



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

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

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

COUNCIL

Hundred and Thirty-first Session

Rome, 20-25 November 2006

Independent External Evaluation of FAO (IEE)

Progress Report of the Council Committee for the Independent External Evaluation of FAO (CC-IEE)

Table of Contents

	Pages
<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>Institutional Arrangements</i>	1
<i>Evaluation Start-up</i>	1
<i>Work of the IEE to Date</i>	3
<i>Financial Situation of the IEE Budget</i>	3
<i>Proposed Inter-sessional Meetings of Friends of the Chair to Assist the Council</i>	3
<i>Deliberations on the Independent External Evaluation of FAO (IEE)</i>	3
<i>In Conclusion</i>	3
ANNEX I: JOURNAL ANNOUNCEMENT FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST IN IEE CONSULTANCIES	5
ANNEX II : SUMMARY CURRICULA VITAE OF THE CORE TEAM AND QUALITY ASSURANCE ADVISERS	6
ANNEX III: INCEPTION REPORT	8

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at www.fao.org

I. Scope and Context	8
II. Appointment of Core Team and Start-up	12
III. Preliminary Situation Assessment: Some Working Hypotheses	13
IV. Initial Evaluation Framework	19
A. THE TECHNICAL WORK OF FAO	20
<i>Initial issues and questions</i>	21
<i>Methodology</i>	21
B. ADMINISTRATION, MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION	23
<i>Initial issues and questions</i>	23
<i>Methodology</i>	23
<i>Issues needing in depth study</i>	24
<i>Lines of investigation and contacts to be made</i>	25
C. GOVERNANCE	26
<i>Initial issues and questions</i>	26
<i>Methodology</i>	27
D. FAO IN THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM	28
<i>Initial issues and questions</i>	29
<i>Methodology</i>	29
V. Reviews at Country, Regional and Sub-regional Offices	30
VI. Risks and Risk Management	31
VII. Indicative Timeline: Main Milestones	33
VIII. Indicative Budget	34
ANNEX IV: EVALUATION TEAM PROGRESS REPORT ON THE INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF FAO (IEE)	36
A. INTRODUCTION	36
B. ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE IEE	37
C. CONTINUING REVIEWS, ANALYSES AND SYNTHESIS OF EXISTING EVALUATIONS AND AVAILABLE MATERIALS	37
D. PREPARATION OF SURVEY AND OTHER RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	38
E. SELECTION OF COUNTRIES AND SCHEDULING OF VISITS	39
F. THE TECHNICAL WORK OF FAO	40

G. GENDER CONSIDERATIONS	41
H. ADMINISTRATION, MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION	41
I. GOVERNANCE	43
J. ASSESSMENT OF THE EVALUATION FUNCTION IN FAO	44
K. FAO IN THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM	45
ANNEX V: PROPOSAL OF THE CC-IEE ON INTER-SESSIONAL MEETINGS OF FRIENDS OF THE CHAIR TO ASSIST THE COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS ON THE INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF FAO (IEE)	47

Introduction

1. The Council Committee for the IEE (CC-IEE) was established by the 129th Session of the Council in November 2005 and endorsed by the Conference at its 33rd Session later that month. Its terms of reference¹ state that the CC-IEE:

“will provide overall oversight for the management and operation of the evaluation, including on financial matters and adherence to standards of quality and independence. It will ensure that the terms of reference are adhered to in a timely manner, with quality and independence of process and outputs and within budget. Drawing on the advice of the quality assurance advisers (see below), Committee comments on findings and recommendations will thus be restricted to quality assurance, i.e. that the findings and recommendations are analysis and evidence based.”

2. This report of the CC-IEE on the progress of the evaluation covers the period since the establishment of the Committee in November 2005. Details of all aspects of the IEE and the work of the CC-IEE can be found on the Evaluation website <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html>.

Institutional Arrangements

3. At its first session in December 2005, the CC-IEE appointed a Bureau with one representative per region and open to attendance by all members. It unanimously decided on Mr. W. Brakel (USA) to be its vice-chair in support of Ambassador F. Perri (Brazil), the CC-IEE Chair appointed by the Council.

Evaluation Start-up

4. **Selection of the Evaluation Core Team:** Following the 33rd Session of the Conference and 130th Session of the Council in November 2005, the Council Committee completed an open process of selection of the IEE Core Team of evaluators and two quality assurance advisers. This included advertisements in journals in all parts of the world and screening against the pre-determined job descriptions (see Annex I) and selection criteria by a special working group of the CC-IEE Bureau. Selections were made as follows:

a) Core Team

- Mr. Keith Bezanson, team leader;
- Ms. Uma Lele, core team member – technical work of FAO;
- Mr. Michael Davies, core team member – management, organization and administration of FAO;
- Mr. Carlos Perez del Castillo, core team member – governance of FAO; and
- Ms. Thelma Awori, core team member - FAO's role in the multilateral system.

b) Quality Assurance Advisers

- Ms. Mary Chinery-Hesse; and
- Mr. Robert D. van den Berg, Director, Evaluation Office, The Global Environment Facility (GEF).

5. Very regrettably due to his health problems, Mr. Bezanson withdrew as team leader and a further selection process took place. Following this, another highly qualified candidate, Mr. Leif Christoffersen, was appointed as IEE team leader from 1 October 2006. Transition arrangements have been agreed between Mr. Bezanson and Mr. Christoffersen in wider consultation with the

¹ CL 129/10 para 18

members of the Core Team and Mr. Bezanson has agreed with the new team leader to continue to support the IEE to the extent possible. The CC-IEE considered that it was most fortunate to locate a replacement candidate of Mr. Christoffersen's high calibre at this stage of the IEE process.

6. Details of the core team and quality assurance advisers are available on the FAO Evaluation and IEE websites <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html> and summary curricula vitae are provided as Annex II to this report.

7. **The IEE Core Team Inception Report:** Following wide-ranging discussions with Member Country Permanent Representations to FAO and with the FAO Secretariat, the IEE Core Team presented its Inception Report to the CC-IEE at its meeting on 24 May 2006. Members welcomed the inception report which, they felt, provided a solid basis to proceed with the evaluation, and a number of suggestions for improvement made by the CC-IEE and the quality assurance advisers were incorporated. The inception report complements the terms of reference in setting out how the core team intends to approach the evaluation and providing an evaluation framework. The inception report is included as Annex III to this report.

8. It should be noted that the IEE Core Team envisages presenting a paper on emerging issues, including a possible outline of the principal conclusions, in April 2007 and its draft final report for discussion and feedback in July 2007. No substantive reports are envisaged prior to these dates because, as stated in the Inception Report of the Core Team (para. 80):

“reporting on conclusions and recommendations on a continuous and piecemeal basis..... would be incompatible with the essence of the Terms of Reference which call for a comprehensive, integrated and inter-related assessment. Such reporting would necessarily assume that results in one area would not impact on and change – perhaps completely – results from another – a patently dangerous assumption.”

9. An area of special attention addressed in the inception report has been the relationship between the IEE and the Reforms being proposed to the Governing Bodies and introduced by the Director-General.

- a) The 33rd Session of the Conference stated in Resolution 6/2005 – Reforms in the Organization:

“Looking forward to the results of the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO as a guide to enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Organization; and stressing that the IEE and the reform proposals should be mutually supportive”.

- b) Further, as discussed in the Inception Report of the IEE Core team (para. 81) and as approved by the CC-IEE:

“The IEE is specifically charged in the Terms of Reference to examine the appropriateness and adequacy of current proposals for institutional reform in the four areas of programmes, headquarters structures and operations, field level structures and operations and the general streamlining of FAO administration. Concerns, however, have already been raised by representatives of countries that the conclusions and recommendations of the IEE might not accord with the current ongoing progress of implementing some of the reform proposals. A related concern that has also been raised is that there is an out of phase problem of timing between the processes of ongoing reforms and the timeline of the IEE. These concerns may well prove valid, as it cannot be ruled out that IEE conclusions could diverge – and even diverge substantially -- from basic components in the current package of reform proposals. Equally, however, the outcome of the IEE could lend increased emphasis to and urgency on implementation of the reform proposals. In the latter eventuality, any delay in implementing reforms at this stage pending IEE results could entail opportunity costs. The problem is that the outcomes cannot be judged ex ante. To the extent that there are major risks in this area,

they are risks of governance and management and not ones that can be dealt with via risk management measures by the IEE itself.”

Work of the IEE to Date

10. At its meetings on 21 and 22 September, the CC-IEE reviewed the Progress Report presented by the Core Team (included as Annex IV to this report) and the comments of the Quality Assurance Advisers. The Committee welcomed the progress which was being made on the evaluation. The Committee further emphasised the independence of the team and that their work should be carried out in line with the directions indicated in the Progress Report and the previously approved Inception Report. Detailed comments were made on the report, which the Evaluation Core Team found helpful in planning its future work and reflected in an Annex to the report posted on the IEE website.

11. Work of the IEE Core Team and the technical consultants appointed by them has been supported by the FAO Evaluation Service as requested by the CC-IEE and with due regard to the need to fully safeguard the independence of the evaluation. The FAO secretariat has also provided information and views as requested.

Financial Situation of the IEE Budget

12. The extent of contributions to the IEE budget has been kept under continuous review by the CC-IEE which established a special working group of the Bureau for this purpose. The budget for 2006 is adequately subscribed but there remains uncertainty on fulfilling the total remaining budget for 2007. Also important is extending the contribution base more widely in the membership. As stated in the report of the 129th Session of the Council (paragraph 56), the Council:

“welcomed, in this context, the establishment of an IEE Multilateral Trust Fund by FAO and urged all Members to urgently contribute to it in order to make this Evaluation a true product of the Membership as a whole.”

13. Although costs have been contained, the budget was fully earmarked and the newly appointed IEE team leader has reviewed the budget situation together with the secretariat. Supplementary costs were incurred in the change of team leader and the additional support which was provided to the former team leader Dr. Bezanson in the July-September period.

Proposed Inter-sessional Meetings of Friends of the Chair to Assist the Council Deliberations on the Independent External Evaluation of FAO (IEE)

14. At a meeting of the CC-IEE on the request of the Independent Chairperson of the Council, the CC-IEE discussed how the Council might best be facilitated in considering its recommendations to the Conference on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the IEE and related matters. The CC-IEE thus suggests to the Council that it may wish to invite its Independent Chairperson to informally convene, as he considers necessary between Council sessions, Friends of the Chair with appropriate regional representation. The Friends of the Chair, without prejudice to the work of the standing committees of the Council, would discuss issues pertaining to follow-up to the IEE in preparation for Council sessions. Details of this suggestion are provided in Annex V to this report.

In Conclusion

15. The Committee of the Council for the IEE considers that the IEE is proceeding well and in a timely, transparent and impartial manner, in line with its terms of reference as approved by the Council and Conference. It invites the Council to join it in expressing its appreciation to the evaluation team for their work, thanking the outgoing team leader Mr. Bezanson and welcoming the new team leader Mr. Christoffersen. It also invites the Council to:

- a) take note of the additional suggested budgetary requirements to cover unforeseen costs of US\$ 380,000 and urge an additional effort by members to cover the remaining budgetary shortfall; and
- b) invite its Independent Chairperson to informally convene, as he considers necessary between Council sessions, Friends of the Chair to discuss issues pertaining to follow-up to the IEE in preparation for Council sessions. Meetings of the Friends of the Chair would be open to all members of the Organization with a core group of representatives per region (Annex V).

ANNEX I: JOURNAL ANNOUNCEMENT FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST IN IEE CONSULTANCIES

(November 2005)



Independent External Evaluation of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization FAO – Expressions of interest by evaluation consultants

Member countries are planning to undertake an evaluation of the effectiveness of the totality of the work of FAO and its institutional arrangements (evaluation work planned over two years 2006-07). Expressions of interest are sought by individual evaluation consultants (companies may nominate staff members to be contracted through them) for the following consultancies based at FAO Headquarters in Rome, Italy:

- Core team leader and core team members (full-time consultancies by individuals of considerable stature and experience) covering:
 - technical work of FAO
 - management and organization
 - governance, and
 - FAO's role in the multilateral system.
- Quality assurance advisers (part-time consultancies by senior evaluation experts) to advise on the independence and quality of the evaluation process, as required.
- Evaluation Operations Administrator – a full-time position for an individual familiar with the provision of administrative support to large multilateral projects.
- Specialist evaluation team members for periods of one to six months, in particular covering technical areas of FAO's work and management and organization who will be required from the second half of 2006.

Individuals expressing interest should be fluent in English and knowledge of Arabic, Chinese, French and/or Spanish will be an advantage. The first criteria in selection will be experience and technical competence. Independence and regional and gender balance will also be factors in selection. Only those expressions of interest being considered for the short list will be acknowledged.

For further details of the job requirements and how to express interest consult the FAO Evaluation Website www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html or go to the FAO website and click on Evaluation.

Deadline 10 November 2005 (selection of specialist evaluation team members will be undertaken later by the evaluation core team in early 2006).

ANNEX II : SUMMARY CURRICULA VITAE OF THE CORE TEAM AND QUALITY ASSURANCE ADVISERS

The IEE Core Team

Team Leader

Mr. Leif E. Christoffersen (Norway) is an experienced development economist who has conducted a number of major institutional evaluations including of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). He worked for 28 years with the World Bank, during which time he served in various managerial positions in the fields of agriculture, rural development and the environment. He is Senior Adviser at Noragric, the Center for International Development and Environment Studies at the Norwegian University of Life Sciences. Mr. Christoffersen has also led the Norwegian Research Council's program committee on multilateral development. He has chaired various Boards of foundations and educational institutions, including the GRID-Arendal foundation in Norway and Scandinavian Seminar College in Denmark. He currently serves on the Board of Directors of Earth University in Costa Rica.

Former Team Leader and Core Team Member

Dr. Keith Bezanson (Canada) is a distinguished expert in international development and has conducted a number of major evaluations including of the African Development Bank. He was most recently the Director of the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) UK. He has also been President of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) Canada; Vice President (Administration) of the Inter-American Development Bank; Canadian Ambassador to Bolivia and Peru; and has held senior positions in Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) including Director General Multilateral Programs, Vice President Americas Branch and Regional Director Eastern Africa (1973-1985). Dr Bezanson is fluent in English, French and Spanish.

Core Team Members:

Technical work of FAO: Dr. (Ms) Uma Lele (USA/India), an agricultural economist has occupied various research, management and advisory positions in the World Bank and recently retired as senior adviser in the Operations Evaluation Department (OED, now known as the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank). She led the independent meta evaluation of the CGIAR as part of the larger evaluation of 70 World Bank supported global partnerships. She also led the independent evaluation of the World Bank's 1991 forest policy. She was Director of the Global Development Initiative of the Carnegie Corporation & Carter Center and was a tenured Graduate Research Professor and Director of International Studies at the University of Florida. She has published widely and is fellow of the American Agricultural Economic Association and of the National Academy of Agricultural Sciences in India.

