit and started a pilot to milk producers to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In **China**, FAO facilitated the knowledge exchange and market linkages between smallholder farmers and research, tech and e-commerce companies. Efforts are ongoing and positive results are expected in terms of building trust between consumers and producers, developing capacities of smallholders and greater market efficiency. This is being undertaken in collaboration with WFP and with Tsinghua University through the FAO-Tsinghua Innovation Lab. These examples show that the partnerships can also be developed through a bottom-up approach based on a clearly identified work plan, and have a potential for results.
44. FAO and Eni signed an agreement in February 2018 for a collaboration to address Nigeria's Government request to oil and gas companies to provide support in alleviating the sufferings of the victims of insurgency in the North East region. The initiative focuses on the provision of water for domestic use and irrigation through photovoltaic/solar-powered systems to local communities and internally displaced persons affected by the crises. The collaboration combines FAO's expertise and know-how in setting-up sustainable irrigation systems with the in-kind contribution provided by Eni for the drilling of boreholes directly with its contractors.

Regional level examples

45. In the Asia-Pacific region, as part of the FAO-EU Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Programme, the FAO-funded Due Diligence Project supported the establishment of a draft guidebook that can be used by the manufacturers, wood producers, suppliers and importers to support due diligence and traceability of timber and wood products. Guidance is given to local stakeholders to register as an FAO (non-profit) vendor, in order to access grant allocation mechanisms. The project is carried out prior to the signature of Letters of Agreement (LOAs) with, for example, the Chamber of Furniture Industries of the Philippines to provide the timber industry with concise, specific information on how to comply with social and environmental aspects of legal compliance.

46. Recognizing that increasing global antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a major threat to human and animal health, FAO's Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO RAP) initiated a dialogue with multinational agri-food companies on the issue of antimicrobial use (AMU), and developed a project funded by USAID to address AMU in Asia's livestock production industry. Nevertheless, the importance of due diligence has been highlighted and at the Regional Forum on Antimicrobial Stewardship in Agriculture (July 2019) FAO RAP facilitated a process whereby participants signed a Declaration of potential conflicts of interest "to ensure the highest integrity and public confidence in the actions taken by FAO".
47. The project Climate Smart Livestock in the Latin America and the Caribbean region illustrates the synergies that can be created when linking two partnerships, Telefonica and the Spanish development finance institution COFIDES, under the advice of a FAO technical team. The project aims at improving the productive and environmental efficiency of small and medium size milk producers in Ecuador. FAO Ecuador is helping milk producers in the adoption of climate-smart practices in pilot areas. Telefonica is working towards the introduction of innovative web-based tools that will allow producers to monitor practices and climate risk and emissions information. COFIDES will provide funds to FAO's technical assistance in a project being prepared which will be submitted to the European Commission and the Spanish Government for consideration. The investment will focus on green loans for producers implementing practices in Ecuador. Thus, investment resources and technical assistance are leveraged in a new blended finance strategy to achieve impactful and sustainable results. In this context, BanEcuador, a public bank, began a partnership with FAO to create credit lines under FAO Ecuador's guidance and as part of the Climate Smart Livestock project. Although the project will be completed in 2020, the partnerships with COFIDES and BanEcuador will capitalize on this experience and provide the basis for investments which are expected to have a nation-wide impact.

Global level examples

48. The FAO Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) partners with the private sector in areas of common interest including access to safe and affordable inputs (feed, equipment, drugs); feed and food safety; animal health and welfare; access to value-addition in supply chains; research and development; and institutional and capacity building. In these areas, FAO has a collaboration with the private sector including the International Feed Industry Federation (IFIF), the International Dairy Federation (IDF), the International Meat Secretariat (IMS), the International Federation for Animal Health (IFAH), the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) and the International Poultry Council (IPC). Examples of collaboration include joint publications such as the Manual of Good Practices for the Meat Industry, developed with the International Carrefour Foundation, the Manual of Good Practices for the Feed Industry, in preparation with IFIF, the Guide to Good Farming Practice published jointly with IDF and the FAO/IDF Dairy Development Newsletter.

Finding 7: The majority of FAO's partnerships with private sector entities have demonstrated limited replicability and sustainability of results achieved.

49. Out of 52 formalized partnerships with private sector entities since the adoption of the strategy, 28 are currently ongoing, and under implementation, 16 are in the talks for possible renewal, and 8 are inactive as of August 2019. Out of the 6 areas of engagement, only 3 areas are covered by formalized partnerships. These areas are advocacy and communication with 35 formalized partnerships, development and technical programmes with 31 formalized partnerships, and mobilization of resources with 17 formalized partnerships, representing 42 percent, 37 percent and 21 percent of the total. However,

findings from field visits reveal activities conducted without a formalized relationship in policy dialogue and knowledge management and dissemination.

50. FAO partnered with several private sector entities to promote FAO's mandate, activities and the fight against hunger in general. In 2015, for example, FAO and La Stampa newspaper partnered to support the La Stampa/Farnesina initiative FOOD4 during EXPO2015, which aimed to showcasing food security-related development projects funded by the Italian Cooperation. Also, FAO and the International Federation of Agricultural Journalists (IFAJ) established an annual prize recognizing a journalist or communicator who has contributed significantly to raise awareness on food security and/or fighting hunger, while the partnership had the overarching goal of increasing the dissemination of FAO's communication products to specialized agricultural journalists (through national associations who are members of the Federation). FAO also partnered with El País and the Thomson Reuters Foundation (TRF) on content related to FAO's mandate, via dedicated journalists and communication platforms managed directly by the media partners. FAO has also partnered with other entities such as National Geographic, La Real Academia de Gastronomía, Radio e Televisão de Portugal, Emirates News Agency (WAM), TASS Russian News Agency, Xinhua News Agency, and others. These partnerships have contributed to increasing the dissemination of FAO's communication outputs. At the same time, improvements could be considered, in similar future partnerships, to enhance the monitoring of the information disseminated through FAO's partner networks.
51. FAO and IKEA partnership aimed at elaborating a study for advancing forest certification and sustainable forest management in Northern Viet Nam. While a formal MOU has been signed with IKEA, the country level agreement(s) have not been concluded. Subsequently, as a separate initiative, IKEA has provided a financial contribution of EUR 114 600 to the Multidonor Trust fund project "Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) Phase II", now extended to December 2022, to promote Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and forest certification in Viet Nam.
52. In Argentina, the formal FAO-Unilever partnership, along with the informal one with Carrefour, a multinational supermarket retailer, and the Ministry of Agroindustry promoted the "Don't Throw Away Food" in 2016. The initiative included a manual of tips and ideas to reduce food waste at home. FAO and Unilever are currently working together towards the approval for a proposed International Day of Awareness on Food Loss and Waste and are holding policy discussions with the Governments of Argentina and Costa Rica.
53. In 2017 the FAO-Unilever partnership developed the guide "Let's Value Food: A Manual to Take the Most Advantage of Food and Avoid Waste" under a nation-wide campaign with message #Do not Throw Away Food which reached 8 million consumers through social media. Similarly, in 2018, a social media campaign was launched, and an informational multimedia kit was distributed to NGOs, companies, the media and government to encourage their participation.
54. In the policy dialogue area, FAO plays an instrumental role by facilitating conversations and articulating private sector actors through informal partnerships based on discussion platforms. In Chile, for example, FAO invited the Latin American Alliance of Associations of the Food and Beverage Industry (ALAIAB) to participate and engage in dialogue at the 35th Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean. Similarly, under the UN Global Compact framework, FAO partnered with the group "Leader Enterprises," comprising private sector entities as well as the public sector and civil society. In this effort, FAO

promoted policy dialogue on infant obesity and food waste related to SP1 while providing analytical support and knowledge.

55. Through technical assistance and resource mobilization, the efforts to reduce rural poverty (SP3) were illustrated by the partnership with Telefonica for the "More Cotton" project, and the financial contribution agreement by Ordeño formed through the "Climate Smart Livestock" project. FAO-Telefonica assisted family farmers to reduce the costs associated with agricultural production by optimizing water usage through the use of sensors and meteorological stations in pilot areas of Colombia, El Salvador and Peru FAO-Ordeño promoted the adoption of production processes and is incorporating technology that is designed to estimate emissions.

3.3 Efficiency of partnerships development modalities and approaches

Finding 8: Administrative burden, lack of clear procedures and lengthy processes of formalizing partnership arrangements are among the top factors that limited the number of partnerships established and in some instances led to lost opportunities. This was partially due to the limited technical and human capacities dedicated by FAO for private sector partnership development efforts.

56. Based on the interviews with selected staff at headquarters, regional and country levels, it became apparent that current organizational set-up and limited capacities resulted in lack of advice and practical assistance made available to interested units. The Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) reportedly lacks a sufficient number of personnel to effectively promote and maintain partnerships. It became evident from interviews and reports that facing a large number of requests for partnerships received (ranging from 300-500 annually), and due to the limited capacities within the Division, FAO had to limit the number of partnerships that it can enter into every year. Therefore, the ability of the Private Sector Partnerships Team to render advice or guidance on the best approaches or enabling and constraining factors related to each prospective partnership is limited. The provided e-learning tools were perceived to provide very basic information on private sector partnerships as they consisted mainly of generic remarks which referred to the Strategy with limited practical guidance on how to develop partnerships with the private sector. The capacities and skills of regional partnerships officers vary by region, with most of them acquiring experience of engaging with the private sector on-the-job and lacking systematic and comprehensive training on this subject. Amidst this lack of training opportunities offered within FAO, some partnership officers have decided to pursue their professional development activities to enhance relevant knowledge and skills.
57. There is a general agreement within FAO that the main factors limiting the success of results include the rather limited understanding of the processes and modalities of engaging the private sector, the scope of FAO's policies and financial instruments regulating collaborative arrangements, and the risk-averse approaches towards partnerships. Overall, the combination of these factors is perceived to be part of a self-defence mechanism that protects the organization from risks but allows little action and flexibility by staff members and the Organization at large. Private sector priorities change over time. Thus excessive time-consuming bureaucracy and organizational effectiveness cause strains in collaborative relationships and affect potential work as momentum slows down.
58. For example, Tonicorp, a dairy company in Ecuador, expressed its interest in joining efforts undertaken through the Climate Smart Livestock project, to improve productivity and

decrease gas emissions by providing small- and medium-size cattle ranchers with best practices for livestock management. However, this alliance did not materialize, in part due to lack of clarity on FAO's administrative processes along with lengthy process of formalizing the potential partnership.