Management, organization and administration of FAO: Mr. Michael Davies (UK) is currently a senior consultant on management support systems (WTO, BIS, EIB, Aga Khan Development Network and WHO), has broad administrative experience including human resources, IT systems, payroll and budget. He published a comprehensive book on all facets of administration in international organisations. He has been a senior adviser in the human resources department of the Inter-American Development Bank, a senior compensation officer in the World Bank and an administrative officer both in the field and at headquarters for FAO. Mr. Davies speaks English, French and Spanish.

Governance of FAO: Mr. Carlos Pérez del Castillo (Uruguay) is currently an international consultant on international economic issues. He served as Uruguay's Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the WTO and UN organizations in Geneva, chairing most of the top bodies of

the WTO, including its General Council. He was Special Advisor on international trade negotiations to the President of Uruguay. He has had Ministerial rank, been Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay and the country's top negotiator at multilateral, hemispheric, regional and bilateral levels. He was Permanent Secretary of the Latin American Economic System. He held senior positions in UNCTAD and ECLAC. He has extensive public and private consultancy experience and is a distinguished international authority on agricultural negotiations. He is fluent in English, French and Spanish.

FAO's role in the multilateral system: Ms. Thelma Awori (Uganda) is a former Assistant Secretary-General at UNDP (Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa), UNDP Deputy Assistant Administrator (Bureau for Policy & Programme Support), Deputy Director UNIFEM and UN Resident Coordinator, Zimbabwe. She has worked on evaluation methods for UNIFEM and was lead consultant and Chair of the Independent Review of FAO TCP. She has worked extensively on gender issues. She is President of ISISWICCE. She speaks English and French.

The Quality Assurance Advisers

Mrs. Mary Chinery Hesse (Ghana) is currently Senior Adviser to the President of Ghana. She was a Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Finance and served as UNDP Resident Representative (resident coordinator) in Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Seychelles, and Uganda. She was ILO Deputy Director-General from 1989-2000. She has served on several high level panels including: the UN Secretary General's panel on threats, challenges and change; Financing for Development (Zedillo Commission); Commonwealth panel on structural adjustment and women; UN Panel on progress of LDCs; Advisory panel to the African Union; and African advisers to the World Bank. She was also chair of the International Civil Service Commission. She served on the Advisory Board for the UNDP Development Effectiveness Evaluation Report; has been author of a number of papers on new trends in evaluation including for the IDEAS evaluation network and was Co-team leader of the Independent Evaluation of FAO Decentralization.

Mr. Robert D. van den Berg (Netherlands) is Director of the GEF Evaluation Office which is an independent office reporting directly to the GEF Council. He served with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs for 24 years working in development cooperation and policy and was Director of the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1999-2004) when he was also chairman of the OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. He served as the Executive Secretary of the Netherlands' National Advisory Council for Development Co-operation, and as the Head of the special program for research of Dutch development cooperation. He has co-edited three books on development cooperation and has published more than 20 articles on various aspects of policy formulation, evaluation, research and development cooperation.

ANNEX III: INCEPTION REPORT

Submitted to the Council Committee for the Independent External Evaluation of FAO (CC-IEE)
by the Independent External Evaluation Core Team
(May 2006)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pages
I.	Scope and Context	8
II.	Appointment of Core Team and Start-up	12
III.	Preliminary Situation Assessment: Some Working Hypotheses	13
IV.	Initial Evaluation Framework	19
	A. THE TECHNICAL WORK OF FAO	20
	B. ADMINISTRATION, MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATION	23
	C. GOVERNANCE	26
	D. FAO IN THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM	28
V.	Reviews at Country, Regional and Sub-regional Offices	30
VI.	Risks and Risk Management	31
VII.	Indicative Timeline: Main Milestones	33
VIII.	Indicative Budget	34

I. Scope and Context

1. The Council of FAO decided in November 2004 to launch an Independent External Evaluation of FAO (IEE) to be financed from extra-budgetary contributions and aimed at “strengthening and improving FAO, taking into consideration FAO’s performance in conducting its mandate...(and considering) all aspects of FAO’s work, institutional structure and decision processes, including its role within the international system”. Detailed terms of reference were subsequently prepared by an Inter-Sessional Working Group and approved by Council in its Hundred and Twenty-ninth Session in November 2005. These underscore that this is to be an exceptionally ambitious undertaking that is:

“... expected to be forward-looking and to emphasize findings, conclusions and targeted recommendations that would allow the Membership, the Director-General and the Secretariat of the Organization to chart the way forward, to better meet the challenges of the future in an evolving global environment, including newly emerging needs of member countries, and to position FAO, based on its strengths and comparative advantages. Consequently, the evaluation has the potential of becoming a milestone for FAO, reinforcing its role in a reformed UN system and the emerging new multilateral architecture. It should help to strengthen the sense of unity and purpose among the

membership of the Organization, and to make FAO fit for the twenty-first century and the challenges ahead.” (underlining ours).

2. The TORs make clear, therefore, that this work should go far beyond the framework of a conventional evaluation which would centre on a diagnosis of institutional performance by assessing outputs, outcomes and results. They assign primary emphasis to the future and to the evaluation’s role in supporting and facilitating the Governing Bodies and FAO management in defining the future role and modus-operandi of FAO itself and achieving the political will to make this happen.

3. Few efforts of this level of magnitude and ambition have previously been attempted and certainly not within the framework of an “evaluation”. There are, however, at least some approximate parallels within the United Nations system. For example, in his address to the General Assembly in September 2003, the Secretary-General warned Member States that the United Nations had reached a fork in the road, that it could either rise to the challenges of meeting new threats or face erosion in the face of mounting discord between States and unilateral action by them. This led to the formation of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change with a mandate to generate new ideas about the kinds of policies and institutions required for the UN to be effective in the 21st century. The report of that Panel, *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*, tabled in December 2004, calls for major systemic changes in structure, organization, accountability and governance and presents proposals for the most ambitious reform agenda in the history of the United Nations.

4. In a similar vein, the Outcome Document of the World Summit of 2005 adopted by global leaders invited the Secretary-General to launch a new high-level panel to recommend measures that would ensure that the UN maximizes its contribution to internationally agreed goals, including the goals of the Millennium Declaration, and specifically that the Panel should develop proposals for more “tightly managed entities” in the fields of environment, humanitarian assistance and development, all of which fall within the broad mandate of the FAO.

5. The TORs for this evaluation indicate four key, interlinked components as the basic conceptual framework for analysis:

- a) **Technical work of FAO:** Included here is both the normative and operational work of FAO in access to food, crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, commodity trade and rural development and their efficiency and effectiveness in overcoming hunger, safeguarding the environment and improving conditions for economic and social development. The technical work is carried out through an array of different instruments, including: technical cooperation, policy development and advice, regulatory and standard setting work, information, dissemination and advocacy, in statistics, studies, emergency responses, networking and dialogue.
- b) **Management and organization of FAO:** This includes planning and programming, budget, administrative and financial systems, organizational structure, including decentralised structures, oversight, evaluation, corporate culture, human resources management and deployment, knowledge and risk management, and accountability policies and practices.
- c) **FAO governance:** Included here are the roles, efficiency and effectiveness of the Governing Bodies, the relationship between the members and the Secretariat in the determination of strategy, policy and priority setting, the financing issues of regular budget and voluntary contributions and governance relationships within the UN system; and wider participation of stakeholder groups.
- d) **FAO’s role in the multilateral system:** Central to this area are the questions of the appropriate role for the FAO in an international development architecture that is vastly different from 1945 when the FAO was founded, the absolute and dynamic comparative advantages of the Organization and its ability to enter into alliances and contribute to the UN and wider international system as a whole.

6. This IEE will be conducted at a time when the UN is itself undergoing major processes of systemic examination, review and renewal, which includes the fundamental international public policy challenge of determining what justifications exist for continued financing of institutions founded decades ago in today's context of numerous new and alternative "sources of supply". Indeed, today's pressures for change and reform involve unprecedented re-examination, review and fundamental questioning of the entire institutional architecture for international development efforts and the provision of global public goods and services. This presents both major opportunities and threats to the future of the FAO, including the challenges of determining FAO's relationship to a system that is itself undergoing major transformation.

7. With specific reference to its core role as the world's "Ministry of Agriculture", the Outcomes Document of the November 2004 Summit of the UN (paragraph 46) emphasizes that the MDG on poverty reduction cannot be achieved without a much tighter integration of rural and agricultural development into national and international programmes and efforts (underlining ours). Statements such as these are clear expressions of what the world is calling for from FAO and they pose direct challenges to FAO to re-look at roles, comparative advantage, the appropriateness and adequacy of its methods, strategies and partnerships.

8. This will be no easy task. Fifty years ago, a small handful of institutions comprised the organizational arrangements of the international development system. Today that system is made up of a bewildering array of bilateral, multilateral, non-governmental, private transnational corporations, philanthropic foundations and hybrid institutions characterized by overlapping functions, duplication and a confused division of labor. Also, the development system needs to be kept in perspective in today's increasingly globalised and interconnected world. Within the international political economy, the main drivers of wealth creation and development have not been central to the development system. Excepting a few of the very poorest countries, the most important factors are internal to individual countries and the external factors that most matter are far less those of development cooperation and far more those that deal with trade and access to markets, capital and technology, human mobility, and supportive security, economic, socio-political and environmental conditions. The institutional arrangements for international development cooperation have included certain instruments designed to facilitate trade and market access (e.g. The Generalized System of Preferences – GSP- a number of Commodity Agreements, Special and Differential Treatment). In the main, however, development cooperation has traditionally been restricted mainly to official development assistance (ODA) that have focused on individual projects through individual institutional actors which have addressed only modestly these main drivers of development.

9. This is, however, changing dramatically through new arrangements and entirely new forms of partnership linking public goods with private investment, governmental with non-governmental, country ownership, the pooling and leveraging of resources in order to reach critical mass and longer term programmatic and sector-wide approaches. The systemic inadequacies of the architecture of international development are today being accorded unprecedented and priority attention. The cause of 'policy coherence' for development has become central to official discourse and recent G8 summits have given explicit endorsement to new strategic approaches to development and to the need for much expanded institutional arrangements. These larger factors must be taken carefully into account in a diagnosis of the effectiveness and relevance of the FAO and in any prognosis for its future.


10. At the same time, ODA is now increasing at its fastest rate since the 1960s and early 1970s (i.e. before the first oil shock) and is projected to exceed US\$100 billion within the next 2-3 years (from just over US\$50 billion in 2003). Also, many new sources of funding for development are emerging. Many bilateral donors point to the dilemma they now confront of major increases in financial resources and severe programming constraints. This may afford the most significant opportunity in decades for the renewal and achievement of the full potential of multilateral organizations such as the FAO. It seems clear, however, that this cannot come about unless such organizations can provide clear and compelling demonstration of their relevance,

effectiveness and potential, can furnish strategies appropriate to the new context for development efforts and the changed realities of the international political economy and can show a very high “value for money”.

11. The food and agricultural sectors of developing countries have also evolved radically since the post World War II period when FAO was established. Profound changes have occurred since then in a variety of ways. The countries of the former soviet block have joined the market economy. The biotechnology revolution and greater recognition of indigenous rights have offered immense opportunities as well as challenges to intellectual property, environmental safety, questions of human health and international trade. New institutions and alternative sources of supply to provide finance, scientific research and technology, policy analysis, advice and technical assistance have mushroomed. Civil society has become far more active and growth of super market chains have linked agriculture to the rapidly modernizing cities where few markets existed before. Agriculture has performed well in many countries of Latin America, in East and South East Asia and parts of South Asia. In many cases, pro poor agricultural and economic development strategies were applied, leading to concurrent poverty reduction and broad based economic growth. This has caused considerable differentiation among countries and regions within the developing world.

12. At the same time, major and regionally highly varied challenges remain. The level of protection of agriculture through either tariffs or subsidies remains an unresolved issue and a principal barrier to success in trade negotiations. While many countries have achieved food security, others have either stagnated or lost ground. Sub-Saharan Africa, which was once food self sufficient when the problems of hunger centred on Asia has experienced little or no agricultural or overall economic growth and become highly food insecure. Ravages of HIV/AIDS and other diseases have decimated the productive agricultural and urban labor force in some countries, and the continent has been afflicted by conflict, and out-migration including of the educated class challenging internal capacity for development. With increased demand on limited natural resources problems of the environment and natural resource management have become more acute, not just in Africa but throughout the developing world .

13. A further and important feature of the current context is the changing place of agriculture in the international development agenda. Between 1985 and 2002, Official Development Assistance (ODA) for agriculture declined by over two-thirds in real dollar terms. Development assistance to agriculture became marginalized in the programmes of both bilateral agencies and the multilateral development banks. To illustrate, World Bank agricultural lending fell by 75%, from 30% of lending in 1980 to only 7% in 2003. Agriculture and rural development are, however, once again a priority in ODA. In 2005, for example, World Bank lending for projects in rural areas increased by 50% to approximately US\$7.6 billion, representing 41% of total World Bank lending.

Chart 1. The Decline in ODA for Agriculture

Source: OECD, DAC

14. Yet most international development agencies have almost completely lost expertise in agriculture, and are looking to FAO, as they are to other organizations, for policy analysis, institutional and technical inputs into their aid strategies, policies and investment priorities. The World Bank, for example, is increasingly looking to FAO for inputs into agricultural strategy formulation, preparation of investment packages, appraisal and supervision.

II. Appointment of Core Team and Start-up

15. The TORs specify that a core team is to have “sole responsibility for the direction, supervision and conduct of all substantive work of the IEE”. The team was appointed on February 14, 2006 at the second meeting of the Council Committee and comprises:

- Mr. Keith Bezanson (Canada) - Team Leader
- Ms. Uma Lele (India/USA) – lead responsibility for the technical work of FAO
- Mr. Michael Davies (UK) – lead responsibility for management, organization and administration of FAO
- Mr. Carlos Perez del Castillo (Uruguay) – lead responsibility for governance of FAO
- Ms. Thelma Awori (Uganda) – lead responsibility for FAO’s role in the multilateral system

16. At the same meeting of the Council Committee, it was also decided to defer the start up date for work until 13 March 2006, subject to firm assurance by that date that US\$2.1 million would be available for 2006 and preferably deposited with FAO. Work actually began on 29 March 2006 when medical clearances were obtained and contracts signed. Since then, the core team has moved together on the fastest track possible. This Inception Report, the endorsement of which is the precondition to moving the evaluation into its fully operational phase, has been prepared following only approximately four weeks of initial work. The core team would have preferred to take more time in preparing this, to have had the advantage of selective preliminary visits to country, regional and sub-regional offices, to have been able to expose some of our initial hypotheses to more rigorous testing and to have completed the identification and pre-contracting of regional, agriculture and nutrition specialists who will support it in its work. Such additional steps and the time required for them would, however, pose risks to the already serious time constraints on the entire endeavor and we have elected, therefore, to adhere to the fastest track

possible. The presentation of the Inception Report at this very early stage is very much on a “work in progress” basis.

17. Since 28 March 2006:

- a) An extensive literature review has been conducted, including, inter alia, all major formal evaluations carried out by the FAO over the past seven years, the main strategy and policy documents (e.g. recent programmes of work and budget, implementation reports, medium-term plan, the strategic framework and a wide range of sectoral publications and assessments on food security, fisheries, forestry, etc.).
- b) Five research assistants have been identified and recruited. They will assist throughout the project with data collection and analysis, literature searches, questionnaire construction, scheduling, logistics and administration.
- c) Discussions have been held with a large number of specialists in the four core areas of technical programmes, management and organization, governance and the international development system. Individuals with specialized knowledge and experience in regional issues of food and agriculture have also been contacted. A specialist on gender issues is being contracted to examine both the gender specific policies and practices of the FAO and the cross cutting nature of gender matters. Terms of reference have been formulated and contractual arrangements agreed in a large number of cases. A number of gaps remain to be filled, but at this stage the human resources for the main components of a comprehensive evaluation are either in place or almost in place.
- d) A number of key institutions have been contacted and arrangements put in place for benchmarking purposes. In addition, a close working arrangement has been established with the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on tightly managed entities. This should ensure that the FAO evaluation takes into account the deliberations of the Panel and any recommendations it may make.
- e) An intensive fact-finding and initial situation assessment exercise was held in Rome over the period 29 March -6 April 2006. Open-ended interviews and meetings were held with approximately one hundred FAO staff. Meetings were also held with forty country representatives. A further meeting, convened on May 4 by the Chair of the G77, was held between the core team leader and 25 representatives of the G77.
- f) A core methodology for the evaluation, a division of labour and an initial critical path were developed and agreed by the five core team members. Although these will doubtless require modification and refinement as events occur, the basic framework will allow essential work to proceed with expedition.

III. Preliminary Situation Assessment: Some Working Hypotheses

18. Initial interviews and conversations held by the core team with almost 100 FAO staff and with 40 representatives of governments from both South and North furnished a wealth of assessments, observations and suggestions regarding the performance of the FAO, of dilemmas, difficulties and challenges for the future. There were, of course, divergent viewpoints, but also a significant number of convergent judgments and concerns and these furnish an important initial picture and a range of working hypotheses. These are being treated as entirely anecdotal at this stage and will be subject to systematic examination in the conduct of the evaluation. The core team cannot overstate this point. What follows in this section is highly tentative in character – comprising initial propositions, working hypotheses and questions to be explored. The team also wishes to be clear that what follows is by no means an exhaustive list of potential issues and questions.


19. There would appear to be little doubt that there is a range of FAO work that is held in high regard and widely appreciated. This conclusion emerges not merely from anecdotal sources but also from a number of systematic, independent assessments and evaluations. FAO has numerous high quality, professional and dedicated staff who like working at FAO. But deep and widely-shared concerns also seem evident over the Organization's well-being, the deterioration of its financial health, directions it is taking and its future prospects. The core team is today in no position to confirm or refute such claims. The IEE, however, will aim as an integral part of its review to examine methodically the perspectives and perceptions of all major FAO stakeholders on the general health and directions of the Organization.

20. FAO has a vast and important mandate, but there appears to be a surprisingly limited systematic evidence base on which to judge its performance. Over the past 6 years, for example, only 20 corporate evaluations have been reported to the Governing Bodies. Also, although an organization-wide results-based management (RBM) system is formally in place, there is some evidence that suggests that uptake may be lagging. Specifically, a comparative study conducted by DFID in 2005 of multilateral organizations assigned FAO to a 23rd position out of 24 organizations in its application of RBM. This, however, was a quite rapid, desk-based study and the IEE will need to look further into the uptake of RBM in FAO. In general, a good body of evidence is available on field-based regular and extra budgetary funding and programming and a similarly good body of evidence on emergencies. The situation with regard to systematic evidence on the Regular Programme of FAO seems less clear at this point. At the country level, the independent review of the TCP in 2005 noted the absence of country strategies and, therefore, of a framework or systems for country performance (impact) assessments. That evaluation recommended establishment of country-specific priorities aligned with PRSPs and UNDAF and this is reflected in the current PWB, but it would appear highly improbable that matters will have changed sufficiently in one year for new and credible evaluation materials to have been produced.


21. Thus, this evaluation may need to undertake a considerable amount of new work (certainly more than had originally been envisaged) and to deviate at least somewhat from a central assumption in the TORs that much of the required work may be predicated on existing materials. In this connection, the TORs state:

“The IEE is conceived as maximising the use of existing information. (It) will maximise the use of existing evaluations and similar work and will thus not itself examine all aspects in detail but will ... rely on the work of others in forming its judgements.”

22. Since 1994, FAO has been engaged in a sequential programme of reform. Efforts have been made to refocus, reorganize and reinvigorate the Organization, including a restructuring of functions to give greater focus and to build synergies between normative and operational work. This has been driven in large measure by necessity, for, at the same time, the financial condition of the FAO has deteriorated consistently and seriously. Management has been forced to contend with truly massive challenges. FAO's regular (core) budget, comprising mandatory contributions by members of US\$ 765.7 million for the biennium 2006-07, represents a decline of 25% in real terms from 1994-95. A zero nominal growth framework has now been in effect for over a decade.

Chart 2. The Decline in the FAO Regular Programme Budget (US\$ million)

23. Over the same period, conventional development project funding through UNDP expenditure has declined from US\$ 163.2 m in 1994-1995 to US\$ 10.7 m in 2004-05 and overall expenditure for emergencies (excluding the Iraq Oil-for-food programme) has seen a five fold increase from US\$ 44.6 million in 1994-95 to around US\$ 228 million in 2004-05. The cumulative effect of these factors has been a continuing and deepening ethos of institutional crisis.

Chart 3. Extra-budgetary Funding of FAO's Programmes (US\$ million)

24. The extent of the budgetary reductions has been very damaging. A strongly held view across a broad constituency is that the damage has been severely compounded by an institutional response that has entailed cutting across the board as opposed to a redefining of comparative advantage and the identification of key areas where impact has been and can be especially strong, assigning them the resources required for effectiveness. The counter to this argument is that management has found ways to continue to cover all relevant issues in the Organization's

normative mandate despite resource cuts and a decade of zero nominal growth budgets. The exception to these cuts has been the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) that has been partially insulated against erosion of purchasing power. The effect of this, however, has been to impose below zero nominal growth on most other items in the budget. A key question that must be examined in this evaluation is whether the application of financing reductions has stretched resources far too thinly and whether it follows (as many have claimed) that many FAO programmes and products are now imperiled.

25. The financing difficulties of the FAO also appear to be increasing. As of February 2006, 81 member countries (more than one third of total membership) were in arrears of US\$ 73 million in payment of assessed contributions, forcing FAO to borrow from commercial sources in order to meet approved operational expenditures. Such borrowing reached US\$ 71 million at the end of 2005 and the 110th meeting of the Finance Committee pointed out that “future cash flow problems could even exceed the Organization’s capacity to borrow externally.”

26. An artificial boundary, together with considerable definitional and conceptual confusion, appears to have developed with regard to the “normative” and “operational” activities of the FAO. Some stakeholders express the view that FAO should have no significant role outside the normative. Others tend to see the normative as primarily of interest and benefit to developed countries, while there appears to be a large constituency that assigns the very highest value to the direct provision of technical services. If this is an accurate assessment – again a hypothesis to be examined in the evaluation – then it configures an exceedingly difficult and unfortunate situation. The centrality of FAO’s “normative” work to global issues (e.g. the establishment of norms and standards, trade and access to international markets, strategies and policies relating to plant genetic resources, the impact of agriculture on the environment and of climate change on agriculture, energy and the potential and limitations of biofuels, etc.) would seem almost self-evident, given the increasing centrality of such issues to the prospects of all humanity in the 21st century. But it also follows that there is a continuum between the production of an international public good and the capacities and resources needed to exploit or benefit from it. The theory and countless studies on public goods demonstrate unequivocally that a good becomes a public good only when it can be accessed and used effectively. This situation appears to be further compounded by a lack of performance measures for much of FAO’s normative work in developing countries and of verifiable means to determine and judge the linkages between normative roles, capacity building and technical cooperation.

27. In regard to the above point, it would seem important to take into careful account that major changes have occurred over time in the key dimensions of FAO activity. In the 1970s and 1980s, for example, a majority of FAO professional staff were working in the field and Regional Offices. Even as late as 1992 only 54 percent of professional staff were in headquarters. While the Organization was not designed as a programme delivery organization in the same sense that UNICEF was, in 1980 it ran at least some 850 large-scale projects (> US\$ 150,000 in 1980 dollars) and 420 small-scale projects in 130 countries with slightly more than 2,000 professional staff and 620 consultants. Today, however, the FAO is not primarily a programme delivery organization. In the regular biennial budget of US\$ 765.7 million, about US\$ 103.55 million (13.5%) goes to the TCP. For 2004-05 (the last biennium for which actual expenditures are available), the regular biennial budget was US\$ 749.1 million, of which US\$ 103 million (13.7 %) was for TCP. Extra-budgetary expenditures amounted to US\$ 623 million, of which 40% was for emergencies, 39% for technical assistance, and 21% for headquarters-based work. About 40% goes to what are commonly grouped under the heading ‘normative’ activities. There is also an amount for “Cooperation and Partnerships” and some of this is assigned to providing policy advice related to normative activities. From various quarters, concerns were raised with the evaluation team that the current proposals for reform which emphasize greatly increased decentralization and delegation will have the effect of shifting FAO from a knowledge-based organization to one of relatively small-scale Field Programme delivery. This concern was very strongly expressed to IEE team members by several of the Organization’s most senior technical specialists and will be carefully examined, as required by the TORs that ask specifically: “To

what extent do FAO resource levels and the application of limited resources reflect members' priorities and needs and are they commensurate with the tasks the Organization is attempting to undertake, its comparative advantages, and areas of effectiveness ...?" and "What is the ... potential for effectiveness of the ... reform proposals?"

28. With regard to corporate governance, a theme mentioned consistently by both governments of Member Countries and FAO management was the difficulty in reconciling divergent views and in establishing priorities. A comparative study of multilateral organizations conducted in 2005 by DFID reached this conclusion and stated that: "there is a failure of the governing bodies to reconcile divergent views on the organization's role and priorities." Yet the same study found that this was not the case for other multilateral organizations, whose basic governing structures are essentially identical to those of the FAO. If these are valid observations (again, they are working hypotheses only at this point), a key question to explore would be what explains the difference between the FAO and, say, UNIDO, WHO, UNDP or UNIFEM.

29. With regard to management and administrative matters, extensive benchmarking² will be an integral part of this evaluation. This will afford a testing of some of the assertions made during our initial interviews which have included claims that the FAO is the most highly centralized of multilateral agencies, that its institutional culture is risk averse relative to other UN entities, that its systems and patterns of managerial decision-making are unnecessarily "bureaucratic" relative to those of its comparators.. There have been no formal evaluations of administrative functions in the FAO, although evaluations on other matters have reported findings regarding administration. In the main, their assessments have pointed to highly risk-averse systems, excessive centralization and lack of delegation and reliance on ex-ante repetitive controls rather than ex-post.

30. The main assessments of administrative matters within FAO are conducted not by the office of evaluation but by internal audit. The IEE has requested and has been granted full access to all internal audit reviews and assessments on financial and administrative issues other than those dealing with the conduct of individuals. This access will greatly facilitate the evaluation of managerial and administrative matters.

31. Current proposals for reform (both on a UN-wide basis and from within FAO) emphasize harmonization and integration across the systems. Our interviews to date have underscored the importance of establishing in this evaluation an ex-ante framework of norms and standards against which to measure the results of efforts of integration and harmonization. The recent evaluation on decentralization, however, contains a suggestion that FAO may be proving reluctant to assign any significant authority over FAO work at country level to Resident Coordinators and to integrate into single UN country offices (both of which are called for under the Secretary General's 'One UN' proposals). This is again a highly complex matter, however. In at least some instances, for example, FAO country offices seem to be located within national Ministries of Agriculture which could well be a lower cost and higher effectiveness arrangement than relocation to a central UN office. A full and objective examination of this is called for and will be included in the challenges for the IEE.

32. **Emergencies:** FAO emergency work has increased five fold (ten-fold if the Iraq food for oil programme is included) over the past decade and is funded almost entirely through voluntary contributions. When disasters occur and the FAO responds, a small division often mobilizes and

² It is important to be clear on what is meant by the term 'benchmarking'. The term as mainly applied in business and industry entails the establishment of rigorously agreed standards (e.g. ISO) against which organisations may benchmark themselves or be benchmarked by others. In the case of FAO and other public international organisations, including the multilateral development banks where considerable effort has been expended, however, such agreed standards generally do not exist. Thus, the benchmarking in this study will apply the more eclectic type of benchmarking that has become generally accepted practice in evaluations of this type. It will seek to compare and contrast the FAO across a wide range of indicators in relation to other reasonably similar organisations.

supervises the work of hundreds of contracted workers. A recent (2003) evaluation of FAO emergency responses identified a number of important issues, including: (i) The early warning systems are highly regarded, but capacities seem to be eroding as resources become increasingly thinly spread; (ii) FAO procedures for emergency response were viewed as bureaucratic and cumbersome and that this limited both response capability and effectiveness. Management responded to this evaluation by setting up a new mechanism for early response - SFERA (Special Fund for Emergency Response). This was in place and applied when the Tsunami struck and the 2005 Tsunami evaluation assigns high marks to the value of this. A further assessment will shortly be forthcoming of the emergency response to the locust crisis in West Africa. As this is clearly a major growth area of FAO activity, the current IEE will include a comprehensive review from operational, managerial and governance perspectives of FAO roles, capacities and performance with regard to emergencies. The assessment will also need to examine the effects of the rapid growth and dominating position of emergency work on FAO as a whole, including the Organization's strategic and programmatic capacities and the implications for policy and comparative advantage of work in emergencies and in subsequent rehabilitation. Finally, the assessment will try to cast light on larger governance questions that arise as to whether emergencies should be a growth area for FAO and the respective roles and potentials for collaboration between the three Rome-based agencies.