59. Lack of clarity of the resource mobilization instruments available was another constraint in forming partnerships. It was reported that a lot of effort and discussions were needed to identify financial instruments applicable to private sector contributions. The Administrative Circular 2016/03 related to the "Procedure for the Treatment of Ad Hoc – Extra budgetary Contributions in Direct Support or in Reimbursement of Regular Programme-Funded Activities (not exceeding USD 200 000)", was used to set up a contribution agreement with Ordeño, an alliance under the Climate Smart Livestock project in Ecuador. The instrument became known as a result of a lengthy and arduous process of research and discovery done by FAO staff, for a partnership that did ultimately not materialize with Tonicorp. Similar processes were followed to identify appropriate instruments in the cases of COFIDES for the financing of small producers and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in value chain development and Rabobank Foundation to support activities related to small farming communities. It is worth mentioning that this instrument (Administrative Circular 2016/03) is currently not available due to concerns from the Legal and Ethics Office (LEG) colleagues regarding the applicability of this modality to non-state partners.
60. The recent attempts of the Regional Office in Europe and Central Asia (REU) in establishing a partnership with IKEA have been constrained by the guidance received from headquarters implying that since there is already an existing MOU, it is not possible to sign more than one MOU with a given private entity in the course of current work plan, but could be considered in the next work plan.
61. In some instances, it has been easier to have collaborations with the private sector without formal agreements. For example, the National Food Processing (PRONACA), an Ecuadorian company that produces and distributes food, partnered with FAO to improve the content of its ads and follow FAO guidelines. This led to another partnership with the Milk Industry Center (CIL), an association of Ecuadorian milk companies designed to promote the development of milk products, to improve videos related to the consumption of milk products. In Chile, BBVA Foundation partnered with FAO in the "Rural Women Campaign" to develop videos that gave visibility to gender gap issues faced by rural, indigenous and Afro-descendant women in the LAC region and published projects and success stories that show the need of working towards rural women's autonomy.

Finding 9: The FAO risk management and due diligence mechanisms and associated processes have been effectively applied towards protecting the Organization from potential risks. However, these have been perceived as cumbersome, lengthy, restrictive and hence limiting the number of partnerships established by FAO.

62. As requested by Member States at the inception of the Strategy, FAO's risk management mechanisms were embedded in the strategy implementation, due to the many standards accompanying the development of food and agriculture systems, and the need in ensuring that the neutrality, independence, and impartiality of FAO as an intergovernmental institution is in no way compromised (FAO, 2013). These mechanisms ensure that no private sector entity influences the outcomes of the research or information provided to the countries in line with the framework of FAO's Basic Texts (2017) which define the relationship with non-governmental organizations and ensures the procedures and policies for the involvement of private sector in FAO's standard-setting processes. Similar risk

management mechanisms prevail across the UN system; however, some UN agencies have tailored and adapted these mechanisms to realize the potential for increased collaboration (see Annex 3).

63. The Strategy established the Partnership Committee as the approving body for proposed partnerships, and the DGB 2014/14 provides the framework for the formal risk assessment and approval process of all partnership proposals. The same procedure is also set down in the Guidelines for Partnerships and Collaboration with the Private Sector. This procedure incorporates the UN Global Compact Principles, Guidelines on Cooperation between the UN and the Business Sector (2009), FAO Corporate Risk Factors and Corporate Social Responsibility standards.¹⁴ It follows that, in practice, the Sub-Committee for the Review of Financial and other Agreements is the body with the power to approve proposed partnerships (FAO, 2014) (see Figure 1 in Annex 2).
64. The Strategy foresees that the functions related to assessment and management of risks will be separated from advocacy and catalytic functions to promote and develop partnerships (FAO, 2013). Nevertheless, the due diligence team formally established in May 2019 is placed under PSP Deputy Director's Office. This change has been initiated based on a recommendation from the recent internal audit, which identified lack of dedicated capacities for this function. It is composed of two staff (one P3 and one P2) and one PSA, and for the second half of 2019 endowed with USD 80 304 for due-diligence related activities. For the period 1 January to 31 July 2019 the same team has received a total of 327 screening requests including co-publication, co-sponsoring/co-organization of events, and participation in meetings; disposal of assets; and information/guidance. It appears that the due diligence team is not equipped to adequately support timely and well-developed analysis for decision-making on engagement with the private sector. Moreover, the current taxonomy does not differentiate between private sector entities. Therefore, there is no differentiated and simplified risk assessment mechanism in place.
65. Most interviewees, representing different areas of FAO work, confirmed that the Strategy and related processes allow some flexibility in engaging with the private sector. However, this appears to be somewhat at the expense of clarity, as it does not provide for systematic engagement, and restricts the possibility for innovation. Furthermore, the limited capacities and understanding of the Strategy in Decentralized Offices has hindered a successful engagement with the private sector, contributing to delays and missed opportunities.
66. Also, many interviewees highlighted the difficulties they faced when engaging with PSP, including late responses and time-consuming exchanges. A collaboration envisaged with Vodafone, which was willing to invest USD 150 000 to establish an early warning system in Tanzania, could be used to illustrate the situation. After preparing a concept note, the CO did not go further as the time needed to formalize the agreement would not allow starting in the agreed time. Other examples of rejected partnerships after protracted negotiations

¹⁴ See footnote no. 5. DGB No. 2014/14 published on the 31 of March refers to "a revised DGB on "Policy Guidelines on the Preparation, Clearance, and Signature of Agreements is under review," expected to be published. However, the DGB No. 2014/13 FAO, Procedures for the preparation, clearance and signature of Agreements, Director-General's Bulletin, No. 2014/13, had been published on 18 March. Thus the DGB 2014/13 and the DGB 2014/14 are not connected. Moreover, DGB No. 2014/14 published on 31 March "Review of Partnerships with Non-State Actors and Composition of the Partnerships Committee and the Sub-Committee for the Review of Financial and other agreements does not specify which financial agreements the Due Diligence Unit handles. The same mentions that "[a]ll eligible proposals will be passed on to the Sub-Committee for Review of Financial and other Agreements (SubCom-RFA), along with recommendations regarding benefits and potential risks" but it does not specify which are eligible to go through to the Sub-Committee.

include CARGO (SP4), Inditex (REU), Standard Chartered Foundation (Kenya CO) among others. Other companies are rejected due to their use of GMOs or sugar. Interviewees suggested that collaboration with these companies could serve to influence their business.

67. As a result of the difficulties in establishing formal partnerships, some interviewees reported that they gave up these efforts and resorted to collaboration on an informal basis. Similarly, the role of facilitator and mediator played by FAO is illustrated by collaborations identified at the country level. In 2014 FAO “formalized” through a Memo its collaboration with Twiga in the framework of a conservation agriculture project in Tharaka Nithi County in Kenya. It allowed the project’s beneficiary smallholders to sell their products to Twiga that distributed them in Nairobi. Also, in the same County, FAO collaborated with East African Breweries and Malting to promote best farming practices on sorghum. The collaboration has resulted in higher production and water conservation. The company is currently discussing with the government about including sorghum in the national food security policy. Other examples include joint efforts with the Government and Agrochemicals Association of Kenya in the framework of a GEF project to dispose of obsolete agrochemicals and the work carried with the Rice Council of Tanzania. Nevertheless, these partnerships were not scaled up, and there is no evidence that they were strategically used in policy dialogue given as well the lack of appropriate instruments to cover this area of work.

Finding 10: Except for the progress reports on partnership development that are required to be submitted to the FAO Programme Committee annually, the overall knowledge management, monitoring and reporting systems for partnerships are inadequate to support FAO’s strategy implementation, and do not facilitate the sharing of best practices or lessons learned.

68. While some exchange of experiences happens during special events, the Organization does not have a distinct platform to share its experience in developing and implementing partnerships or to direct interested users to relevant experts or units. Communication on partnership development practices was limited between different units, and even among the regional partnership officers. The FAO partnerships website, except for latest news, is not regularly updated with documented best practices on partnerships.
69. The partnerships’ corporate database lacks information, and most of the progress reports on partnerships were either missing or not duly prepared. The progress reports submitted by the responsible officers are not checked by the Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) for their completeness and content. Although the database is available to other divisions, its use across the Organization is minimal. Some partnerships agreements were difficult to find, and in most cases, the information in the progress reports was extremely limited to assess the results or the level of engagement. Due diligence processes and reviews of partnership proposals are not well-documented to facilitate further development of the system based on experiences and lessons learned.

3.4 Integration of cross-cutting themes

Finding 11: Effective gender mainstreaming has largely not been demonstrated in the design and implementation of partnerships initiatives developed.

70. The Strategy has only a general reference to gender equality and the role of women in developing partnerships for food security and improved livelihoods. Also, the associated guidelines do not address or further elaborate on this cross-cutting theme. Nonetheless,

some established partnerships are attentive to gender issues. For example, project documents and reports related to partnerships with Rabobank, PhosAgro, to some extent, have integrated gender issues. In Chile, FAO partnered informally with BBVA Foundation in the “Rural Women Campaign” (FAO, 2018). Videos were developed for providing greater visibility to gender-related issues faced by rural, indigenous and Afro-descendant women in Latin America. Formally, there is a pending MOU¹⁵ with BBVA on increasing access to financial services for rural women, promoting women’s rights, and raising awareness through the “Rural Women Campaign.”

Finding 12: Climate change adaptation and resilience considerations are integrated to some extent within partnerships that have explicit focus on promoting environmental sustainability.

71. The Strategy’s basic principles imply that partnership activities should be planned to promote economic, environmental and social sustainability. The Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment (PRAI), a joint initiative of IFAD, FAO, the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the World Bank, comprise seven principles intended to guide both governments and the private sector in ensuring the social and environmental sustainability of agricultural investments. Although these requirements were not considered in each of the established partnerships, there are a few examples of alignment. In Viet Nam, FAO partnered with IKEA on a forest certification initiative to reduce forest degradation through sustainable practices. Moreover, the partnership with Google contributes to monitoring results under REDD+ programme by developing Forest Reference Levels. In Central America, FAO is working with Telefonica to deploy digital technology to enhance farms’ resilience against risks of extreme weather events. Aura Light Italia donated and installed LED lighting technology products in the offices of FAO, contributing to the reduction in electricity consumption and thus reducing the organizations’ environmental footprint. Using the Climate Smart Livestock (CSL) project¹⁶ as a framework, FAO formed partnerships with Ordeño and Telefonica to implement and disseminate technologies for climate-smart livestock management, monitor CSL emissions, and building adaptive technology in Ecuador.

Finding 13: With regard to the public discourse on governance-related matters, FAO’s Basic Texts (9th Session of Conference) provide mechanisms for engagement of non-state actors, including the private sector.