33. **Norms, Standards and Regulations:** As global public goods, these are about as pure as they come. There would appear to be no competition or accepted alternative source of supply to FAO's role as a neutral forum for standard setting in Codex, the IPPC, and the Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources. The Codex Alimentarius was evaluated two years ago with generally very positive conclusions, but also with a concern that resources were becoming very thinly spread and that staff were overstretched. Other areas where FAO is active in establishing norms, standards and regulations (e.g. IPPC, the Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources, the Rotterdam Convention³, Law of the Sea, Desertification Convention, etc.) have not had formal evaluations. Questions have also been raised with the IEE team regarding other collaborative and partnership arrangements between FAO and other entities in establishing global norms, standards and regulations (e.g. the World Organization for Animal Health {OIE}, the World Trade Organization on food and sanitation standards, the International Atomic Energy Commission on agriculture-related applications of nuclear technologies, etc.). The roles, relevance and effectiveness of FAO in all of these areas merit careful assessment. As already indicated, however, with the exception of the Codex Alimentarius, no formal evaluations have to date been conducted on these. The IEE, will not be able to undertake comprehensive assessments in all areas to fill this gap, but it will endeavor to examine the full picture, to apply rapid assessment survey techniques and possibly undertake a case study.

34. **FAO's Role in Facilitating Agricultural Trade:** FAO, along with other international organisations, focuses substantial attention on issues of issues of agricultural trade and investment. *The State of Food and Agriculture* report of 2005⁴, for example, was dedicated to such issues and the Committee on Commodity Problems and its commodity groups directly address trade issues. The Organization also works directly to facilitate agricultural trade through standard setting (Codex Alimentarius and Phytosanitary standards), in agricultural value chain analyses and in technical and policy capacity building support. There have been to date, however, no assessments of the relevance, appropriate roles, value and contribution of the Organization's work in these vital and highly topical areas except for the evaluation of the Codex. A corporate level evaluation, is currently underway on agricultural commodity and trade work and an evaluation of the IPPC has just been initiated. The IEE will address these issues by drawing from these reports and will also consider additional analysis should that appear essential.

³ The Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade.

⁴ The State of Food and Agriculture, Agricultural Trade and Poverty: Can Trade Work for the Poor?, FAO, 2005

35. **FAO's Policy Assistance Role:** An evaluation of FAO's policy assistance was conducted five years ago in 2001. This may now be somewhat dated and the IEE will aim to review its findings and update its conclusions as appropriate. The 2001 evaluation concluded that the quality of the policy advice was technically good (although it is not clear from the report how this was measured) but the report was also highly critical. It reported an absence of organizational and management systems for policy advice, a generalized failure to build on areas of FAO comparative advantage and an absence of linkages between normative and policy work due to a deleterious segmentation of headquarters roles. This suggests a number of obvious questions that the IEE will explore through field visits, including: (i) To what extent is policy advice demand driven? (ii) What is the source of the demand and what exactly is being sought? (iii) How is the assistance assembled, verified, validated and provided? (iv) Who provides the assistance and to whom? Does this depend on the quality and experience of individual country representatives (FAORs)?

36. **Governance:** There seem to have been no systematic evaluations, assessments or reviews either of overall corporate governance or of specific instruments of governance (e.g. Council, Committees, etc.). Leaving aside the broad issues of UN-wide reforms and the governance implications of these for FAO, a number of issues recurred in the situation assessment interviews and these will be examined in the conduct of the IEE, including:

- the institutional structure of the Governance and the respective roles of its various organs;
- the term of the Director-General and the selection process for that office and other top staff;
- the governance of extra-budgetary funds;
- the role of the Regional Conferences;
- whether an enhanced governance role should be established for non-governmental stakeholders as is now the practice in some other multilateral organizations; and
- the relationship between FAO governance and overall UN system governance.

37. **Advocacy and Communication of FAO's Message:** This role has been much accentuated since 1994. FAO has provided global leadership on food and food security issues through World Food Summits and active participation in other summits, especially relating to the environment. There have, however, been no formal evaluations of these, although it is claimed that, without these initiatives, the establishment of hunger reduction as a specific MDG target would not have occurred. In terms of more general communications performance an evaluation conducted in 2005 found a generally inappropriate policy and institutional structure. It made numerous recommendations that appear to have been acted on. The TeleFood initiative is currently being evaluated separately and its report is expected in June/July. FAO's knowledge management infrastructure also now forms a part of its communications and advocacy structure and needs to be benchmarked against best practice.

IV. Initial Evaluation Framework

38. This evaluation will follow to the extent possible and practicable the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, as approved by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). It will aim to ensure that its approaches and procedures adhere to the OECD-DAC Principles for Evaluation for measuring relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (responsiveness, outcomes, outputs, contributions), and sustainability. In this regard, the standard inventory of methodologies derived from the social sciences will be applied in sampling, identification and specification of indicators, open-ended, structured and semi-structured interviews, structured and weighted questionnaires, surveys, benchmarking and validation of results through triangulation, peer reviews and statistical means. It is important to be clear, however, that the standard investment projects comprise only a relatively small part of the FAO portfolio compared to the Organization's other more global public goods functions. The latter are less easily evaluated using the standard OECD prescribed evaluation methods which were designed mainly for conducting audits and assessments of investment projects. The evaluation of the technical

programmes of FAO, therefore, will also draw on more eclectic methods, drawing from, for example, the techniques used in the World Bank's external reviews of natural resource management, the CGIAR, the global programmes in health and the environment and the evaluation of partnerships. In addition, since a major part of this IEE is to focus on a prognosis for the future, the views of "experts" and "expert groups" will be sought, both formally and informally, on matters of governance, the evolving shape of multilateralism, and the place of the FAO in the changed institutional architecture for international development. Consideration is being given to organizing and convening focus groups to address these issues. Finally, the sage definition of "impact" provided in the TORs approved by the FAO Council will be applied throughout this study, notably that:

"In view of the relatively small inputs of FAO to development processes at the national and global level, key questions will concern the extent to which there has been contribution to a plausible line of causality." (underlining ours)

39. Although the four key components of analysis will be approached on parallel tracks, processes for continuous exchange and coordination among the five core team members have been established. This is imperative as the areas entail huge overlaps and high levels of inter-dependency. It is also essential in order to ensure the integration and synthesis of overall findings and recommendations into a single and coherent narrative.

40. The following presents the initial framework that will be applied to the four areas of (i) FAO's technical work, (ii) administration, management and organisation; (iii) governance, and (iv) FAO in the multilateral system. Evaluation matrices will be developed for each of the four core areas but these will not be static as the evaluation is a process during which new issues and thus new demands for both questions on relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, together with the corresponding indicators will arise as the evaluation proceeds. An overall evaluation matrix will also be developed for the country level analysis which will help in ensuring a uniformity of approach.

A. THE TECHNICAL WORK OF FAO

41. The technical work of FAO currently includes the following nine functions:
- Information collection and dissemination;
 - Standard-setting;
 - Routine Assessment of the State of the World and global surveillance on food security, pests, diseases, environmental damage/depletion of soils, fish, water, forestry, and early warning systems;
 - Global Rule Setting: Agreements involving member countries on such issues as right to food, plant genetic material and sustainable fisheries management;
 - Advocacy on Food Security and a wide range of other such issues;
 - Policy Research at the global, regional and national level--this includes the gamut of food, agriculture, trade, forestry, fisheries, natural resources, human development--particularly of the disadvantaged groups--women, poor farmers, etc.;
 - Partnerships on policy and technical subjects with institutions such as the WTO, WHO, World Bank, CGIAR, OECD, WFP, IFAD, IAEA, GEF, UNEP, NGOS, WMO (these would seem to be the major ones to focus on although there may be many others);
 - Technical Assistance in fighting transboundary pests and diseases and, more generally, to developing countries in all the above areas, both on its own and in cooperation with the World Bank's FAO-CP, CGIAR, bilateral donors, regional banks, IFAD etc.; and
 - Technical assistance in and in emergency assessments and immediate post-emergency rehabilitation.

42. A working hypothesis (to be confirmed or rejected during the IEE) is that there are key areas included in the first four global public goods functions above that only FAO can perform, given its international character and legitimacy involving all member countries.

43. The second working hypothesis (again to be tested and confirmed or rejected) is that it is currently performing some of them well and others not so well and that the adequacy of financing is a main issue here, but that the international community continues to require that all these public goods be supplied by the FAO.

44. The last five of the nine areas are those in which numerous alternative sources of supply have emerged. This has raised numerous questions and controversies - with suggestions from some quarters that FAO has a strong role in each of these areas and questioning from other quarters of the quantity, quality, efficiency and impact of this work.

45. These are merely hypotheses based on the preliminary feedback from a very diverse group of individuals and they need to be tested, confirmed or rejected.

Initial issues and questions

46. In each of these areas the evaluation of technical areas would entail asking some standard evaluative questions:

- What is FAO currently doing, where (what in which regions and which countries within regions), how, with what sets of (financial and administrative) resources, how efficiently and with what results? - data are being collected on this but these activities will need to be prioritized and evaluated - see more on this below.
- What are the key alternative sources of supply and what are they doing? How well is FAO doing relative to others both using objective measures of performance and in terms of perceptions of its stakeholders (i.e. all those who are directly or indirectly affected by it)?
- What do the management and staff of FAO and clients of FAO think of what it is doing, how well and what it should be doing in the future in a highly changed context both absolutely and relative to others - some of which are to be benchmarked?
- What are the technical areas of FAO's strong comparative advantage?
- What are technical areas in which FAO does not have a comparative advantage but carries out functions anyway and why? Would/could FAO gain comparative advantage by not carrying them out?
- How does FAO's UN set up give it the strengths of legitimacy, access to governments, convening power and ability to forge global agreements and how do the potential weaknesses of lack of independence, limited staff incentives relative to non-UN institutions and constrained and uncertain financial resources limit the realization of the strengths?
- What are the implications for the future for FAO from four perspectives: acting alone, through reforms, collaboration with other institutions, and in comparison with benchmarked institutions?

Methodology

47. The review of technical work of FAO will start with the standard UNEG and OECD prescribed evaluation methods and criteria (relevance, efficacy, efficiency, institutional impact and sustainability). As mentioned earlier in this Inception Report, however, standard investment projects are a relatively small part of FAO's portfolio compared to other more global public goods types of functions and this calls for more eclectic methods along the lines of meta evaluation techniques used in evaluations conducted by the World Bank.

48. As the very first task the team has launched a review of previous evaluations of FAO, and will explore systematically what recommendations were made, the responses of management and the state of implementation. Where recommendations have not been implemented, the reasons

and justifications will be sought. This review will shortly be completed and will form an important diagnostic foundation of the evaluation.

49. Global papers are being commissioned from several of the most experienced and highly regarded global specialists in the major areas of FAO technical activity (e.g. forestry, fisheries, agriculture, food security, food safety and nutrition, emergencies, and technical assistance). These papers will begin with a review of key changes that have taken place over the last several years in their specific areas of enquiry and spell out clearly a few best and worst case scenarios at the outset to ensure the evaluations provided in the papers are consciously forward looking and that they allow not only for a critical review of FAO processes and outputs but that they furnish the global scenario setting. This will include, for example, the changed role of agriculture in economic development across regions, the growing interregional differentiation within the developing world and their different challenges as they pertain to FAO's mandates and functions, the extent and the nature of resource depletion, population and urbanization dynamics as these affect the supply of and demand for specific commodities and services, the extent of current and projected hunger and poverty, changing international trade and climate change. Not all papers are expected to report on all these trends but to address those of direct relevance to the evaluation of FAO activities in each specific area.

50. Each of these reviews will take into account all relevant previous formal and informal, self and external independent evaluations of FAO. These are currently being assembled, but each evaluator will verify the completeness of the information with both FAO managers and the staff of the Evaluation Service. The conclusions in the papers will be integrated with and tested against findings in the member countries.

51. Following from this, the technical evaluation will combine several different approaches:

- The global papers will furnish comprehensive assessments of the state of specific areas (fisheries, forestry, food and agriculture, etc.), taking a vertical look at each from global to local and situating the work of FAO in this context (i.e. relevance, scope, adequacy, timeliness, reliability, utility, etc.).
- With regard to the nine FAO functions listed above, the global papers will furnish a synthesis of findings, issues, questions and the identification of a suggested set of needs across regions.
- Regional teams will then employ 1 and 2 to structure field visits so that they address issues both of diagnosis and of prognosis. Although there will be differences in emphasis and even in the applicability of different FAO products to different parts of the world and countries at different levels of development, visits to the respective regions will follow certain standard TORs that will be developed by the global team. This will ensure uniformity in the information collected across regions - both by looking at what FAO is doing in their regions and what the perceptions are among stakeholders. Included in the hypotheses to be tested will be a range of cross-cutting issues such as policy and programme measures and their effectiveness in gender, sustainable development and the mainstreaming of poverty reduction.
- The foregoing will then be integrated into global "think/evaluative piece" papers which have the benefit of the country/regional assessments and which will situate these in the larger and longer-term context of cross-cutting and forward looking views.
- Taken together, the above approaches will feed into the other overarching reviews of FAO's governance and management and role in the international system as well as the evaluation of technical work.
- Benchmarking of FAO will be carried out as a coordinated and joint effort by the core team.
- Data collection and desk review of FAO's output will be followed by interviews of FAO staff, FAO stakeholders, staff of benchmarked institutions, accompanied by formal surveys of stakeholders to determine outputs, outcomes and impacts of FAO.

B. ADMINISTRATION, MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

Initial issues and questions

52. Following the initial meetings of the IEE core team it has been possible to identify several over-arching themes that will need to be considered in the administrative sphere of the evaluation, as well as a number of key areas requiring examination in detail. It is clear that issues of trust and transparency are themes that have to be examined, in as much as they can be addressed through human resources activities and administrative processes in general. Another over-arching issue is the degree to which FAO has become risk adverse and subject to micro-management while at the same time moving into activities and structures that call for a culture which accepts greater accountability balanced with a degree of risk acceptance. At a macro level, questions have been asked as to the cost-effectiveness of administrative support in the organization. This leads to a seeming contradiction, with some indicators showing that administrative services have, over a long period, responded well to demands to cut costs. It will therefore be necessary to assemble some comparative data on the cost of administrative support in organizations similar to FAO.

53. It has been determined that a core team of six persons will evaluate the administrative management and organizational (AMO) structure of FAO. This will comprise the team leader (who will hold the briefs for human resources and general administrative issues); a researcher who will work across all team activities, a programme budget specialist, a financial risk management and audit specialist with private sector orientation and experience in leadership and management development; an IT specialist and an evaluator from the academic sector who will examine the delivery of knowledge management and FAO communications with the general public. Of this group, at least four evaluators will have some degree of cross-cutting responsibility requiring interface with other evaluation groups led by members of the core team (budget, IT and communications). Responsibility for all identified areas of work will be distributed across the team when they are collecting data from third parties. The team will be assisted by a researcher with, inter alia, experience in organizational culture and legal matters.

54. It is felt that the most sensitive aspect of the review will be in respect of management and leadership issues and that for this component a well-recognized high-level peer reviewer may be needed at a later stage in the evaluation.

Methodology

55. After reading the relevant background material some of which will be assembled in advance for the team, it is envisaged the AMO team will meet as a group for one week in Rome to arrive at a common understanding on the approach to the evaluation, develop questions and lines of investigation, define additional evaluation needs, undertake initial introductory meetings with senior managers in the areas to be investigated and initiate some focus group meetings. Thereafter, individual team members will pursue agreed lines of investigation independently and conduct focus group meetings in their assigned areas. Some of the team may be required to join cross-cutting core teams visiting other FAO departments, field offices or other international organizations for interviews, benchmarking, etc. A mid-term meeting of the AMO team may be required to review the findings to-date, decide on further lines of enquiry and discuss the direction that the evaluation is taking in each of the major subject areas, particularly those where cross-linkages are apparent. At the end of the process in early January 2007 there will be a third but shorter group meeting to discuss preliminary conclusions and to develop a cohesive approach to the development of individual reports.

56. Essentially the AMO team will take a bottom up approach to its investigation trying to explore the strengths and weaknesses in rules and processes from the working level up through line management and then to senior management. The first round of investigation will involve focus groups and analysis of a staff questionnaire as well as the development of flow charts for some major processes which have been identified by the IEE as central to the Organization's functions.

Issues needing in depth study

57. This list cannot be exhaustive or even definitive, as the final list will depend on the preliminary assessment of the full AMO team when they have had initial meetings in FAO and the first review of the relevant documentation. Furthermore it should be stressed that, as the evaluation is a moving target, given parallel considerations of reform both in FAO and the UN and the current “testing” of new decentralized structures in some FAO offices, it is even more necessary that the AMO team can adjust the list of in-depth studies as it proceeds. The following therefore, provides an illustrative listing of areas for in depth analysis:

- **Human Resources:** Grading, competencies and ICSC broad banding proposals particularly in the light of trials being undertaken for the UN Common system by IFAD and WFP; Recruitment and appointment process and objectives including nationality and gender targets and the linkages between people management and personnel decisions; Mobility and rotation (the possible scope for rotation between FAO and other UN agencies); Performance assessment and the potential for performance pay also given current ICSC proposals, which are currently being tested in IFAD and WFP; Human Resource programmes and their ability to support a flexible workforce given UN common system requirements and constraints; The use and cost of consultants in the work of FAO given that shifts have taken place in the modalities for employing short-term expertise.
- **Administration:** Security and risk; Analysis of potential and ongoing joint/third party administrative activities in Rome or elsewhere including outsourcing; Mechanisms to ensure joined-up thinking in the provision of administrative support, given the tendency to compartmentalise or decentralise activities for budgetary reasons; The feasibility of the Administration and Finance Department becoming involved in national institution building as suggested in the Director-General’s reform proposals.
- **Finance:** Issues of financial risk; The flow of resources into FAO in the light of the payment of assessed contributions by members; The impact of the forthcoming changeover to International Accounting Standards, including the need to provision for after service liabilities, including health insurance; Benchmarking of financial and accounting procedures; Ex-post versus ex-ante controls.
- **Budget:** The strengths and weaknesses of different budget instruments, such as the Strategic Framework, the Medium-Term Plan (MTP) and the Programme of Work and Budget (PWB); The utility and cost effectiveness of preparing different budget scenarios; The adequacy of existing budget instruments in priority setting; The rolling medium term plan and its “best fit” to the biennial programme of work and budget; Transparency and informed decision-making in the budget process; Appropriateness of performance indicators used in the budget under the Results-Based Management (RBM) approach adopted by the UN system; Benchmarking the budget and planning process.
- **The Relation between Regular Budget and Extra-budgetary Resources** and the management of extra-budgetary resources, including: the arrangements for agreement on receipt of funds; the efficiency and flexibility of procedures; arrangements for substantive accountability; integration of the funding under extra-budgetary and regular programme resources; benchmarking against practices of other organizations for application and management of voluntary funding.
- **Organizational Structure and Management:** Fit of structure to programme needs (cross reference to the work of the technical evaluation team and governance as well as Director-General’s reform proposals); Structure to best support a de-layered management; Best practice review of oversight structures; Decentralization structure (cross reference to the work of the technical evaluation team as well as Director-General’s reform proposals); Results of management training in FAO including participation in activities of the joint management centre (cross-reference to knowledge);

Leadership - perceptions and realities; Suitability of management information systems (cross reference to IT).

- **Information Technology (IT):** Risk assessment in IT infrastructure; Suitability of IT infrastructure for a knowledge driven and transparent organizational management (cross reference also to infrastructure); The implementation methodology and objectives for the major human resources software system under construction at the present time; The need to further incorporate legacy systems into the financial system architecture; Ability of IT systems to support a decentralized operation.
- **Knowledge:** The way in which FAO supports a knowledge environment; The FAO outreach programmes in the field of communications and public information including the publications programme and the programmes associated with fund raising activities; The degree to which knowledge management is integrated internally and externally (cross reference to inter-agency review team and technical requirements of member states); Internal training programmes (cross-reference to Human Resources); The nature of management in a knowledge environment (cross reference to management).

Lines of investigation and contacts to be made

58. The following list is not intended to be exclusive at this stage, as additional approaches may prove desirable as the work progresses. The examination of AMO issues will, however, include the following:

- Data will be extracted from the existing FAO personnel system, HLCM personnel statistics, FAO budget and finance systems and reports, and information held by the Documentation Systems Division in WAICENT.
- A staff survey will be conducted in which questionnaires will be sent to all staff (this will be a core-team activity as questions should cover all general aspects of the FAO work environment). The survey will cover staff at Headquarters, Regional and Sub-regional Offices and Country Offices.
- Previous departmental/divisional studies on needs, policies and problem areas will be collected and reviewed, as will be evaluation reports, internal audit reports of relevance and reports of the FAO external auditor.
- In-depth structured and semi-structured interviews will be held with all Director (D) level staff and above in management positions in the departments and divisions responsible for AMO and with a large sample of other line managers in headquarters and the decentralized offices.
- At a more general level, the AMO team will meet with staff focus groups at a divisional level, selected to represent a good cross-section of job types by function, nationality and gender. Focus groups will cover:
 - P5 and P4 line staff
 - P 3, P2 and P1 staff
 - General Service Staff
 - At least one group of consultants covering a broad group of subject areas
- Staff in a cross-section of Programme Co-ordination and IT units in the technical departments (including fisheries and forestry) will also be interviewed in focus groups. Based on the findings of focus groups and the staff survey some individual in-depth interviews may be needed.
- Prior evaluation and other relevant material will also be assembled from UN Common Services, including: the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), the High Level Committee for Management (HLCM), the UN Information Systems Co-ordination Committee (ISCC), the Inter Agency Procurement Service (IAPSO) and the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC).
- Deriving from the above a typology or policies, practices, assessments of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness will be formulated. The typology will then be employed in a benchmarking exercise with several other multilateral entities. Benchmarking will

involve at least two other UN organisations but may also include some non-UN organisations in order to provide a broader perspective on the collected data and on the comparative effectiveness of different systems. With regard to UN agencies, WHO and UNESCO will be used since they are both specialised agencies and generally similar to FAO in size and programmatic functions. Recent major studies conducted by these institutions that may be of particular relevance may also be reviewed (such as the 1999 Review of WHO Procurement Services).

- The typology will also provide the foundation for the detailing of the specific questions on administration, management and organisation that will be used in visits to at least two Regional Offices, two Sub-Regional Offices and a selected number of Country Offices. Selection of the offices to be visited will be co-ordinated at the Core Team level.

C. GOVERNANCE

59. To be forward looking, the questions that the evaluation will have to address are what kind of FAO does the international community require today and what kind of FAO it would wish to see in the future. From a governance point of view these questions cannot be addressed by looking at FAO in isolation. A systemic approach is required, for while some of the governance difficulties faced by FAO are specific to the Organization, others are doubtless part of a larger UN system governance issue. The IEE work on governance, therefore, necessarily relates closely to the work on the place of the FAO in the multilateral system. A tightly integrated approach between the two will be followed.

60. In 1991, the seminal report that came to be known as the second “Nordic Project” on “The United Nations Issues and Options” was tabled. It was predicated on a number of “futures studies” and one of its main conclusions was that the specialized agencies of the United Nations were then “at a crossroads” of declining focus, core competencies and influence. This, it concluded, was essentially a matter of collective governance failure through consistent shortcomings in arriving at clear decisions on strategic directions and strategic choices and due to either the absence of or inconsistent policy decisions. Sixteen years later, the views and assessments gathered in the IEE’s first round of interviews with FAO staff and member governments would suggest that little has changed, at least with regard to FAO. This observation, however, is presented at this point as a working hypothesis only and subject to careful and thorough examination.

Initial issues and questions

61. The structure and roles of the Governing Bodies of FAO (Conference and Council) must be carefully examined. It is important to highlight that of all the FAO bodies listed as governing bodies only the Conference and Council are assigned decision-making powers. The others, while an integral part of the institution, function in advisory capacities. In the past, a number of FAO technical Committees (Fisheries, Forestry) met at Ministerial level. From a governance perspective, it will be important to ascertain whether the decisions reached in those gatherings were referred for approval to the Governing Bodies of FAO or considered as final decisions. The same applies to decisions taken at Regional Conferences of FAO.

62. The analysis of institutional structure and functions will include, inter alia, to the following questions: How are the Governing Bodies integrated? To what extent are the Governing Bodies perceived as inclusive and representative of the interests of all members of the Organization? Are the Governing Bodies able to make decisions and set priorities? Are there agreed criteria, including transparency, for establishing priorities? Are there power asymmetries in governance and, if so, how do these affect confidence in the Organization? Do the Governing Bodies measure their own performance for efficiency and effectiveness (this is becoming a standard best practice)? What might be the benefits of different types of institutional governance? How are the substantive items for governance agendas decided? How does FAO governance compare and contrast with that of other multilateral organizations? Is it desirable and feasible for

new entities, such as representatives of civil society, to become more directly involved in governance as is now the practice in some other multilateral organizations such as The Global Fund (to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis)? If so, what modalities might apply? Are the evaluation and audit roles performed adequately and with sufficient independence and do these provide the Governing Bodies with adequate, reliable and sufficient information to ensure that these are able to meet their fiduciary responsibilities?

63. A second constellation of questions on governance concerns the relationship between governance and management. What is the nature of the relationship between governance and management in FAO, both according to statute and in practice? Are role definitions clearly specified and are they applied? Is accountability clear and adequate? In practice, do the definition of objectives, and the policy and strategy setting of the organization respond to the initiatives of Governance or of the management? Do tensions exist and, if so how are they addressed and resolved? Following the collapse of ENRON, World Com and Arthur Anderson, major changes have been introduced in governance-management relationships and these have not been limited to the corporate sector, but are now being applied increasingly to the structures of charitable foundations and non-governmental organizations. Are patterns of “best practices” either now known or emerging and would these hold possible value and application for FAO?

64. A third constellation of issues relates to the relationship between the Governance of FAO and that of the UN system as a whole, including informal elements of that governance through requests and mandates assigned by global summits and conferences, existing formal relationships with ECOSOC and the General Assembly and elements of FAO Governance which have been ceded to the “Common System”, including the ILO Tribunal.

65. A fourth constellation of issues and questions relates to the relationships between governance and financial-budgeting coherence. This would need to begin by ascertaining, over a representative period of time, the nature and trend in FAO’s funding (core budget, extra budgetary trust funding, and other supplementary funding arrangements). Some key questions to be posed from this is the extent the implications and consequences of trends in funding have been examined, understood and governed by the Governing Bodies and how impacts were examined and deleterious consequences minimised. How are the funding allocations dictating the organizations objectives and activities? Is the process of establishing a budget inclusive and representative of the interests of the members of the Organization? A specific issue in this constellation involves the governance regime for trust funds consigned to FAO. Has the lack of funding led to the reduction or elimination of some traditional FAO activities? How has it affected its global reach?

66. A fifth constellation of issues relates to efficiency of the Governance processes, including the delimitation of areas of competence of the various committees; their processes, procedures and cultures; their documentation requirements and their timings in relation to the decision making processes of the Organization.

Methodology

a) Information gathering, research and consultations

67. A comprehensive list of available materials is currently being gathered relating not only to the meetings and discussions of the Governing Bodies (and their Committees) of FAO but also those of other institutions that will be used for comparative purposes. Academic and policy research information is also being gathered on current thinking about governance, on what structures and practices appear to work best, on how best to measure it and to judge effectiveness. Information gaps will be identified and, where necessary, short term consultants.

68. This will be followed by the application of structured and semi-structured interview techniques and multiple consultations with relevant actors who are either stakeholders or leading thinkers on governance matters (e.g. governments, donors, recipients, ex-FAO staff, ambassadors,

heads of international and regional organizations, civil society, think tanks, etc). A detailed framework with clear guidelines will be prepared for this purpose. Focus group techniques are also a possibility in this regard, but this will depend on the results of a first round of interviews. The possibility, desirability and potential usefulness of using structured questionnaires on governance issues will be reviewed. A final decision on this will also be made after the first round of interviews. Whatever the outcome on this matter, a number of governance and governance-related questions will be included in a wider FAO staff survey that is to be carried out as part of the IEE and in the information gathering at country level.

b) Case Studies

69. A number of specific case studies, including benchmarking, are envisaged as part of the IEE review of governance. Before deciding on and structuring these, however, a number of issues need to be addressed and resolved as these will inform the case study choices made. Included here are:

- A study of the decisions taken by the Governing bodies and other advisory Committees of FAO, in the last few years, (e.g. on the basis of the Strategic Framework, the MTP and PWBs) and their follow up, in order to give a sound basis for the selection of our case studies.
- A study of the trend regarding the funding by FAO's members of the regular budget and extra-budgetary and implications for the major issues being addressed by the Organization.
- A review of proposals for UN system reform and their possible consequences on FAO mandate and activities.
- An analysis of inter-agency governance arrangements on a regional basis, with regard, for example, to structural, representational and programme-sharing arrangements between FAO and IICA in Latin America.
- An analysis of the recent measures taken on increased decentralization and their implications for governance.