72. Non-state actors and international non-governmental organizations can attend and participate in FAO Governing Bodies and Technical Committees as observers (Basic Texts, Volume II, section M). According to FAO’s Basic Texts, formal relations can be established in three different ways: Consultative Status; Specialized Consultative Status; and Liaison Status. A small selection of Associations and Federations representing private sector companies and institutions have been listed as having Formal Status. Some of these Associations participate in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) through the Private Sector Mechanism (PSM) and contribute to the negotiation of CFS policy products. Some Associations with Formal Status have received invitations to FAO Conference and COAG with observer status.
73. At global and regional levels, FAO has supported multi-stakeholder forums and platforms that provide for international norms and standards, and foster participatory decision-

¹⁵ FAO-BBVA MOU.

¹⁶ FAO, “FAO and the Private Sector Continue their Commitment Towards Climate Smart Livestock” <http://www.fao.org/ecuador/noticias/detail-events/en/c/1194465/>

making and policy discourse. FAO ensures engagement of the private sector entities and associations in these platforms. These include the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, FAO technical Committees on Fisheries (COFI), on Forestry (COFO) and on Agriculture (COAG) as well as regional conferences for Africa (ARC), for Latin America and the Caribbean (LARC), Asia and the Pacific (APRC), Regional Conference for Near East (NERC) and for Europe (ERC) and regional communities such as Africa's Regional Economic Communities (RECs). The level and modality of private sector engagement in these setting vary significantly, and there remains significant potential for further participation in existing Platforms at regional level, for example in Sustainable Rice Platform hosted by UN Environment.

74. The evaluation team also found specific case of FAO support towards development of the private sector business strategies. For example, Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance Partnership (LEAP)¹⁷ develops methodology for understanding the environmental performance of livestock supply chains and informing evidence-based business strategies. The Incentives for Ecosystem Services (IES) project¹⁸ also aims at building the business cases for private sector engagement.

CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (CFS-RAI)

75. The CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems (CFS-RAI) were formally endorsed by the Committee on World Food Security in 2014, as a result of extensive multi-stakeholder consultation. They built on previous initiatives such as the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment (by FAO, IFAD, World Bank and UNCTAD), VGGT and the Guidelines on the Realization of the Right to Food. The CFS-RAI are voluntary and are aimed at guiding all public and private investments towards more inclusive and sustainable and food systems.
76. Once CFS-RAI were endorsed, FAO established a dedicated team and the Supporting Responsible Investments in Agriculture and Food Systems, an umbrella programme for their dissemination and promotion among key food systems actors. This work focused on raising awareness on the CFS-RAI, on building capacities for their inclusion in national policies and laws, and on monitoring of trends and impacts of agricultural investments. This work has been conducted by a cross-divisional team from different technical areas of FAO and was brought under a unified team in 2015, under the Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS), even though a multi-departmental working group remains active.
77. At present, this area of work has mobilized around USD 6.3 million, and has resulted in several country level activities, which have mainly focused on assessing the level of compliance of national laws with the CFS-RAI and on producing detailed guidance on their application. Some of the most notable results in terms of assessments include the studies and consultations in **Guatemala, Dominican Republic, Colombia and Tunisia**. In some cases these assessments focus on the overall investment laws and policies (e.g. Guatemala and Dominican Republic) and in others they focus on a specific sector or value chain (e.g. the Banana sector in Colombia, or youth employment in Tunisia). This work has responded to specific country request as an initial step in ensuring a recognized compliance with the CFS-RAI as this is perceived to be of value to national priorities. Other examples of the dissemination and adoption of the CFS-RAI include the work in **South-East Asia**, where FAO, in collaboration with Grow Asia and the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), has assisted the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in

¹⁷ <http://www.fao.org/partnerships/leap/en/>

¹⁸ <http://www.fao.org/in-action/incentives-for-ecosystem-services/policy/private-sector-engagement/esp-africa-conference/en/>

creating and endorsing a regional version of the guidelines. Collaboration with IISD also resulted in the development of model contracts for responsible contract farming. Furthermore, in **Sierra Leone**, FAO's technical assistance has resulted in the CFS-RAI being incorporated into the compliance clauses of the national investment promotion agencies, ensuring their mainstreaming into all investments in the country. Finally, FAO teams have developed, in partnership with IFAD and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT), technical guides for responsible contract farming and large-scale land-based investment, which have already been adopted in some of the investments of the Charoen Pokphand Group of **Thailand**.

78. These activities and results, while being highly relevant to FAO's work on private sector partnerships, have so far been carried out largely as a separate work stream, and the CFS-RAI have not been formally promoted consistently with all private sector partners with whom FAO has a formalized agreement. Furthermore, the CFS-RAI were endorsed prior to the establishment of the SDGs and while being relevant to several SDG targets, further action is needed to clarify these linkages and support private sector use of the Principles towards supporting the achievement of the SDGs.

Finding 14: The majority of private sector engagement initiatives do not incorporate nutrition at the design nor implementation stages.

79. FAO engages the private sector in a global debate on nutrition-related aspects, among others through consultations within the framework of the Global Forum on Food Security and Nutrition, in the context of International Conferences on Nutrition (ICN), through FAO coordination role in implementation of the International Year of Pulses, or through the Symposium on the Future of Food. However, these efforts have not materialized in any significant partnerships with the private sector on nutrition-related aspects.
80. However, there is a strong potential for greater emphasis on nutrition-related aspects in current and future FAO partnership initiatives. Recent agreement with the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) offers potential for more active collaboration towards increased availability of nutritious food in developing countries.¹⁹ In 2015, FAO and Danone Foundation Argentina²⁰ and the Cooperativa SanCor²¹ signed an agreement with the Argentine Network of Food Bank²² (REDBdA) to assist with the donation of milk to the Food Bank of Santiago del Estero. The partnership agreement with Fertitecnica Colfiorito envisages the development of the mobile application to educate children on nutritional value of pulses. Also, it promotes healthy diets in European markets with products from smallholder farmers in Latin America.

¹⁹ <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/1184468/icode/>

²⁰ <http://www.fao.org/argentina/noticias/detail-events/en/c/338095/>

²¹ <http://www.sancor.com/la-empresa/la-empresa-acerca-de-sancor?es>
<http://www.fao.org/argentina/noticias/detail-events/en/c/338108/>

²² <https://www.redbda.org.ar/>

4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

Conclusion 1. The 2013 FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector gave the opportunity and laid the basis for a more proactive and open approach towards involvement of private sector entities in FAO programmes and operations. While formalized partnerships have been and continue to be limited, there has been a trend towards increasing number and variety of private sector interventions across FAO thematic areas of work.

81. The FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector was approved through an iterative consultation and negotiation process with member countries, which started with a provisional outline in March 2011, and ended with an endorsed document in April 2013. In light of this context, the adoption of the Strategy was a major step forward which reflected a new approach towards engagement with the private sector. The strategy defined several relevant areas of engagement, besides resource mobilization and technical cooperation, and specified administrative and legal instruments for partnerships, as well as internal clearance processes for entering into partnership agreements. In the period of evaluation (2013-2019), a total of 52 private sector partnerships were formally established, of which 28 are still active, 8 are inactive and 16 are being considered for possible renewal. Besides these, FAO technical units and decentralized offices have had extensive engagement with private sector entities as part of FAO programmes and policy dialogues, mostly at country and regional levels. There are positive examples of private sector engagements which are generally aligned to the key Strategy's principles, but are perceived to be emerging in parallel to the Strategy's implementation modalities. FAO's work on the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems is largely not linked to the strategy and has the potential for having a greater impact if it is mainstreamed into all private sector partnerships. FAO should draw important lessons from these areas of work in order to produce more transformative and sustainable development solutions.

Conclusion 2. Despite important progress made since 2013, FAO is still lacking a broad recognition of the benefits arising from partnerships with the private sector, particularly in the context of its critical role in contributing towards the SDG agenda. Many of FAO engagement with the private sector have been one-time events. There were limited efforts towards effective management of the partnerships developed and maximizing the potential of their contributions towards strategic results.

82. The lack of real-time advice and guidance tailored to specific proposals have been limiting factors in developing potential partnerships, mainstreaming, and scaling up development solutions. FAO needs to pay due attention to each partnership, taking necessary steps in nurturing a truly collaborative environment, building trust to broker partnerships with the appropriate mix of resources — knowledge, science and technology, finance — and mobilizing their respective assets to find innovative solutions to pressing challenges that can be scaled up and mainstreamed to the required scale.

Conclusion 3. Fostering a targeted approach to partnerships with the private sector in support of FAO Strategic Objectives and expanding the number of engagements appear limited by the overall modus operandi to partnering with the private sector.

83. The UN General Assembly resolution 55/215 called for enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular, the private sector (UN, 2003). Furthermore, in its resolution 68/234, the General Assembly encouraged the United Nations system to place greater emphasis on due diligence without imposing undue rigidity in partnership agreements (UNGA, 2013). There is a culture gap between the United Nations system and the private sector as testified by 78 percent of UN leaders and partnership practitioners which cite restrictive legal policies and procedures that delay or limit partnership opportunities, while 50 percent see a lack of partnership-building skills across the UN system" (UN, 2018).
84. On the other hand, private sector firms compete in very dynamic environments governed by concepts like value for money, swiftness and cost-effectiveness. Nonetheless, significant challenges persist concerning bureaucracy, cumbersome and complicated rules, regulations and procedures, organizational effectiveness and partnership impact, communication and reporting requirements, and the use of emblems and the logo.
85. FAO's internal processes and modalities ensure that no potential reputational risk or conflict of interest arises. However, these have been underutilized due to limited organizational effectiveness as PSPS appears to be short-staffed and not well-equipped to support informed decision-making on engagements with the private sector. Thus, there is a need for operational transformation that provides more flexible partnership arrangements and incorporates new forms of financing while better identifies and manages risk to ensure that decision-making – on whether and how to engage with the private sector – is fully informed and opportunities are not lost.

Conclusion 4. FAO is lacking a substantive knowledge management and communication support around its private sector partnerships, which is preventing more effective partnerships due to limited learning and often unclear expectations and messages.

86. The limited information on the formalized partnerships with the private sector is not sufficient for adequately assessing partnership development efforts, documenting progress made and supporting strategic decision-making. FAO needs to ensure effective monitoring and timely reporting to identify gaps and issues to address, as well as lessons learned to be shared across the Organization, and to respond to the recent call from Governing Bodies to assess progress against objectives and focus on the impact on the ground, the benefits achieved, challenges faced, exchange of experiences, lessons learned and constraints with the partnerships and in the implementation of the Strategy (FAO, 2018).

Conclusion 5. Effective strategy implementation requires commitment and a structured approach towards integration of private sector partnerships in core areas of FAO's work. FAO needs to move towards promotion of such transformative and strategic partnerships, as compared to identifying solutions to specific issues or capturing emerging opportunities.

87. In the context of the significant role of the private sector in financing the 2030 Development agenda, FAO will need to step up its private sector engagement and focus on fostering such partnerships to achieve its strategic results. The contributions stemming from the partnerships developed have not been highly visible or effective, and FAO needs to ensure that the Strategy fulfils its objective to steer partnerships towards contributions to SDGs.

In order to this, FAO needs to encourage all its units to consider potential opportunities for partnering with the private sector as an integral element of work towards achieving the Organization's Strategic Objectives and associated results. This can potentially include facilitating exchanges between FAO units or decentralized offices to share lessons on engagement with the private sector, and fully utilizing experience and knowledge of the technical units and FAO Investment Centre Division (DPI) in engaging with the private sector through diverse channels and modalities.

4.2 Recommendations

Rating criteria	Impact			Urgency (years)		
Recommendation	High	Medium	Low	<0.5	0.5-1	1-2
1. Develop a new vision and update the Strategy						
2. Invest in existing partnerships						
3. Improve internal processes						
4. Foster proactive engagement						
5. Improve monitoring and knowledge management						

Recommendation 1. The Strategy should become a “living” document, reflecting emerging development trends and global practices, and should be updated to respond to the SDG agenda. Taking these contexts into full consideration, FAO management should first develop its long-term vision for developing partnerships with the private sector, identifying key strategic and specific thematic areas of engagement, the associated modalities of collaboration, and expected results, and present to its Governing Bodies the updated version of the Strategy.

88. As a first step, FAO should develop the new vision on collaboration with the private sector detailing Strategy's implementation approaches in response to SDG agenda and emerging development trends and update relevant guidelines accordingly.

- The 2030 Agenda, its universal coverage and commitment to leaving no one behind raises high expectations and calls for robust partnerships. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, many UN entities have further recognized the need to partnering with the private sector, and made efforts to adopt a more proactive approach and simplify working procedures. FAO needs to follow this trend, taking into consideration best practices available in the UN system. FAO contributions towards SDGs shall be strengthened by enhanced focus on strategic partnerships, including with the private sector, to fully utilize potential for joint global actions towards the SDG Agenda. Thus, FAO should develop its vision on areas of engagement and modalities, which would best serve the mutual needs of FAO and its prospective private sector partners, conform to FAO's mandate and principles and fit with relevant Strategic Objectives and programmes. The existing guidelines should be updated to communicate this new vision and associated Strategy's implementation approaches to all organizational units.

89. FAO should analyse and categorize existing areas of engagement and partnerships initiatives to identify and prioritize specific thematic and strategic areas of engagement reflecting FAO's comparative advantages and Strategic Objectives, and develop respective value propositions for potential collaboration with the private sector.
 - In developing new approaches towards partnership development, FAO should initiate the review of its existing partnerships and initiatives to determine its comparative advantages and define key strategic areas of engagement with the private sector. This could include a combination of different areas and modalities. These may consist of strategic areas of engagement within each Strategic Objective, thematic areas of work related to the SDGs, the framework of the CFS Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems, or the potential for engaging in "financing for development" interventions. Furthermore, FAO may use its comparative advantage in providing its technical assistance and engaging the private sector in the development of agribusinesses and value chains through investment projects funded by international financial institutions, linking the partnerships development efforts to ongoing work of the FAO Investment Centre Division (DPI). Based on these identified areas of engagement, FAO should develop value propositions and model business proposals offering to prospective partners the clear overview of its Strategic Objectives and development goals, the potential mutual benefits, and model designs of the initiatives and the appropriate modalities for the engagement. These value propositions should become the main communication products accompanying the Strategy and its guidelines and should be used in partnership development activities, outreach and communication events. FAO decentralized offices should develop similar value propositions for the respective regional and country programmes.
90. Based on the new vision and identified key areas of engagement, FAO management should develop a revised Strategy, that would explicitly reflect the Organization's approach towards partnering with the private sector in the context of the SDG Agenda and emerging development trends and global practices.
 - FAO management should propose to its Governing Bodies the discussion on the updated version of the Strategy, presenting the new vision developed and identified key areas and modalities of engagement.

Recommendation 2. FAO should effectively manage each ongoing individual partnership, fostering effective results and collaboration in support of FAO Strategic Objectives, and aiming at further expanding successful partnerships and scaling up and replicating best initiatives and practices.

91. FAO should promote the development of transformative and strategic partnerships that would provide significant contributions to the achievement of FAO's goals and objectives. Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) with the support from other relevant FAO units should provide dedicated and continuous support towards effective implementation of each ongoing individual partnership. Officers responsible for managing specific partnerships should receive timely guidance and advice to ensure responsiveness to partners and avoid delays in addressing partners' concerns. FAO should also continuously review the progress and results achieved within the framework of each partnership to inform possible adjustments towards more tangible results.

Recommendation 3. FAO needs to ensure a better balance between upholding the organizational image, principles and values without imposing undue rigidity in partnering with the private sector.

92. FAO shall reconsider its current approach to engaging with the private sector to ensure it is conducive to developing sustainable partnerships that deliver on the Strategic Objectives. In this regard, FAO should review and further develop its partnership-building approaches, including due diligence and risk management, and associated processes.
- A robust internal process for the approval, formalization, implementation and monitoring of partnerships is critically important for successful partnerships. The process should balance the promotion of results with strategic risk management, and should consider the potential efficiency gains from a decentralization of risk management and a decision-making with a more centralized escalatory process in case of more problematic or significant partnerships. It should also clarify as much as possible the functions, roles and authority of the secretariat services involved. While these principles are generally well understood in FAO, the existing mechanisms need to be revised to bring a more efficient and effective partnership-building mechanism.
 - FAO may put in place a “one-stop shop” to receive and appropriately channel private sector partnership initiatives which could facilitate engagement and reduce the associated bureaucracy. The Organization may consider establishing an online Partners Portal that would serve as an official channel through which the Organization may interact with (prospective) partners and include due diligence and approval process conducted on the basis of transparency, openness, inclusiveness, accountability, integrity and mutual respect. Consistency in downstream arrangements could be ensured by conducting due diligence and risk assessment even before considering the conclusion of a framework partnership agreement rather than at the moment of concluding specific implementation arrangements. Also, FAO may want to consider putting in place non-compliance measures, i.e. a reminder, warning, cease-and-desist letter, a rejection of renewal of engagement, and termination of the engagement.
 - In practical terms, the Organization could adopt a prescreening questionnaire by asking systematic questions and thus informing from an early stage if the prospective partnership is fit for purpose.²³ Based on this, the due diligence team may provide a prescreening snapshot to potential partnership initiators taking into account national priorities and (any) national risk assessment(s). Also, this approach could help in limiting ad hoc solutions to private sector engagement.
 - The approval mechanism could be tailored to the financial commitment and the level of risk presented by the partnership. In this regard, FAO could consider delegating authority for initial screening and risk assessment to (sub)regional and country offices provided that the due diligence review does not reveal any risks to the Organization. The *ex ante* assessments, preconditions and due diligence process should be reinforced by a *post factum* analysis of the fulfilment by the private sector partners of their commitments and the impact and added value of such partnerships. Critical for risk

²³ Crucial issues to be covered include the mandate/agenda, track record, and reputation, skills and competencies that complement the Organization’s management and governance structures, financial record and on the proposed partnership, identifying clearly the expected outcomes, likely costs and associated risks.

management remains continuous monitoring and ensuring risk review over time as risk issues are not static.²⁴

- The corporate database of past and ongoing partnerships is a primary tool used to access the organizational experience of working with the private sector. Further concerted efforts to develop performance benchmarks with clear indicators for measuring actual financial resources raised, the value generated by private sector partnerships and the overall benefit to FAO would ensure the systematic review of ongoing partnerships performance against the defined objectives. This, in turn, can facilitate informed decision-making as to whether to extend or close individual partnerships.
- FAO could also allow for a flexible approach, whereby engagement with the private sector may be on an ad hoc basis when revolving around knowledge or skill transfer if the relationship is not structured, nor publicly promoted as a “partnership” but rather as a dialogue or an interaction.

93. **The current instruments informing the formal risk assessment and approval process of all partnership proposals need to be reviewed for clarity, coherence and consistency.**

- These instruments should clearly set a menu of sources and types of information to assist those engaging in partnership efforts and reduce the risk of oversights (FAO, 2014). DGB 2014/13 provides for a specific instrument for the Legal and Ethics Office (LEG) to determine how to propose agreements. The DGB 2014/13 in point 3 excludes several agreements which encompass resource mobilization and implementing partners, and thus the assumption is that those are excluded as well from the purview of the Partnership Committee. Moreover, DGB No. 2014/14 published on 31 March “Review of Partnerships with Non-State Actors and Composition of the Partnerships Committee and the Sub-Committee for the Review of Financial and other agreements does not specify which financial agreements the Due Diligence Unit handles. The same mentions that “[a]ll eligible proposals will be passed on to the Sub-Committee for Review of Financial and other Agreements (SubCom-RFA), along with recommendations regarding benefits and potential risks” but it does not specify which are eligible to go through to the Sub-Committee.

94. **The due diligence team shall be adequately organized and equipped so that they can manage potential demand and exercise their role most objectively and effectively.**

- Measures to ensure this may include establishing a reporting line for due diligence processes outside the partnerships function. In line with what foreseen in the Strategy functions related to assessment and management of risks are to be separated from advocacy and catalytic functions to promote and develop partnerships (FAO, 2013). Nonetheless, proximity and even co-working arrangements with partnerships teams are instrumental in ensuring that prospect research and risk management are undertaken most effectively. Thus, the due diligence team could be transferred to the Legal Office (or other units), reporting to the Partnership Committee.

²⁴ Other risk management measures include the development of a risk log, monitoring plan, grievance mechanism, stakeholder engagement, conditions in agreements and exit strategy, among others.

Recommendation 4: FAO should practice a more proactive approach to private sector partnerships by actively identifying, mapping and reaching out to potential partners with clear messages and value propositions.

95. In order to do this, FAO can consider facilitating the engagement with private sector partners by formulating partnership and communication action plans for each Strategic Objective, aiming at engaging with all potential partners (including private sector) and exploiting complementarities and synergies around its program areas. These action plans could be further complemented by localized approaches to identify and actively engage all relevant (private) partners and alliances.
96. In developing its Country Programming Frameworks, FAO country offices should broaden the consultation to potential private sector partners, especially those who can contribute to transformative results. The Private Sector Partnerships Team (PSPS) should provide clear guidance on related administrative processes, and strategic advice based on lessons from other countries/regions.
97. FAO may consider engaging in more frequent periodic consultations with the private sector. Annual private sector partnership dialogues should be complemented with special sessions with private sector entities at the margin of global and regional events organized by FAO. Furthermore, FAO could seek opportunities for human resources exchanges (secondments) with businesses on a reciprocal or unilateral basis. This could contribute in bridging the cultural and operational differences and incompatibilities and create a pool of experts capable of understanding and guiding partnerships both ways.
98. Third, FAO may also consider enhancing its capacities in partnering with the private sector by developing specialized training programmes, peer-to-peer knowledge exchanges and webinars showcasing good practices.