D. FAO IN THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM

70. With regard to the role of FAO in the multilateral system, in addition to benchmarking FAO performance against that of comparable organizations, the Terms of Reference as approved by the Council state that the examination of FAO's comparative advantage may include the following:

- a) The international architecture for FAO's area of mandate and those areas of member country priority and need which:
 - i) are inadequately addressed at present by the international system;
 - ii) have adequate coverage without any input from FAO; and
 - iii) are being ineffectively addressed, in part due to competition and/or lack of partnership between organizations.
- b) The extent to which FAO's areas of mandate and competence are clear and respected by other partners in the multilateral system, including the sustainability of other agencies' intervention in areas of FAO's mandate.
- c) The relation of FAO at the Governing Body and managerial level to other organs of the UN system, decisions of the major organs of the UN system and the UN Secretary-General.
- d) Partnership collaboration and integration, including:
 - i) participation and contribution in the central coordinating and partnership mechanisms of the UN system;
 - ii) work at country level (including UNDAF, PRS process and collaboration in the UN country team);
 - iii) partnering with the Rome-based organizations (IFAD and WFP);
 - iv) collaboration on treaty and international regulatory work;

- v) collaboration on agricultural research and its application (eg. CGIAR);
- vi) collaborative technical programmes;
- vii) collaboration in building accessible global knowledge;
- viii) collaboration with non-governmental multilateral organizations; and
- ix) collaboration with regional organizations.

Initial issues and questions

71. Four key clusters of questions follow from the above:
- a) What has changed, is changing and is likely to change in the overall architecture for international development and what does this require or imply for FAO? In particular, what are the implications of system-wide UN reform efforts especially with regard to the three Rome-based agencies, of country level coordination arrangements (e.g. PRS, UNDAF, “One-UN”, the role of the UN Resident Representative, developments with regard to “tightly managed entities, etc.)?
 - b) Who is now doing what (technical programmes, research, norm and standard setting, building global knowledge bases) in the area of FAO’s mandate? When FAO was founded 60 years ago it was *sui generis*. That is far from the case today. A myriad of institutions and institutional arrangements and a large number of alternative sources of supply now exist. Does FAO hold comparative advantages in this changed context? What are they and how are they determined, judged, measured? Is FAO clear with regard to its comparative advantages? How does it verify and validate these?
 - c) What is the level and quality of FAO’s participation in the major efforts underway to increase development coherence, build stronger and more enduring partnerships between international development organisations, governments, non-governmental actors and the private sector, and to harmonise policies, practices and organisational arrangements, especially at the country level? How does FAO decide on partnerships and what is the evidence that FAO is a valued partner? What internal mobilisation has occurred in response to ECOSOC Resolutions? What are the main perceptions and views of FAO by other actors in the UN system? Is there anything of significance in the fact that FAO was not assigned a major role when the Secretary-General set up an independent group to report on “Realising the Promise and Potential of African Agriculture”?
 - d) What are the effective demands of member countries in the area of FAO’s mandate? How are these determined? Have they changed and are they changing? How do they relate to greater system-wide coherence? If there are coherence weaknesses, can the Organization’s management do anything about them or does the genesis of these lie with competing and non-reconciled demands from member countries?

Methodology

72. In an attempt to respond to these four clusters, this aspect of the evaluation will use several methods and approaches to its work. It will:
- Carry out a comprehensive mapping exercise of actors and activities in the area of FAO’s mandate. The Oxford Policy Management Group has undertaken an initial exercise in this regard which will serve helpfully as a foundation for this work. The mapping will begin by listing all main areas of FAO activity. From this it will develop a survey instrument to obtain profiles of the activities of a range of other organizations and will aim to apply the survey to all key actors (including, for example, the CGIAR, large international NGOs (both developmental and environmental), new intergovernmental partnerships such as the recently formed OECD High Seas Task Force and the Forest Stewardship Council, new international partnership initiatives such as the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition

and the Micronutrient Initiative, etc.) and the many inter-governmental organizations at global and regional levels providing normative public goods, such as the OIE, the international commodity organizations and the fisheries bodies. Before its distribution, the survey instrument will be pre-tested, verified for clarity and accuracy through face to face meetings with a small, randomly sampled number of organizations and a scorecard system will be determined. This will be complemented by collection and analysis of the main programme and conference reports, reviews and any institution-wide evaluations pertaining to the work of the surveyed organizations.

- Using the results of the mapping exercise as a template, follow-up interviews will be conducted with a structured sample of organizations included in the survey. These interviews will aim to go beyond a classification of areas of convergence and divergence and of alternative sources of supply and to probe issues of longer-term strategies and plans, projections of the adequacy and predictability of financing for alternative suppliers to the FAO, and the possibilities for FAO in new and durable partnership arrangements. The combined results of these two actions will then be tested (triangulated) with and reactions sought from a cross-section of FAO stakeholders.
- Further verification and validation will take place as an integral part of the reviews of country, regional and sub-regional offices. This will seek the views and assessments of national scientists, technicians, administrators and managers, as well as those of other resident international development agencies and non-governmental organizations of the role and comparative advantage of FAO in the overall development system. Where possible and appropriate, this will also include a comparative examination of reported results at country level with respect to ending poverty, hunger and malnutrition.
- Similar country level verification in both developing and developed countries will take place with respect to the truly global normative public goods of the Organization.
- A close working relationship has been established with the High Level Panel on Tightly Managed Entities and the results of its enquiries and recommendations of changes to the United Nations international development architecture will be incorporated into the analysis of the IEE.
- Several of the major donor agencies (e.g. the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Canada, and Sweden) have conducted or are now conducting strategic and policy reviews of how to strengthen multilateralism in today's changed context, including the much greater availability of ODA funding. A similar exercise is underway in OECD/DAC and a major, fully independent exercise (the "New Rules Coalition") on future needs and modalities of development financing (and the role of multilateralism in this) involving a broad consortium of think tanks and other actors has been underway for over three years. The IEE will connect with all of these, seeking particularly issues and changes that may impact on the future role of the FAO. Again, the mapping template will be used to structure questions and issues to be explored and to ensure that a consistent and comparable approach is followed with all these actors.
- In addition, efforts will be made through interviews with main actors in the UN system and through an analysis of documents pertaining to participation to obtaining a cross section of main perceptions and perspectives on FAO as a partner and on the Organization's participation in UN system-wide activities.

V. Reviews at Country, Regional and Sub-regional Offices

73. The IEE will conduct field-level reviews of approximately 22-25 countries and regional offices and at least two Regional Offices and two Sub-Regional Offices. In addition to experienced evaluators, most of the Regional Teams that are being assembled will include recognized specialists in agriculture from the individual regions. At least one core team member will be included in the Regional Teams. In selecting the offices to be visited, every effort will be made to achieve broad-based representativeness of the breadth, depth and diversity of FAO operations. The number of countries per region will be determined in rough proportion to the

relative size of FAO activities in that region. Thus, visits are envisaged to approximately 8 African countries, 5-6 Asian, 5-6 Latin American and Caribbean, 2 Near East, 1 Central Asia and 1 non-EU Europe. The selection of countries within these groupings will be made by applying stratified sampling techniques to (i)- the magnitude of the FAO programme in the country (excluding emergencies); (ii)- % of total population reported as under-nourished and; (iii)- % of total population engaged actively in agriculture. Weighting or segmenting by total population will also be required, for otherwise only low population countries would be selected. Population weighting will also be applied.

74. A template will be prepared as a framework for and guide to all country visits. This will draw, inter alia, from the results of the global studies, multilateral mapping, administration reviews and benchmarking and case studies on governance. It will provide a broad range of key issues to be examined at country level and hypotheses to be tested. Not all issues, of course, will apply to all countries. The template, however, should ensure both comparable approaches and comparability of results. Summary reports of each country visit will be prepared on the basis of a common format.

75. In addition, numerous visits to and discussions with donor agencies and with users of FAO's normative outputs in the South and the North are envisaged as part of the evaluation.

VI. Risks and Risk Management

76. A question often posed during the initial interviews by the IEE concerned risks to the evaluation and was on the risks to the evaluation itself and measures to deal with them. In the view of the core team, there are five main categories of risk.

77. It is self-evident that the first area of risk lies in the combination of the highly ambitious magnitude of the task set and its very tight time frame. Unless appropriate measures are built in from the outset this combination could impact negatively on the thoroughness of the work and its timely completion. The approaches being taken by the core team and outlined in this document aim specifically to control these risks. The multi-faceted approaches (e.g. global reviews by acknowledged specialists and institutional core competency mapping) are front-end loaded with the aim of an early delineation of key and defining issues. As indicated earlier, contracts have already either been signed or are being negotiated with roughly 80% of the specialist consultants and technicians required. Most activities within each of the four main component areas have been situated within a sequenced, monthly critical path framework. This will allow for a continuous tracking of progress and, if necessary, for adjustments and corrective actions. The coordination of all of this comprises a most daunting challenge, given the large number of actors involved and the fact that the core team is located on four different continents. The various specialist teams (sector and region) and the core team will, therefore, meet together according to a clear schedule (final details of this are being decided, for example, the governance team will gather in Rome in mid-May, the AMO team at the end of May, the global sector specialists in July, and so on). In addition, the five core team members will share bi-weekly updates. Finally, a team of Research Assistants (five to begin with) have been recruited and will furnish essential supports throughout.

78. A second major risk lies in the availability of financing for the IEE. Annex IV of the TORs suggest a total budget of US\$ 4,283,000, all of which is to be provided on the basis of extra-ordinary contributions. As of the beginning of May, however, only US\$ 3,047,000 had been committed or indicated for approval. This has meant that contracts and related financial commitments could be made only to December 2006. Yet the scope of work and processes outlined in this inception report cannot be met without full financing. Should the remaining financing required not be in place by December, either (i) the scope of work would need to be substantially altered and it would also then become very doubtful that the current timeframe could be met, or (ii) the entire project would need to be aborted. This risk is completely outside of the control of the core team and its leader.


79. A third risk is obviously that of cost containment and budgetary control. In this regard, a tight budget management system is currently being established which will ensure both ex ante controls over commitment levels and cumulative balance sheet calculations on expenditures. In addition and in most cases, fixed price contracts are being used, thereby reducing contingent liabilities. While not all contingencies can ever be foreseen in an undertaking of this magnitude and major unanticipated problems cannot entirely be ruled out, the measures for cost containment and budget control should reduce any major risks of cost overruns to a minimum.

80. A fourth area of risk relates to possible expectations for ongoing reporting. The expectations for the IEE are justifiably very high. Because of this, several requests have already been received from country representatives for reporting on conclusions and recommendations on a continuous and piecemeal basis. This, however, would be incompatible with the essence of the TORs which call for a comprehensive, integrated and inter-related assessment. Such reporting would necessarily assume that results in one area would not impact on and change – perhaps completely – results from another – a patently dangerous assumption. Finally, to proceed along such a route would pose huge increases in transactions costs to the entire exercise, with attendant risks to the timeframe of the project. As stipulated in the TORs, it will be essential as an integral part of the process to ensure that the terms of reference and the requirements of quality assurance are adhered to and that the project is proceeding within budget. It is hoped that this inception report will furnish a first basis for such assurance. Other major milestones will include:

- A report on implementation progress to date, including reports on the individual areas covered by the IEE, will be provided to the IEE Committee of the Council at least one month before the meeting of Council in November, at which point stock will need to be taken of overall available finances through extra-ordinary contributions.
- An “emerging issues” paper will be provided in April, 2007. It will outline the framework for the final report and contain an overview of the main issues and observations that have emerged from the study. It will also endeavor to include an outline of principal conclusions, although these will still at that stage be subject to further review by the core team. A workshop or workshops in Rome to discuss and obtain feedback on this paper should be arranged.
- A draft report in July 2007.
- The final report in September 2007.

81. A fifth risk, raised by many with the core team, is the relationship between the IEE and the implementation of reforms. The IEE is specifically charged in the TORs to examine the appropriateness and adequacy of current proposals for institutional reform in the four areas of programmes, headquarters structures and operations, field level structures and operations and the general streamlining of FAO administration. Concerns, however, have already been raised by representatives of countries that the conclusions and recommendations of the IEE might not accord with the current ongoing progress of implementing some of the reform proposals. A related concern that has also been raised is that there is an out of phase problem of timing between the processes of ongoing reforms and the timeline of the IEE. These concerns may well prove valid, as it cannot be ruled out that IEE conclusions could diverge – and even diverge substantially -- from basic components in the current package of reform proposals. Equally, however, the outcome of the IEE could lend increased emphasis to and urgency on implementation of the reform proposals. In the latter eventuality, any delay in implementing reforms at this stage pending IEE results could entail opportunity costs. The problem is that the outcomes cannot be judged ex ante. To the extent that there are major risks in this area, they are risks of governance and management and not ones that can be dealt with via risk management measures by the IEE itself.

VII. Indicative Timeline: Main Milestones



VIII. Indicative Budget

82. At this stage the budget is purely indicative, as neither travel nor consultancies have been finalised and it will be possible to define precisely the requirements for individual areas of work only when much more initial work has been completed. The budget is based upon the best estimates of the work involved in undertaking the IEE as summarised in this Inception Report. It is intended to manage the resources within the broad envelopes indicated below, not in terms of the breakdown between travel and consultancies, etc. but in terms of the allocations in the four main areas, each led by a member of the core team. The funds for the conduct of the IEE will be managed under the supervision of the team leader, while those for the CC-IEE and central administrative support are managed by the secretariat. Funds available will be provided in order of the priority of commitments (contracting) and the budget indicates funds as spent from the time of commitment when a contractual obligation is entered into (thus for example core team consultants funds for honoraria have already been committed for the remainder of this year and will be committed at the end of 2006 for 2007, whereas travel funds are committed a few weeks before the travel is actually undertaken).