Recommendation 5: FAO should enhance its assessment and monitoring of partnerships performance, and exercise effective knowledge management to generate lessons learned that inform future improvements.

99. Building upon the existing partnerships database, FAO should consider the development of a knowledge management and monitoring system to continuously capture, document and share lessons from ongoing experiences and results achieved to inform improved collaboration with the private sector. Specific performance benchmarks would need to be developed to ensure the systematic review of ongoing partnerships performance against the defined objectives. This should include clear indicators for measuring contributions (including financial resources), and the value generated by private-sector partnerships towards achievement of FAO results. The performance assessment (or progress) reports should ideally be publicly accessible to provide detailed information about all FAO's partnerships with private entities, and used as a platform to communicate its current and past experience, and demonstrate what can be expected from the partnerships, highlighting comparative advantages, and ultimately building a distinctive brand identity and spotlight for the organization's unique strengths as a partner.
100. The knowledge management system would also benefit from monitoring the performance of the due diligence and risk management processes, as these can produce useful learning for FAO. This could be done, for instance, by establishing a documentation management system that allows the status of requests to be tracked; and document the total number of requests received, cases approved or rejected, results of risk assessment, reasons for

rejection and any other relevant information. FAO should use this knowledge system to periodically inform its Member States and key development stakeholders using well-documented cases of successful results in partnering with private sector.

References

- FAO.** 2013. CL 146/PV 117, page 116. <http://www.fao.org/3/mg635t/mg635t.pdf>
- FAO.** 2013. *Evaluation of FAO's Role in Investment for Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural Development*. FAO, 2013, para 98. <http://www.fao.org/3/mf599e/mf599e.pdf>
- FAO.** 2013. *FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector*, JM 2013.1/2, Rome, 20 March 2013, pp. 3,10, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25,
- FAO.** 2014. *Procedures for the preparation, clearance, and signature of Agreements*, Director-General's Bulletin, No. 2014/13, Rome, 18 March 2014.
- FAO.** 2014. *Procedures for the preparation, clearance, and signature of Agreements*, Director-General's Bulletin, No. 2014/13, Rome, 18 March 2014.
- FAO.** 2014. *Review of Partnerships with Non-State Actors and Composition of the Partnerships Committee and the Sub-Committee for the review of financial and other agreements*, Director-General's Bulletin, No. 2014/14, Rome, 31 March 2014.
- FAO.** 2016. Cf. FAO, *FAO Guidelines for Partnership and Collaboration with the Private Sector*, Rome, 2016, p. 22.
- FAO.** 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's contribution to SO4*, paragraph 101. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/bodies/Progr_Comm/PC_122-documents/MU657e.pdf
- FAO.** 2018. CL 160/5 Rev.1, Para 8 c). Report of the Joint Meeting of the 125th Session of the Programme Committee and 173rd Session of the Finance Committee (12 and 15 November 2018)
- FAO.** 2018. Report of the 125th Session of the Programme Committee (Rome 12 and 16 November 2018), CL 160/3, Rome, FAO. Available at http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/bodies/Progr_Comm/PC_125-documents/MY401e.pdf
- FAO.** 2018. Rural Women, Women with Rights, "Rural Women, Women with Rights: Main Results and Lessons Learned" Presentation (2018).
- FAO.** 2019. *Open National Dialogue*, (Argentina, FAO, July 2019)
- FAO.** 2019. *Open National Dialogue*, (Chile, FAO, June 2019)
- FAO.** 2019. *Synthesis of SO evaluations*, para 92. <http://www.fao.org/3/ca3774en/CA3774EN.pdf>
- UN.** 2003. Cf. UNGA, *Enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular the private sector*, Report of the Secretary-General, A/58/227, 18 August 2003.
- UN.** 2013. UNGA, *Towards global partnerships: a principle-based approach to enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners*, A/RES/68/234, 20 December 2013. in its resolution 68/234
- UN.** 2018, Accenture Study; Transforming Partnerships for the SDGs. https://www.accenture.com/t20180404T213323Z_w_usen/acnmedia/PDF-74/Accenture-Transforming-Partnerships-for-the-SDGs-UNGC-Accenture-Strategy.pdf

Bibliography

Baxter, Pamela., & Jack, S. 2008. "Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers". *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 13 n. 4. Pp. 544-556

Bray, Mark., & Thomas, R. M. 1995. "Levels of comparison in educational studies: Different insights from different literatures and the value of multilevel analyses. *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 65 n. 3. Pp. 472- 491 (also available at <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.65.3.g3228437224v4877>)

CGIAR. 2017. *Evaluation of Partnerships in CGIAR*, Rome, CGIAR

CGIAR. 2017. *Risk Management Guidelines of the CGIAR System*, Rome, CGIAR. (also available at https://www.cgiar.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/CGIAR-System_Risk-Mgmt-Guidelines-APPROVED.pdf)

CGIAR. 2017. *Risk Management Good Practice Note*, Rome, CGIAR. (also available <https://www.cgiar.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/GPN-Risk-Management-July-2017.pdf>)

Collier, D. 1993. "The Comparative Method", in Ada W. Finifter (ed.) *Political Science: The State of the Discipline (II)*, Washington, DC, American Political Science Association, pp. 105-19

Creswell, W. J. 2013. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*, Thousand Oaks, California, Sage.

Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C., eds. 1992. *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. London, Cambridge University Press.

Dyson, Haas. A., & Genishi, C. 2005. *On the case: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, Teachers College Press.

Horton, D., Prain, G., & Thiele, G. 2009. *Perspectives on partnership: A literature review*. International Potato Center (CIP), Lima, Peru. Working Paper 2009-3.

FAO. 2016. *Incentives for Ecosystem Services, Private sector consultation: Investment in sustainable supply chains and ecosystem services*, Rome, FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/in-action/incentives-for-ecosystem-services/policy/private-sector-engagement/private-sector-consultation/en/>)

FAO. 2000. *Principles, and Guidelines for FAO Cooperation with the Private Sector*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2010. *Strategic Evaluation of FAO Country Programming*, Management Response, PC 104/4 Sup. 1, Rome, FAO.

FAO Partnerships and Advocacy Branch (OCPB). 2013. *Technical Guidance for Involving Non-State Actors in the Country Programming Framework (CPF)*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2013. *Evaluation of FAO's Role in Investment for Food and Nutrition Security, Agriculture and Rural Development*, Rome, FAO. PC 113/2.

FAO. 2013. *Corporate Policy on Risk Management*, FAO. (also available at http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/osp/risk/RiskPolicy-Dec2013.pdf)

FAO. 2013. *FAO Strategy for Partnerships with the Private Sector*, JM 2013.1/2, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2014. *Review of Partnerships with Non-State Actors and Composition of the Partnerships Committee and the Sub-Committee for the review of financial and other agreements*, Director-General's Bulletin, No. 2014/14, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2014. *FAO Accountability Policy*, Rome, FAO. (also available at <http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/faomanual/OSP/FAOAccountabilityPolicy-Dec2014.pdf>)

FAO. 2014. *Procedures for the preparation, clearance, and signature of Agreements*, Director-General's Bulletin, No. 2014/13, Rome, FAO. (Director-General's Bulletin) (also available at http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/FAO_Communications/dgb/dgb14_13.pdf and http://intranet.fao.org/fao_communications/from_the_director_general/director_generals_bulletin)

FAO. 2014. *Third FAO private sector partnerships forum, Meeting Report*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2015. *Fourth FAO private sector partnerships dialogue, Meeting Proceedings*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2015. *Policy against fraud and other corrupt practices* (AC 2015/08) (also available at http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/FAO_Communications/ac/AC15_08.pdf); The Policy issued in 2004 (AC 2004/19) (also available at http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/FAO_Communications/ac/AC15_08.pdf); and further reiterated in 2007 (AC 2007/11), reaffirming the Organization's commitment against fraud and other corrupt practices (also available at http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/FAO_Communications/ac/Ac07_11.pdf);

FAO. 2015. C 2015/3 *The Director-General's Medium Term Plan 2014–2017 (reviewed) and Programme of Work and Budget 2016–2017 from the Thirty-ninth Session of the Conference 6–13 June 2015*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2015. *Guide to the Formulation of the Country Programming Framework (CPF)*, Rome, FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/a-bb020e.pdf>)

FAO. 2016. *FAO Guidelines for Partnership and Collaboration with the Private Sector*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2016. *FAO Internal Control Framework*, Rome, FAO. (also available <http://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/faomanual/OSP/IntControlFrame.pdf>)

FAO. 2016. *Evaluation of FAO's technical cooperation assistance in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to the Reduction of Rural Poverty through Strategic Programme 3 (SO3)*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2017. *Guide to the Formulation of the Country Programming Framework (CPF)*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2017. *The Director-General's Medium Term Plan 2018-21 and Programme of Work and Budget 2018-19*, Rome, FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/a-ms278e.pdf>)

FAO. 2017. *FAO and the SDG. Indicators: Measuring up to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Rome*, FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6919e.pdf>)

FAO. 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to the Kyrgyz Republic*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2017. *Evaluacion de Programa Pais, Guatemala 2013-2016*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's Programme in West Bank and Gaza Strip, 2011-2015*, Rome, FAO.

FAO. 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to Strategic Objective 4: Enabling Inclusive and Efficient Agricultural and Food Systems (SO4): Review of the Implementation of FAO's Strategy for Improving Food Safety Globally*, Rome, FAO. **FAO.** 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's contribution to inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems (SO4)*, PC122/3, Rome, FAO.

- FAO.** 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 2012-2017*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to the Myanmar Country Programme*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2017. *Evaluation de Programa Pais, Honduras 2013-2016*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2017. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to Bangladesh*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2017. *Evaluation du Programme de la FAO au Cameroun 2013-2017*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2018. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World*, Rome, FAO. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/3/i9553en/i9553en.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2018. *Synthesis of lessons learnt in the application of the Country Programming Framework*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2018. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to the Arab Republic of Egypt, 2012-2017*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2018. *Evaluacion del Programa de la Cooperacion de la FAO en Nicaragua 2013-2016*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2018. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to the Republic of Kenya, Final Report, Case Study*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2018. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to The Kingdom of Cambodia*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2018. *Evaluation of FAO's Strategic Objective 1: Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity, and malnutrition*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2018. *Evaluation of FAO's Contribution to Integrated Natural Resource Management for Sustainable Agriculture (SO2)*, Rome, FAO.
- FAO.** 2019. *Our priorities – The Strategic Objectives of FAO*, Rome, FAO.
- Kenneth W. A., & Snidal D.** 2010. "International Regulation without International Government: Improving IO Performance through Orchestration," *The Review of International Organizations*, vol. 5, n. 3, 2010.
- Gerring, J.** 2004. "What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?", *American Political Science Review* vol. 98, n. 2. 341-354 pp.
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J.** 1997 "Culture, power, place: Ethnography at the end of an era", in Akhil Gupta & James Ferguson (eds.), *Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical anthropology*, Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press, 1–32 pp.
- Hannerz, U.** 2006 "Studying down, up, sideways, through, backwards, forwards, away and at home: Reflections on the field worries of an expansive discipline" in Simon. M. Coleman & Peter. Collins (eds.), *Locating the field: Space, place, and context in anthropology*, Oxford, UK, Berg Publishers. 23-41 pp.
- IFAD.** 2007. *Private-Sector Development and Partnership Strategy*, Rome, IFAD.
- IFAD.** 2011. *IFAD's Private-Sector Development and Partnership Strategy, Corporate-Level Evaluation*, Report n. 2420, Rome, IFAD.
- IFAD.** 2012. *IFAD Partnership Strategy*, Rome, IFAD.
- IFAD.** 2014. *Due Diligence Process for Corporate Private Sector Partnerships*, PB/2014/09, Rome, IFAD.

- IFAD.** 2016. *How to do Public-Private-Producer Partnerships (4Ps) in Agricultural Value Chains*, Rome, IFAD.
- IFAD.** 2018. *Report of the Consultation on the Eleventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources. Leaving no one behind: IFAD's role in the 2030 Agenda*, Rome, IFAD.
- IFAD.** 2018. *Revised organizational structure to realign IFAD's operational areas effective as of 1 April 2018*, PB/2018/02, Rome, IFAD.
- IFAD.** 2018. *Building partnerships for enhanced development effectiveness – a review of country-level experiences and results, Evaluation Synthesis*, Report n. 4729, Rome, IFAD.
- IFAD.** 2018. *Operational Procedures on Country Strategies*, Rome, IFAD.
- Kenneth W. A., & Snidal D.** 2010. "International Regulation without International Government: Improving IO Performance through Orchestration," *The Review of International Organizations*, vol. 5, n. 3, 2010.
- Leander, K., & Sheehy, M. eds.** 2004. *Spatializing literacy research and practice*. New York, Peter Lang.
- Massey, B. D.** 2005. *For space*. London, Sage.
- Merriam, B. S.** 1998 *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Middleton, S.** 2014. *Henri Lefebvre and education: Space, history, theory*, New York, Routledge.
- Nespor, J.** 1997. *Tangled up in school: Politics, Space, Bodies, and Signs in the Educational Process*, Mahwah, New Jeersey, Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Inc. Publishers.
- Ragin, C. C., and Becker, S. H.** 1992. *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ragin, C. C.** 1992. "Introduction: Cases of "what is a case?" in Charles C. Ragin & Howard. S. Becker (eds.), *What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry*, New York Cambridge University Press. 1-17 pp.
- Ragin C. C. Berg-Schlosser, D. & De Meur, G.** 1996 "Political Methodology: Qualitative Methods", in Robert. E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (eds.), *A New Handbook of Political Science*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 749-68 pp.
- Rittenburg L., & Martens F.** 2012. *Enterprise Risk Management – Understanding and Communicating Risk Appetite'* COSO, 2012. (also available at <https://www.coso.org/Documents/ERM-Understanding-and-Communicating-Risk-Appetite.pdf>)
- Tennyson R.** 2011. The Partnering Initiative (IBLF), *The Partnering Toolkit: An essential guide to cross-sector partnering*, Tennyson, 2011. (also available at <https://thepartneringinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Partnering-Toolkit-en-20113.pdf>)
- UN Global Compact.** 2000. *The Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact*, New York, The UN Global Compact.

UN. 2007. "Guiding World Economic Forum and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Principles for Public-Private Collaboration for Humanitarian Action*, 2007. (also available at https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/legacy_files/World%20Economic%20Forum%20-%20OCHA%20Guiding%20Principles%20for%20Public-Private%20Collaboration%20in%20Humanitarian%20Action.pdf)

UN. 2009 and 2015. *Guidelines on a principle-based approach to the Cooperation between the United Nations and the business sector*. New York, The UN. (also available at 2009 https://www.un.org/ar/business/pdf/Guidelines_on_UN_Business_Cooperation.pdf; also available at 2015 https://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/un_business_partnerships/guidelines_principle_based_approach_between_un_business_sector.pdf)

UNGA. 2003. *Enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular the private sector, Report of the Secretary-General, A/58/227*. (also available at https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/501843/files/A_58_227-EN.pdf)

UNGA. 2013. *Towards global partnerships: a principle-based approach to enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, A/RES/68/234*.

UNGA. 2013. Report of the Second Committee, *Towards global partnerships, A/68/445*.

UNGA. 2014. Human Rights Council, *Elaboration of an international legally binding instrument on transitional corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, A/HRC/RES/26/9*.

UNGA. 2015. *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, A/RES/70/1, 21 October*

UNGA. 2016. *Towards global partnerships: a principle-based approach to enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, A/RES/70/224, 23 February 2016*.

UNGA. 2017. Economic and Social Council, *Repositioning the United Nations development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda: ensuring a better future for all, Report of the Secretary-General, A/72/124-E20183*.

UNGA. 2011. Human Rights Council, *Human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, A/HRC/RES/17/4, 6 July 2011*.

Tsing, Lowenhaupt A. 2005. *Friction: An ethnography of global connections*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005.

UNEP. 2009. *UNEP Policy on Partnerships and Guidelines for Implementation*.

UNEP. 2011. *UNEP Partnership Policy and Procedures*, 21 October 2011. (also available at <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/20739/Resource%20Doc%20-%20Partnership%20Policy.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>)

UNEP. 2013. *Decision adopted by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its first universal session, 27/2*.

UNEP. 2016. *Delivering on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Assembly Resolution 2/5, Nairobi, UNEP*.

MOPAN. 2016. *Mopan 2015-2016 Assessments, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Institutional Assessment Report*.

UNEP. 2018. *Report by the Secretariat on UN Environment Programme's Private Sector Engagement*, UNEP/CPR/142/4.

UNEP. 2018. Subcommittee meeting of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, *UN Environment Programme Private Sector Engagement*.

UNEP. 2018. *UN Environment Programme: Delivering the Programme of Work through Partnerships, 5th Annual Subcommittee meeting of the CPR*.

UNEP. 2018. *Handbook for stakeholder engagement at UN Environment*, 2018 (also available at <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/26862/HANDBOOK%20FOR%20STAKEHOLDER%20ENGAGEMENT.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>)

UNICEF. 2001. *UNICEF Guidelines and Manual for Working with the Business Community*. (also available at <https://business.un.org/en/documents/445>)

UNICEF. 2009. *UNICEF strategic framework for partnerships and collaborative relationships*, E/ICEF/2009/10.

UNICEF. 2010. *Guidelines for Ethical Reporting on Children*, 2010. (also available at <https://www.unicef.org/eca/media/ethical-guidelines>)

UNICEF. 2017. *Principles for Partnership*, 2017. (also available at https://www.unicef.org/about/partnerships/index_60074.html)

UNICEF. 2017. *Private Fundraising and Partnerships, 2017 Annual Report*, Geneva. (also available at https://www.unicef.org/about/annualreport/files/PFP_2017_AR.pdf)

UNICEF. 2017. *UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2018-2021*, E/ICEF/2017/17/Rev.

UNICEF. 2010. *UNICEF Sabbatical Program*. (also available at <https://news.pg.com/blog/live-learn-and-thrive/pg-and-unicef-sabbatical-program>)

WFP. 2004. *New Partnerships to Meet Rising Needs – Expanding the WFP Donor Base*, WFP/EB.3/2004/4-C, Rome, WFP. Annex II WFP Private – Donor Selection for Cooperation, and Annex III WFP Code of Conduct. (also available at <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000029805/download/>)

WFP. 2012. *WFP's Private Sector Partnership, and Fundraising Strategy: An Evaluation*, Vol. I, Full Report, Report n. OE.2012.010, Rome, WFP.

WFP. 2013. *WFP's Private Sector Partnership and Fundraising Strategy (2013 – 2017)*, WFP/EB.A/2013/5-B, Rome, WFP.

WFP. 2014. *WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017)*, Rome, WFP. (Also available at <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp282072.pdf?ga=2.39728939.943151875.1553616390-1061019313.1552386887>)

WFP. 2017. *Policy Evaluation, WFP's Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017), Evaluation Report*, Report n. OE.2016.010, Rome, WFP.

WFP. 2017. *Policy Evaluation, WFP's Corporate Partnership Strategy, Evaluation Report*, Vol. II, **Annexes**, Report n. OE.2016.010, Rome, WFP.

WFP. 2018. "UN Food Agencies commit to deeper collaboration to achieve Zero Hunger", 6 June 2018. (also available at <https://www.wfp.org/news/news-release/un-food-agencies-commit-deeper-collaboration-achieve-zero-hunger>)

WHO. 1946. *Constitution of the World Health Organization* (also available at <http://apps.who.int/gb/bd/PDF/bd47/EN/constitution-en.pdf?ua=1>)

WHO. 2014. *Partnerships*, Report by the Secretariat, A63/44, 22 April 2010.

WHO. 2014. *Basic Documents*, 2014. (also available at <http://apps.who.int/gb/bd/>)

WHO. 2016. *Framework of engagement with non-State actors*, Agenda item 11.3, WHA69.10.

WHO. 2018. *Engagement with non-State actors*, EB144/36.

WHO. 2018. *Handbook for non-state actors on engagement with the World Health Organization*, Geneva.

Yin, K. R. 2011. *Applications of case study research*, Thousand Oaks, California, Sage.

Yin, K. R. 2014. *Case study research: Design and methods*, fifth edition, Los Angeles, Sage.