Tentative Budget IEE - US\$ (000) (figures shown at date of contractual commitment)							
	2006			2007			Total
	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	1st. Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	
Budget managed by the IEE Team	1,074,000	976,000	784,000	352,000	100,000	13,000	3,299,000
Work Directly by Core Team Leader	192,000	265,000	227,000	170,000	30,000	13,000	897,000
Team leader travel and honorarium	130,000	18,000	130,000	18,000	18,000	6,000	320,000
Research support travel and honorarium	50,000	65,000	65,000	120,000			300,000
Consultants travel and honorarium		150,000					150,000
Unforeseen contingencies		20,000	20,000	20,000			60,000
Teleconferencing etc.	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000		25,000
Miscellaneous administrative costs	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	42,000
Technical Work of FAO	474,000	383,000	167,000	27,000	23,000	0	1,074,000
Core Team member travel and honorarium	122,000	28,000	62,000	17,000	18,000		247,000
Technical specialists (14) travel and honorarium	170,000	150,000	40,000				360,000
Regional specialists (5) travel and honorarium	150,000	150,000	30,000				330,000
Focus groups, etc. (travel, honoraria, tele-conferencing)		20,000	25,000				45,000
Research support	27,000	25,000					52,000
Other	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	5,000		40,000
Administration, Organization, etc.	168,000	147,000	152,000	48,000	13,000	0	528,000
Core Team member travel and honorarium	84,000	8,000	46,000	8,000	8,000		154,000
Technical specialists (3) travel and honorarium	62,000	116,000	92,000				270,000
Research Support	16,000	17,000	9,000	35,000			77,000
Other	6,000	6,000	5,000	5,000	5,000		27,000
Governance	108,000	92,000	125,000	58,000	17,000	0	400,000
Core Team member travel and honorarium	78,000	11,000	38,000	14,000	14,000		155,000
Technical consultants (2) travel and honorarium	25,000	30,000	23,000				78,000
Focus groups, etc. (travel, honoraria, tele-conferencing)		18,000	36,000	36,000			90,000
Research support		25,000	20,000				45,000
Other	5,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	3,000		32,000
FAO's Role in Multilateral System	132,000	89,000	113,000	49,000	17,000	0	400,000
Core Team member travel and honorarium	78,000	11,000	38,000	14,000	14,000		155,000
Technical consultants (2) travel and honorarium	25,000	27,000	20,000				72,000
Focus groups, etc. (travel, honoraria, tele-conferencing)		18,000	27,000	27,000			72,000
Research support	24,000	25,000	20,000				69,000
Other	5,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	3,000		32,000
Budget Managed Centrally for the IEE	387,202	129,319	102,170	166,723	117,021	196,574	1,099,011
Quality Assurance advisers	19,000	19,000	15,000	50,000	0	0	103,000
honorarium and travel	19,000	19,000	7,000	38,000			83,000
support			8,000	12,000			20,000
Administrative Support	240,530	4,000	4,000	85,600	4,000	4,000	342,130
Evaluation operations administrator/researcher	107,000			52,000			159,000
Administrative support (1.5)	118,530			29,600			148,130
Other including equipment	15,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	35,000
Meetings of the CC-IEE including translation and interpretation	40,000	40,000	30,000		100,000	180,000	390,000
FAO central administrative support	87,672	66,319	53,170	31,123	13,021	12,574	263,881
Grand Total	1,461,202	1,105,319	886,170	518,723	217,021	209,574	4,398,011

ANNEX IV: EVALUATION TEAM PROGRESS REPORT ON THE INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF FAO (IEE)

Submitted to the Council Committee for the Independent External Evaluation of FAO (CC-IEE)
by the Independent External Evaluation Core Team

(September 2006)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pages
A.	Introduction	36
B.	Organizational Arrangements for the IEE	37
C.	Continuing Reviews, Analyses and Syntheses of Existing Evaluations and Available Materials	37
D.	Preparation of Survey and Other Research Instruments	38
E.	Selection of Countries and Scheduling of Visits	39
F.	The Technical Work of FAO	40
G.	Gender Considerations	41
H.	Administration, Management and Organization	41
I.	Governance	43
J.	Assessment of the Evaluation Function in FAO	44
K.	FAO in the Multilateral System	45

A. INTRODUCTION

1. The IEE became operational at the end of March 2006 and its Inception Report was presented shortly thereafter. On 24 May 2006, at the second meeting of the Council Committee for the Independent Evaluation of the FAO (CC-IEE): “Members welcomed the inception report which they felt provided a solid basis to proceed with the evaluation...⁵”. It was agreed at the same time that a progress report would be made available for the meeting of Council in November 2006. This report responds to that agreement. The preparation of the report, only approximately fifteen weeks following the Inception Report, was essential, since the progress report must first be translated for review by members of the CC-IEE in September and transmitted together with any changes for consideration by the Council in November.

2. The report has been reviewed by the Core Team at a meeting at the beginning of September. At that meeting, the progress of the IEE to date, its planned outputs and time schedule were reviewed in detail by the team as a whole. Supporting papers to this Progress Report have been placed on the IEE website: <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/219/index.html> and cover:

- the evaluation framework as set out in the Inception Report;
- partially annotated outline for IEE country mission reports;

⁵ Chair’s Aide-Mémoire, Second Meeting of the Council Committee for the Independent Evaluation of FAO (CC-IEE), 24 May 2006 - Consideration of the IEE Inception Report.

- responsibilities and timetable for the Global Assessment of FAO's Technical Work; and
 - tentative schedule of developing country visits.
3. Following its initial planning meetings and approval of the inception report, the IEE core team took immediate steps to operationalize the evaluation framework⁶ for the four main areas of investigation, namely FAO's (i) technical work, (ii) administration, management and organisation; (iii) governance, and (iv) role in the multilateral system. In doing so, particular attention was given to the comments of the members of the CC-IEE and of the Quality Assurance Advisers in considering the Inception Report.
4. Over the past weeks, considerable progress has been made. This report provides a brief overview of those activities, all of which comprise work in progress. While all aspects of the IEE must in the end be synthesised and integrated into a coherent overall evaluation (a point emphasised in the Inception Report), this report reflects the fact that at this early stage, several of the activities are on separate, information gathering, data collection and analysis tracks.

B. ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE IEE

5. Core Team members have designed the programme of work in their specific areas and selected specialist consultants against agreed criteria, with overall support and coordination from the team leader. Selection criteria emphasized technical competence and independence. Administrative support has been provided by the FAO Evaluation Service which has also provided advice on sources of information and overall background on various aspects of the work in relation to FAO. Budget control has been undertaken by the team leader in conjunction with the Evaluation Service acting on behalf of the CC-IEE.
6. A team of research assistants has been recruited to assist on all aspects of the work of the IEE and has been directed by the team leader with some support from the Evaluation Service for day-to-day supervision.
7. All major decisions with respect to the IEE have been taken by the team leader in close consultation with the Core Team.

C. CONTINUING REVIEWS, ANALYSES AND SYNTHESSES OF EXISTING EVALUATIONS AND AVAILABLE MATERIALS

8. As stipulated in the TORs for the IEE and affirmed in the Inception Report, this evaluation is drawing to the maximum extent possible on the considerable range of materials already available and directly relevant to a comprehensive assessment of the FAO. Examples of activities undertaken include:
- a) A review and summary of all major corporate evaluations from 1998-2005 has been completed, including the main findings, formal recommendations, whether externally peer reviewed, management response (agree, qualified agreement or disagree), commitments and time frames, and follow-up (where known). To facilitate the further analytical work in the four IEE focus areas, attention has also been drawn in each summary to principal factors that seem to apply to each of them.
 - b) A programme of work to synthesise common themes and lessons that have emerged globally or inter-regionally from previous assessments/evaluations in selected areas (clusters) is underway (e.g. Forestry, Policy Related Activities, Emergencies, Special Programme for Food Security). Following the identification of the clusters, a standardized metric was prepared for the review. Priority was given to sectoral

⁶ The evaluation framework as set out in the Inception Report <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/219/index.html>

- clusters with most evaluation reports and/or greatest likelihood of common themes. Several syntheses have been completed and a schedule devised for others.
- c) A matrix of factors (e.g. adequacy of planning, extent of prior risk analysis, extent of consultation, etc.) has been drafted and will be applied in a retrospective examination of historical institutional initiatives and reforms taken within FAO.
 - d) A review of the extent of literature citations and internet references to FAO has been launched. This will furnish an important baseline indicator of the extent to which different FAO products are accessed.
 - e) Efforts are underway to compile decisions taken by FAO Governing Bodies and a draft matrix to classify these (e.g. strategy, policy, administrative, financial, inter-institutional, etc.) has been prepared. It is hoped that this will furnish a helpful foundation for two or three detailed case studies on FAO governance.
 - f) For each of the 24 developing countries to be visited in the conduct of the IEE, a country profile is being prepared. To expedite and streamline this, a standard format has been developed. Each country profile will include insights on each country through telephone and face-to-face interviews with technical officers and other key FAO staff, and inventory of FAO projects operating in the country in the last six years, key donor and government programming documents, country profiles and briefs prepared by FAO and other agencies, PRSPs, etc. The FAO project delivery in country is being analysed to suggest key programme areas for teams to concentrate their enquiries in each country. These country profiles are being prepared sequentially to accord with the timing of the visits to each country.
 - g) An inventory of key global and (inter-) regional organizations supplying services in the agriculture and food sector has been compiled, drawing from the evaluation of FAO partnerships and alliances conducted in 2005 and further refined according to services rendered, as opposed to constituencies represented. FAO technical divisions have now been requested to rank the organizations by importance as both partners and as competitors. This will furnish an essential baseline for further follow-up through questionnaires and interviews with a sample of the organizations and other informed parties (triangulation).

D. PREPARATION OF SURVEY AND OTHER RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

9. Several of the key evaluation instruments that are to be applied have been developed within the last three months, including:
- a) An all-staff survey has been prepared and will be sent out in September. In addition to seeking to establish statistically valid indicators of staff views and experiences on a wide range of issues, the survey will seek to establish the 'FAO Institutional Profile' (using a highly regarded social science classification instrument⁷). The survey includes a range of standards used previously in surveys in international organizations along with questions posed by the IEE in order to test and validate statements and observations that have emerged in individual interviews.
 - b) A questionnaire on FAO governance has been prepared which will be sent in September to all the Permanent Representations to FAO. Many of the questions and issues raised in the questionnaire derive directly from individual face-to-face interviews conducted to date. The statistical results of the questionnaire will be employed in further structured and semi-structured follow-up interviews.
 - c) Country visits in Africa and Latin America began on schedule during the third week of August. An evaluation matrix of key questions, issues, suggestions of

⁷ The instrument is proprietary to Booz Allen Hamilton. The company has kindly agreed to furnish the instrument and its proprietary key to the IEE as a public good and at no cost.

possible indicators and data collection methods particularly for the 24 developing country visits has been prepared. This is a work in progress that has been pre-tested in initial visits to four countries. In addition, a suggested annotated outline has been prepared for the reports that are to be written on the visits to each country⁸ and was reviewed by the Core Team at its September meeting. Given the diversity of the countries to be visited, the programs within each country and the diversity of teams, it is to be expected that there will be variability in the coverage of issues in the country reports and challenges in synthesizing country lessons. Nevertheless, the annotated outline should help to ensure some comparability in the written reports. Regional working papers will be distilled from the individual country reports and these will serve as a basis for inter- and intra-regional comparisons and as both a source of verification and further hypotheses to be examined. Given the number and diversity of FAO activities and the time and resources available for country visits, however, there can be only selective and limited empirical country-specific technical feedback and rigorous testing of the usefulness of FAO's services to its clients.

E. SELECTION OF COUNTRIES AND SCHEDULING OF VISITS

10. As had been indicated in the Inception Report, the selection of countries to be visited was made essentially on the basis of a simple, transparent, numerically-based formula of the relative size of the FAO programme in each country, the population percentage reported as undernourished and the percentage population engaged in agriculture. For each major region of the world, the results from this formula were then population-weighted and a random selection made. An exception to this was made in the case of Cape Verde which was included as it is one of the trial countries for the 'one UN' experiment. The result is a sample of 24 countries (see tentative schedule of developing country visits⁹).

11. It is important to underscore that no sample of countries to include in IEE country visits could ever meet all desirable criteria and that the list that has resulted may have some obvious weaknesses. One comment already received, for example, is that since Niger and Burkina Faso are both Sahelian countries, a selection of another country for one of them would have contributed positively to the diversity of the sample. A second comment conveyed is that the countries that emerged in the sample may not reflect the growing importance of FAO's involvement in emergencies. However, to avoid a drift towards visiting countries suggested by different parties to the evaluation or the FAO secretariat, the sampling methodology has been applied rigorously apart from the one exception of Cape Verde referred to above and the sample size of 24 should assure at least a reasonable level of representativeness.

12. In addition to the 24 developing countries, semi-structured interviews with policy-makers in natural resources ministries and development assistance agencies in several OECD capitals and Russia are being scheduled.

13. It was with an obvious view to breadth of coverage that Council and Conference specifically mandated that such a large number of countries be visited as an integral component of the IEE. It is important to be clear, however, that there are necessarily trade-offs between breadth and depth, especially in the context of the exceedingly tight time frame for this IEE. The country visits will be conducted by teams of two or three, normally including a regional specialist and a member of the core team. Each country visit must be compressed into only 5-7 days and, although this will furnish valuable evaluation information, it is clearly insufficient time for comprehensive assessments of FAO activities in terms of relevance, adequacy, effectiveness, efficiency and

⁸ <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/219/index.html>

⁹ <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/219/index.html>

sustainability. Every effort is being made to deal with this through, for example, inclusion of country and regional specialists in country visits, the advance preparation of country profiles referred to above and the identification of particular issues to study in more depth in individual countries. However, the trade-offs between breadth and depth should nevertheless be acknowledged explicitly.

14. Among the key questions that will be probed in the country visits, as well as in enquiries to countries and global studies will be the following:

- a) How do client countries view/value FAO's services? How do they compare and contrast with services provided by others?
- b) How do clients assess/evaluate FAO's regional and country activities?
- c) Do the MDGs (relevant to FAO) currently influence the mix of its activities? Which ones? How?
- d) How did the portfolio of activities since 2000 come about?
- e) To what extent is the portfolio demand-led by countries or supply-led by FAO or the donors at the country level?
- f) How well does the FAO portfolio fit into the country's own hunger and poverty reduction strategies? and/or
- g) How does it relate to MDGs, to the PRSP and to UNDAF?
- h) What level of funding does it have?
- i) With whom do the FAO programs partner and why?
- j) What is known or claimed for FAO activities in terms of outputs, outcomes and impacts?
- k) Are there indicators of the sustainability of impacts and, if so, what are they?