Appendix 1. People interviewed

No.	Name	Position	Organization
1	Ms Marcela Villarreal	Director	FAO – Partnerships Division
2	Mr Rodrigo Castaneda	Deputy Director	FAO – Partnerships Division
3	Mr Andrew Nadeau	Senior Partnerships Officer	FAO – Partnerships Division
4	Ms Annamaria Pastore	Partnerships Officer	FAO – Partnerships Division
5	Ms Ana Saez	Consultant	FAO – Partnerships Division
6	Mr Daniele Volpe	Partnerships Officer	FAO – Partnerships Division
7	Ms Lara Machuama	Partnership Officer	FAO – Partnerships Division
8	Ms Darya Alekseeva	Program Officer – Regional Partnership focal point REU	FAO – Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia
9	Mr Kayan Jaff	Senior Policy Officer – Regional Partnership focal point RNE	FAO – Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa
10	Mr Nafis Khan	Program Officer – Regional Partnership focal point RNE	FAO – Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa
11	Ms Paola Bolivar	Consultant – Private Sector Partnerships RLC	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
12	Ms Dulclair Sternadt	Partnerships Officer – Regional Partnership focal point RLC	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
13	Mr Kazuyuki Fujiwara	Partnerships Officer – Regional Partnership focal point RAF	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
14	Ms Karin Christianson	Partnerships Officer – Regional Partnership focal point RAF	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
15	Ms Kaori Abe	Programme Officer (Partnerships and Resource Mobilization) – Regional Partnership focal point RAP	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
16	Mr Roberto Ridolfi	Assistant Director General	FAO – Programme Support and Technical Cooperation Department
17	Mr Daniel Gustafson	Deputy Director General	FAO – Programmes
18	Mr Franz Martin	Head of Due Diligence process	FAO – Partnerships Division
19	Ms Emma McInerney	Partnerships Officer	FAO – Partnerships Division
20	Ms Soyoong Bong	Partnerships Officer	FAO – Partnerships Division
21	Mr Yannick Fiedler	Consultant – Responsible Agricultural Investment	FAO – Partnerships Division
22	Ms Emma Mcghie	Consultant – Responsible Agricultural Investment	FAO – Partnerships Division
23	Mr Karel Callens	Deputy Director	FAO – Hunger Eradication, Food Security and Nutrition Programme (SP1)
24	Mr Jamie Morrison	Strategic Programme Leader	FAO – Food Systems Programme (SP4)
25	Ms Siobhan Kelly	Agribusiness Officer	FAO – Food Systems Programme (SP4)
26	Mr Jorge Fonseca	Nutrition and Food Systems Officer	FAO – Food Systems Programme (SP4)
27	Mr David Conte	Senior Strategy and Planning Officer	FAO – Rural Poverty Reduction Programme (SP3)
28	Ms Kakoli Ghosh	Coordinator	FAO – Sustainable Agriculture Programme (SP2)
29	Mr Etienne JuvanonDuVachat	Expert on resilience Sahel for food security, nutrition and agriculture	FAO – Resilience Programme (SP5)

No.	Name	Position	Organization
30	Ms Kazumi Ikeda-Larhed	Deputy Director	FAO – Office of Human Resources
31	Mr Giacomo De Besi	Livestock Development Specialist	FAO – Animal Production and Health Division
32	Ms Cornelia Boesch	Food Safety and Quality Officer (Mars Technical Focal Point)	FAO – Office of Food Safety
33	Mr Vittorio Fattori	Food Safety and Quality Officer (Mars Technical Focal Point)	FAO – Office of Food Safety
34	Mr Jeffrey Lejeune	Food Safety Officer (Mars Technical Focal Point)	FAO – Office of Food Safety
35	Ms Daphne Hewitt	Forestry Officer – Programme Manager FAO-EU FLEGT Programme	FAO – Forestry Policy and Resources Division
36	Mr Bruno Cammaert	Forestry Officer – FAO-EU FLEGT Programme	FAO – Forestry Policy and Resources Division
37	Ms Sophie Grouwels	Forestry Officer	FAO – Forestry Policy and Resources Division
38	Mr Danilo Mollicone	Technical Officer	FAO – Climate and Environment Division
39	Ms Anika Seggel	Climate Change Expert	FAO – Climate and Environment Division
40	Mr Michael Clark	Senior Coordinator	FAO – Economic and Social Development Department
41	Ms Dubravka Bojic	Programme Officer	FAO – Economic and Social Development Department
42	Mr Patrick Mcnellis	Senior Governance and Private Finance Sector Expert	FAO – Economic and Social Development Department
43	Mr Akos Szebeni	Rural Finance and Investment Specialist	FAO – Social Policies and Rural Institutions Division
44	Ms Stepanka Gallatova	Agribusiness Economist	FAO – Agricultural Development Economics Division
45	Ms Rosa Rolle	Senior Enterprise Development Officer	FAO – Nutrition and Food Systems Division
46	Mr Pedro Marcelo Arias	Economist	FAO – Trade and Markets Division
47	Mr Christophe Duhamel	Coordinator	FAO – Statistics Division
48	Mr Mohamed Manssouri	Director	FAO – Investment Centre Division
49	Mr Dmitry Prikhodko	Economist	FAO – Investment Centre Division
50	Ms Amalia Daniela Renosto	Donor Relations and Resource Mobilization Specialist	FAO – Business Development and Resource Mobilization Division
51	Ms Aiko Toda	Group Coordinator, Pacific Rim & Non-State Actors Programme Officer	FAO – Business Development and Resource Mobilization Division
52	Mr William Marvin	Senior Finance Officer	FAO – Finance Division
53	Ms Sabina Zaccaro	Senior Communication Coordinator	FAO – Office for Corporate Communication
54	Mr Matthew Keil	Programme Officer	FAO – Office for Corporate Communication
55	Ms Sherri Dougherty	Photo Editor	FAO – Office for Corporate Communication

No.	Name	Position	Organization
56	Ms Tina Mittendorf	Facilities Management Officer	FAO – Corporate Services Department
57	Mr Angus Rennie	Senior Manager	UN Global Compact
58	Ms Gabriela Ocampo	Partnerships Officer	UN Global Compact
59	Mr Francois Malha	Due Diligence Officer	UNICEF
60	Ms Deidre White	Chief Executive Officer	PYXERA Global
61	Mr Vincenzo Cursio	Coordinator of FAO Nobel Alliance for Food Security and Peace	Yunus and You
62	Mr JB Cordero	Focal point for FAO partnership	Mars Inc.
63	Ms Yvonne Harz-Pitre	Director, Communication and Public Affairs	International Fertilizer Association – France
64	Ms Regina Campa	Advisor on Partnerships	PAHO/WHO
65	Ms Kundhavi Kadiresan	Assistant Director General – Regional Representative Asia and the Pacific	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
66	Mr Jongjin Kim	Deputy Regional Representative and focal point for Thai affairs	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
67	Mr Tomio Shichiri	FAO Representative India	FAO – India
68	Mr Albert T. Lieberg	FAO Representative Vietnam	FAO – Vietnam
69	Mr Robert Simpson	FAO Representative Bangladesh	FAO – Bangladesh
70	Mr Vincent Martin	FAO Representative China and DPRK	FAO – China and DPRK
71	Mr Stephen Rudgard	FAO Representative Indonesia and Timor Leste	FAO – Indonesia and Timor Leste
72	Ms Minà Dowlatchahi	FAO Representative Pakistan	FAO – Pakistan
73	Mr José Luis Fernandez	FAO Representative Philippines	FAO – Philippines
74	Mr Xuebing Sun	FAO Representative Sri Lanka and Maldives	FAO – Sri Lanka and Maldives
75	Ms Eriko Hibi	Sub-regional Coordinator Pacific Islands	FAO – Samoa
76	Mr Muhammad Nasar Hayat	FAO Representative Lao PDR	FAO – Laos
77	Mr Chanthath Pongmala	Assistant FAO Representative Lao PDR	FAO – Laos
78	Mr Dong Le	Poverty Reduction and Innovation Officer	FAO – China
79	Mr Thomas Hofer	Group Leader of Natural Resources Management Support Group	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
80	Mr Sridhar Dharmapuri	Group Leader of Food and Agriculture Systems Support Group	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
81	Ms Katinka De Balogh	Senior animal production and health Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
82	Ms Allison Moore	Group Leader, Country/Region Support Group	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
83	Ms Xiangjun Yao	Regional Programme Leader and SO Focal points	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
84	Mr Filip Claes	Technical Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
85	Ms Clara Park	Gender Officer and Focal Point SP3	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
87	Ms Caroline Von Gayl	Programme Officer (Partnership & Resources Mobilization) Designate	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
88	Mr Ben Vickers	Forestry Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
89	Ms Louise Whiting	Senior Land and Water Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

No.	Name	Position	Organization
90	Mr Aziz Rahman Arya	South-South Cooperation Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
91	Mr Tony Bennett	Senior Food Systems Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
92	Mr Pierre Ferrard	Senior Agricultural Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
93	Mr Simon Nicol	Senior Fisheries Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
94	Ms Caroline Turner	Programme Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
95	Mr Wyn Ellis	Coordinator, Sustainable Rice Platform	UNEP – Thailand
96	Mr Tomas De Clercq	Programme Officer	UNEP – Thailand
97	Mr Jaco Cilliers	Private Sector and Partnerships	UNDP – Thailand
98	Ms Christine Gerlier	Private Sector and Partnerships	UNDP – Thailand
99	Ms. Vanida Khumnirdpetch	Director of Bureau of Foreign Agricultural Affairs (BOFAA)	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives of Thailand
100	Mr Torlarb Thanvareerat	Policy analyst, Bureau of Foreign Agricultural Affairs (BOFAA)	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives of Thailand
101	Mr Krit Han	Bureau of Foreign Agricultural Affairs (BOFAA)	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives of Thailand
102	Mr Christopher Wilson	Policy analyst, International Environment, Policy and Trade	Ministry of Primary Industries – New Zealand
103	Mr Ryan Zhong Li	Asst. Researcher	Centre for International Agricultural Research – China
104	Ms Delisa Jiang	Senior Manager	CropLife Asia – Thailand
105	Ms Thelma Soriano	Seed Regulatory Affairs Director	CropLife Asia – Thailand
106	Ms Tyna Hà Giang Huynh Dinh	CEO	BioPhap – Thailand
107	Mr Grahame Dixie	Executive Director	Grow Asia – Singapore
108	Mr Julio Berdegue	Assistant Director General and Regional Representative for Latin America	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
109	Mr Francisco Yofre	FAO Representative Argentina	FAO - Argentina
110	Mr Rafael Zavala	FAO Representative Brazil	FAO – Brazil
111	Mr Augustin Zimmermann	FAO Representative Ecuador and former Secretary of the Program Committee	FAO – Ecuador
112	Mr John Preissing	Formerly FAO Representative Ecuador / Currently Deputy Director	Formerly FAO – Ecuador / Currently FAO – Investment Center Division
113	Mr Walter DeOliveira	Deputy FAO Representative Haiti	FAO – Haiti
114	Mr Diego Recalde	FAO Representative El Salvador and Guatemala	FAO – El Salvador and Guatemala
115	Mr Ivan Leon	FAO Representative Nicaragua	FAO – Nicaragua
116	Mr Mael Thibaut	Programme Officer	FAO – Panama
117	Ms Maya Takagi	Regional Programme Leader	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
118	Ms Hivy Ortiz Chour	Regional Forestry Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
119	Mr Ricardo Rapallo	Senior Policy Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
120	Mr Peter Moers	Field Program and Resource Mobilization Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
121	Mr Matias Reeves	Field Program and Resource Mobilization Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean

No.	Name	Position	Organization
122	Ms Adriana Gregolin	Regional Project Coordinator	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
123	Ms Carolina Maturana	Policy Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
124	Mr Joao Intini	Policy Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
125	Mr Mauricio Mireles	Indigenous Peoples Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
126	Mr Rolf Hackbart	Land and Natural Resources Tenure Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
127	Ms Ignacia Holms	Program Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
128	Ms Claudia Brito	Gender Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
129	Mr Luis Lobo	Technical Advisor	FAO – Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
130	Ms Daniela Acuna	Comite Nacional PDA Representative	Comite Nacional PDA Representative – Chile
131	Mr Marcos Contreras	Telefonica Representative	Telefonica – Chile
132	Ms Jasmine Cabello	Assistant Manager Corporate Affairs and Sustainability	Tres Montes Luchette – Chile
133	Mr Gonzalo Bravo	Treasurer	Flama – Chile
134	Mr Cristobal DellaMagiora	Chief Calorie Operator	Burn to Give – Chile
135	Ms Maria Francisca Gonzales	Project Coordinator	Pacto Global – Chile
136	Ms Elizabeth Keliman	Technical Advisor	FAO - Argentina
137	Ms Agustina Rovira	Head of Public Affairs in the Southern Cone	Unilever – Argentina
138	Ms Mercedes Nimo	Director	Office of Agribusiness of Argentina
139	Ms Darinka Anzulovich	Technical Assistant	COPAL – Argentina
140	Mr Martin Dupaus	CSR Coordinator	Danone – Argentina
141	Ms Gisela Krasnansky	Public Affairs Manager	Danone – Argentina
142	Mr Diego Liverti	Scientific Affairs Manager	Danone – Argentina
143	Ms Cecilia Antun	City of Buenos Aires Representative	City of Buenos Aires
144	Mr Santiago Gonzales	Head of Public Affairs	Telefonica – Argentina
145	Ms Yamila Scollo	Sustainability Representative	Carrefour – Argentina
146	Ms Johanna Flores	Assistant FAOR	FAO – Ecuador
147	Ms Diana Rosero	Communication and Institutional Relations – Private Sector Strategy Consultant	FAO – Ecuador
148	Ms Gabriela Rosero	Food Security Project Coordinator	FAO – Ecuador
149	Ms Karina Marcillo	Program Consultant	FAO – Ecuador
150	Mr Savid Suarez Duque	Agrodiversity – Mas Algodon – Project Coordinator	FAO – Ecuador
151	Mr Kelvin Cueva	Conservation and Good Living GEF Napo Project Coordinator	FAO – Ecuador
152	Mr Juan Merino	Smart Climate Livestock	FAO – Ecuador
153	Ms Sophia Jarrin	Focal point for FAO partnership	Ministry of Agriculture of Ecuador
154	Mr Christopher Brett	Lead Agribusiness Specialist	World Bank
155	Mr Niraj Shah	Principal Investment Officer	International Finance Corporation (IFC) – World Bank Group
156	Ms Alexandra Christina Horst	Agricultural Economist	World Bank
157	Ms Florence Rolle	FAO Representative Morocco	FAO – Morocco

No.	Name	Position	Organization
158	Mr Hansin Dogan	Head, UNDP Istanbul International Center for Private Sector in Development	UNDP – Turkey
159	Mr Abebe Haile-Gabriel	Assistant Director General and Regional Representative for Africa	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
160	Ms Jocelyn Brown Hall	FAO Representative in Ghana and Deputy Regional Representative for Africa	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
161	Mr Ade Freeman	Regional Programme Leader	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
162	Mr Blaise Ouattara	Food Safety and Quality Officer and SP2 Focal Point	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
163	Ms Pamela Pozarny	Strategic Focal Point for SP3	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
164	Ms Ndiaga Gueye	Regional Senior Fisheries and Aquaculture Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
165	Ms Suela Krifsa	TCP Programme Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
166	Mr Peter Anaadumba	South-South Cooperation Officer	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
167	Mr Scott Newman	RI2 and SP2 Leader – Animal Health Production	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
168	Mr Pious Asante	Gender Consultant	FAO – Regional Office for Africa
169	Ms Hamdiya Ismaila	General Manager	Venture Capital Trust Fund – Ghana
170	Mr Andrews Ahiaku	Head of Agribusiness	Fidelity Bank – Ghana
171	Ms Dorothy Anima Effa	Program Officer, Policy & Advocacy	AGRA – Ghana
172	Mr Pa Kwesi Awuku-Darko	Inclusive Finance Associate Programme Officer	AGRA – Ghana
173	Mr Theophilus Otchere Larbi	Country Programme Officer	IFAD – Ghana
174	Ms Nana Osei-Bonsu	Chief Executive Officer	Private Enterprise Federation – Ghana
175	Mr Fredrick Acquah	Business Incubator Design Specialist	African Agribusiness Incubators Network – Ghana
176	Mr Anthony Morrison	President	Chamber of Agribusiness Ghana
177	Mr Sheu Salau	Senior Agriculture Economist	World Bank Ghana
178	Mr Samson K. Konlan	Private Sector Development	International Finance Corporation Ghana
179	Mr Willem Olthof	Deputy Head of Unit Rural Development, Food Security, Nutrition	European Commission – Brussels
180	Mr Juan Manuel Velasco Leon	FAO Focal Point	European Commission – Brussels
181	Ms Joanna Kahiluoto	Policy Officer Private Sector, Trade	European Commission – Brussels
182	Mr David Phiri	Sub-regional Coordinator for Eastern Africa	FAO – Ethiopia
183	Mr Gabriel Rugalema	FAO Representative Kenya	FAO – Kenya
184	Mr Hamisi Williams	Assistant FAO Representative Kenya	FAO – Kenya
185	Mr Robert Allport	Programme Coordinator	FAO – Kenya
186	Mr Joseph Njuguna	Livestock Officer	FAO – Kenya
187	Ms Judy Maina	Youth Specialist	FAO – Kenya
188	Mr Tito Arunga	Agribusiness and Value Chain Officer	FAO – Kenya
189	Mr Barrack Okoba	Climate Change Officer	FAO – Kenya
190	Mr Antonio Salort-Pons	Head of Governments & Private Sector Partnerships	WFP – Kenya
191	Mr Magana Gakandi	Partnership Officer	WFP – Kenya
192	Mr Siddharth Chatterjee	UN Resident Coordinator	United Nations – Kenya
193	Mr Arif Neky	Senior Advisor, UN Strategic Partnerships	United Nations – Kenya

No.	Name	Position	Organization
194	Mr Lawrence Maina	Agriculture General Manager	East African Maltings Ltd – Kenya
195	Ms Sonali Ruparelia	Project Manager – Kenya, Uganda	Rabobank Foundation – Kenya
196	Mr Patrick Amuyunzu	Chairperson	Agrochemicals Association of Kenya
197	Mr Eric Kimunguyi	Chief Executive Officer	Agrochemicals Association of Kenya
198	Mr Eric Bureau	Managing Director – Country Head Crop Science East Africa	Bayern – Kenya
199	Mr Manoj K. Shah	Chief Executive Officer	Osho Chemical Industries Ltd. – Kenya
200	Mr Evans Mutuva	Principal Consultant	Mega Consult Limited – Kenya
201	Ms Rachel Kabuyah	Grants & Partnerships Manager	Twiga Foods – Kenya
202	Mr Fred Kafeero	FAO Representative Tanzania	FAO – Tanzania
203	Mr Tulahi Charles	Assistant FAO Representative Tanzania	FAO – Tanzania
204	Mr Geoffrey E. Bakanga	National Natural Resource Management Officer	FAO – Tanzania
205	Mr Jonathan Sawaya	National Natural Development Assistant	FAO – Tanzania
206	Mr Melvin Gassana	Project Officer	FAO – Tanzania
207	Mr Fadhili Mtengela	Project Officer	FAO – Tanzania
208	Ms Ajuaye Sigalla	Project Officer	FAO – Tanzania
209	Ms Cypridion Mushongi	Project Officer	FAO – Tanzania
210	Ms Moorine Lwakatare	Project Officer	FAO – Tanzania
211	Mr Diomedes Kalisa	Project Officer	FAO – Tanzania
212	Ms Winnie Bashagi	Executive Director	Rice Council of Tanzania
213	Mr Wilson Kivanda	Project Officer	Rice Council of Tanzania
214	Mr Geoffrey Rwiza	Project Officer	Rice Council of Tanzania
215	Ms Leoncia N. Salakana	Project Officer	Rice Council of Tanzania
216	Mr Godfrey Simbeye	Executive Director	Tanzania Private Sector Foundation
217	Mr Fernandos Vallerian	Senior Project Manager	NMB Foundation for Agricultural Development –Tanzania
218	Mr Sylvester Mpanduji	Director General	Small Industries Development Organization of Tanzania
219	Mr Kalumuna P. Benedicti	Manager Technical Services	Small Industries Development Organization of Tanzania
220	Ms Evaclotida M. Kapinga	Manager Regional Administration	Small Industries Development Organization of Tanzania
221	Mr Stephen Bondo	Training Manager	Small Industries Development Organization of Tanzania
222	Ms Fatuma Hamisi	Executive Director	Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture
223	Mr Gotfrid Mugande	Director of Commerce	Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture
224	Ms Anna Msonsa	Planning Officer	Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture
225	Mr Giorgi Misheladze	Chairman	Georgia Agricultural Cooperatives Development Agency (ACDA)
226	Ms Khatia Tsilosani	Deputy Minister	Georgia Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA)

No.	Name	Position	Organization
227	Mr Konstantine Zhgenti	Head of Association of Business Consulting Organizations of Georgia	Association of Business Consulting Organizations of Georgia (ABCO-Georgia)
228	Mr Mamuka Meskhi	Assistant FAO Representative	FAO Georgia
229	Mr Oleg Guychgeldiev	FAO Representative	FAO Tajikistan
230	Mr Gaudenz Ulrich Silberschmidt	Director for Partnerships and Non-State Actors	World Health Organization

Annexes

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

Annex 2. Evaluation synthesis study

Annex 3. Comparator study

Annex 4. Timeline of Private Sector Strategy

Annex 5. Logical map of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations

Annexes are available to download at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation/en/>