F. THE TECHNICAL WORK OF FAO

15. The team specifically dedicated to the evaluation of the technical work of FAO is by far the largest of the four groups. It currently comprises 14 technical specialists reviewing FAO's activities at the global level. Among the key activities since the endorsement of the Inception Report are the following:

- a) Eleven of the 14 global technical team members, together with most core team members and their consultant teams, met in Rome from July 1 to July 11 to define the specific program to assess FAO's work at the global level and to assign responsibilities and establish a timetable¹⁰. During these meetings, a standard evaluative framework for the scope and an outline for the technical working papers were prepared and agreed, although this is still work in progress and is evolving as team members make progress in their work. Questions for the country visits were defined by the technical specialists but the feedback on the effectiveness of specific technical programmes at the country level to the technical team are expected to be limited for the reasons outlined above.
- b) During the July 1 to July 11 period, the technical specialists also held interviews with FAO staff and managers in their respective areas to familiarize themselves with FAO as an organization, its staffing, budgeting, policy, process and substantive activities. They reviewed past evaluations, collected other related information, developed the key questions and hypotheses to be investigated in the global papers and explored in country visits.
- c) The technical specialists are currently undertaking interviews of professionals outside FAO in their respective areas of analysis in organizations that compete or collaborate with, or otherwise utilize the work of FAO's respective departments. The results from this will link not only to the technical assessment of the FAO but

¹⁰ <http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/219/index.html>

also contribute to assessing FAO's place and comparative advantage in the multilateral system.

- d) Technical working papers for consideration by the IEE core team are expected to specifically address:
- Policy-related analysis and assistance in all areas of FAO's mandate
 - Technical assistance
 - Investment assistance
 - FAO's work in food security
 - International treaties, conventions, laws, standards and norms
 - Nutrition
 - Forestry and watershed management
 - Fisheries
 - Livestock
 - Assistance in emergencies and rehabilitation
 - Statistics, data bases, knowledge and information systems including early warning
 - Sustainable development
 - Agricultural support systems
 - Plant genetic resources, improvement, protection, nutrition and production
 - Water and irrigation; and
 - Land resources.

16. Assessing the extent and nature of demand for FAO services is a major challenge. The 186 member countries of FAO differ in stages of development and needs. It also seems clear from initial interviews that they have asymmetrical information on what goods and services FAO and other competing and complementary organizations can provide and there are multiple channels through which demand can be expressed. This begs the question of assessing "whose demand?" and determining how it is articulated. Interviews and other instruments are being developed to assess demand from developed and developing countries and the way it is currently articulated. Also, while demand may seem unlimited because FAO services are free to all member countries, supply is severely constrained by budgetary factors, including the specific purposes attached to extra-budgetary resources.

G. GENDER CONSIDERATIONS

17. Gender considerations span work in all core areas and particular attention has been given to this aspect with appointment of a gender specialist. She has prepared a work programme, including taking part in the meetings at FAO of the technical team in July and participation in a number of country and other follow-up visits. Particular lines of enquiry include assessing the validity and results of implementation of the FAO Gender Plan of Action, which covers, *inter alia*:

- a) gender awareness in the FAO secretariat;
- b) gender balance in the secretariat;
- c) mainstreaming of gender principles in the totality of FAO's work;
- d) appropriate attention to the significance of gender in all of FAO activities including the Governing Bodies; and
- e) partnering and appropriate division of work in the multilateral system for gender awareness and gender action in agriculture, food security and rural development.

H. ADMINISTRATION, MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

18. The six-person Administration, Management and Organization team was recruited in the course of May 2006 and consists, *inter alia*, of specialists in human resources, incentives and

compensation, budgeting, finance and audit, Information and Communication Technology, and knowledge management. Since then:

- a) The full team met in Rome during the week 29/5-2/6 and established the details of its work plan and timetable. As part of this, the team met as a whole with all relevant Division Directors in FAO, their senior colleagues, the chairs of the Group of 77, regional groups, the Finance Committee and some Programme Co-ordinators from FAO technical departments. Individual follow-up meetings were also held. As a result, the team was able to obtain perspectives and perceptions on main issues, challenges, data availability and aspirations for the IEE, to arrive at its shared workplan and timetable and to formulate individual workplans.
- b) A framework to evaluate FAO's human resources management and procurement practices and performance was developed and is currently being applied. This has included in-depth semi-structured interviews and/or meetings with all FAO supervisory and managerial staff in the Human Resources Division, the relevant staff working on the new HR management model, the Shared Service Centre (SSC) and Purchasing Branch (AFSP).
- c) A similar exercise to the one mentioned above on Human Resources and Procurement took place in early September for the budget function.
- d) An initial examination of a selection of audit reports has been conducted and follow-up work is being planned.
- e) For comparator (benchmarking¹¹) purposes, discussions have been held and the required arrangements have either been made or are in process with WHO, UNESCO, OECD and the IMF. Additional collaborative work arrangements have been established with the UN Joint Inspection Unit, the UN System's High Level Committee for Management, and the International Computing Centre.
- f) Two processes have been identified for detailed comparative mapping (benchmarking) between FAO and the comparator institutions, namely the budget process and the recruitment/appointments process. The baseline statistical comparators for FAO have been determined and initial work has been done on two out of the four selected comparators.
- g) AMO team members have, thus far, joined in visits to three FAO country offices (Mexico, Niger, Burkina Faso) and one Regional Office (Accra) in order to examine administrative, organizational and management issues at field level.
- h) 23 focus groups will have been completed by the end of October covering over 150 staff, with each focus group having two hours of structured discussion.
- i) The staff survey referred to previously in this report was sent out in September.
- j) As a global knowledge institution, FAO is one of the oldest. In close consultation with the technical team, work is underway to map the ways knowledge flows in and out of the FAO, how information and data are transformed into value-added knowledge internally, and to identify the strong and weak points of the knowledge management process, including FAO's ability to facilitate the dissemination of the work of other organisations.

19. The main issues and questions indicated in the Inception Report remain valid and these are serving as the foundation for all survey and interviews to date and those to be effected over

¹¹ It is important to be clear on what is meant by the term 'benchmarking'. The term as mainly applied in business and industry entails the establishment of rigorously agreed standards (e.g. ISO) against which organisations may benchmark themselves or be benchmarked by others. In the case of FAO and other public international organisations, including the multilateral development banks where considerable effort has been expended, however, such agreed standards generally do not exist. Thus, the benchmarking in this study will apply the more eclectic type of benchmarking that has become generally accepted practice in evaluations of this type. It will seek to compare and contrast the FAO across a wide range of indicators in relation to other reasonably similar organisations.

the next three months. By the end of January 2007, the team aims to produce its first set of analytical reports, to include:

- a) Budget and programming – This will review the current strengths and weaknesses of the budget process for both regular and extra-budgetary resources, including the nature of policy discourse with member states, the effectiveness and adequacy of indicators and utility and value in applied performance measurement for Results-based Management.
- b) Finance – The transparency and effectiveness of the FAO financial management and controls structure relative to that of other comparator organizations.
- c) Audit – The adequacy of coverage of the FAO audit function, its systems and instruments for verification and validation and its independence as compared to those of other organizations, and indicators of its effectiveness in the management and governance of FAO.
- d) Human resources – The effectiveness, transparency and equity of FAO's human resource policies; and the extent to which those policies allow the Organization to flexibly secure the human resources of the quality it requires to meet changing needs at the lowest cost, while contributing to a positive working environment.
- e) General Administration – The adequacy, relative efficiency and cost structures of the main administrative processes of FAO, how these compare and contrast with those of the other Rome-based agencies and the possibilities for and risks involved in different configurations of shared services between the three agencies.
- f) Knowledge Management – The flow of knowledge within FAO from planning and production through distribution, together with the views of end-users as to value and utility will be tracked and reported. Indicators of efficiency and effectiveness will also be sought.

I. GOVERNANCE

20. During the week of 8-14 May, initial fact-finding interviews on FAO governance issues were conducted in Rome. During that period, the governance team leader also attended meetings of the Programme, Finance and Joint Committees and their joint session. Immediately following endorsement of the Inception Report in May, the services of three core members were contracted and arrangements made for additional specialized guidance and selected peer reviews by two governance advisors. Since then, the following activities have been performed:

- a) An extensive effort in data collection and analysis has taken place and is continuing. This includes academic and business studies literature, as well as more specific studies and evaluations of governance issues and problems of multilateral institutions. This is a vast and fast-evolving field, with new notions and assessments of 'good governance' and 'best practices' emerging on a regular basis. Work is continuing to analyse and synthesize the literature in order that its relevance to FAO may then be systematically assessed.
- b) Two additional visits to Rome have been made, including:
 - i) A detailed work planning meeting of the full governance team (14-20 June) along with a round of semi-structured interviews. At this meeting, the team defined and agreed on the range of key issues and questions to be addressed, a methodology and common approach to address them and an overall work programme. Questionnaire instruments were designed and an analysis launched on the nature, quality, pattern and clarity of FAO governing body decision-making;
 - ii) 2-5 July to coordinate country visits and overall work programme with the Team Leader and other Core Team Members.
- c) As part of the visits indicated above, interviews specifically on governance issues have been held with the Director-General and his deputy, all heads of FAO Departments and Divisions, the Chair of the Council, the Chairs and several

Members of Programme and Finance Committees, the Chair of the Group of 77, the Chairs and members of Regional Groups, other members of the FAO Council, the Secretaries to several FAO Committees, a range of high level staff (both active and retired) and other relevant stakeholders and researchers on governance matters. An initial visit was made to the Latin American Regional Office, principally with a view to gathering assessments of region-wide issues confronting FAO and their possible implications for FAO governance.

21. A number of key questions and issues have emerged from the many interviews indicated above. These include both global governance concerns and those that relate to the internal governance of FAO. For example, questions have been raised about FAO's proper place in the governance of global issues of food and agriculture in a much changed external environment. These have been coupled with concerns over how to meet a large range of new agriculture and nutrition challenges, opportunities and threats to the well-being of poor people and poor countries. These include coping with the shifting requirements for successful trading and access to markets, the dominance of the private sector in the codes, standards and norms that affect international agricultural trade, access to the knowledge and science required for effective policy choices, the role of TRIPS and intellectual property rights in general, etc. Given this situation, what is the proper role for the FAO, and is the governance structure appropriate to this global responsibility?

22. At the more detailed level, a range of questions have been raised about the appropriateness and effectiveness of the existing structures of the Governing Bodies of FAO, how these compare and perform relative to those of other international organizations, including other specialized agencies of the United Nations, and whether a range of suggested changes would enhance the prestige, efficiency and effectiveness of the FAO.

23. The work plan of the governance group that was prepared and agreed during its meeting in the week of June 14 focuses on this dual configuration of issues. A full range of structured and semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, focus group discussions and comparative analysis is part of that work plan. Questions have also been identified for both developing and developed country visits. The work programme will also undertake:

- a) Specific case studies of FAO governance in selected areas, as indicated earlier in this report.
- b) A carefully triangulated review and assessment of the relationship between governance and management.
- c) An assessment of the governance implications for the functions and organization of the Regional Offices in the light of the decentralization process.
- d) An analysis of coherence between governance and financial budgeting will attempt to illuminate the extent to which different patterns of funding allocations (especially core and extra budgetary funding) determine the organization's objectives and priorities.
- e) An examination is underway into the appropriateness of the structure and roles of the Governing Bodies of FAO, as defined in the Basic Texts, to current functions, practices and realities.

J. ASSESSMENT OF THE EVALUATION FUNCTION IN FAO

24. Another cross-cutting area being given attention by the IEE is an assessment of the evaluation function in FAO. This function serves both Governance oversight and organizational learning in the Organization's work. A review will examine all aspects of evaluation, including its contribution to policy-setting, efficiency and programme effectiveness and how it compares and contrasts with the evaluation function in other multilateral organizations.

K. FAO IN THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM

25. The multilateral system team is composed of three highly experienced individuals with varied backgrounds and experience in senior positions in government, international organizations and academia.

26. The team met as a group in Rome during the first ten days of July. In addition to the formulation and launching of the mapping exercise, the team interviewed FAO staff, determined its specific scope of work and division of labour, including how and where its members would integrate into the field visits, and planned its logistics. Work is well underway.

27. The IEE must take account of the vast changes that have occurred in the international environment since the FAO was created over 60 years ago. An overview paper is being prepared which will describe this changing global landscape and the nature of FAO's relationships with the many new players that have emerged as partners and competitors. It will reflect on the changing nature of the issues being confronted and the clash between old and new paradigms, and then assess how well the FAO fits in this new landscape.

28. In recognition of this and with an aim to ensure relevance, work is underway to map the main organizations working in the areas of FAO's mandate, to assess respective roles and relative comparative advantage and to arrive at a typology that may serve as a guide to policy and strategic choices. The approach and framework for this mapping exercise have been described above.

29. The team will also prepare a landscape paper on the changing UN system and FAO's participation in it at the global, Rome-based and country levels. This will include an assessment of the impact on FAO of recent ongoing and potential UN Reforms, and FAO's role in that process. Moreover, the team will seek to determine how FAO is perceived by other members of the UN family, including reflections on the quality and value of its participation in system-wide coherence efforts. Special attention will be paid to FAO's interaction with IFAD and WFP.

30. As the foregoing synopsis makes clear, a great deal has been accomplished during the ten weeks since the presentation and endorsement of the Inception Report at the end of May. Vast amounts of material have been reviewed, analyzed and synthesized against standard evaluation criteria, including relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. Interviews and focus group discussions have been held with approximately 300 individuals. The evaluation framework outlined in the Inception Report has served as a solid and steady guide to: the recruitment of specialist consultants to work within the four core teams and on the country reviews; define detailed methodologies to develop work plans of essential activities; and prepare questionnaire and survey instruments. Country selection has occurred and technical country and other assessments have already begun and are scheduled for completion before the end of the year. Arrangements have been put in place or are being put in place to conduct extensive comparisons (benchmarking) against a substantial number of other institutions.

31. In essence, therefore, the IEE is well on track and working to the schedule provided in the Inception Report. This is not to suggest that there are not continuing risks, including those described in the Inception Report. This remains an exceptionally ambitious undertaking, indeed one that is without precedent in its aspirations; and it is being compressed into an exceedingly - indeed almost impossible - time frame. It is already clear that the depth of individual country reviews that would otherwise have been desirable, including some selective new technical probing in selected areas, will not be possible. As existing evidence in many areas and on many activities is already known to be limited, this situation will restrict the extent to which evidence-based knowledge can be presented for those areas. It is also evident that the time constraints coupled with the extent of demands on core team members have restricted, and will continue to restrict, the number of opportunities to work directly together and that much of the coordination and integration will need to continue to be done through virtual means, and this, too, is not without risks.

32. Finally, however, there are the new risks that have arisen as a consequence of the frailty of human health. A new Team Leader is being sought and must soon be appointed, as my health has become precarious and my priority must be to focus on its recovery and follow medical counsel.

33. While every effort has been made to prevent this unforeseen factor from creating a cost overrun to the budget, it now appears likely that some additional resources will be required to cover the costs of recruitment, transition and additional support to myself during the recent months, as well as unforeseen requirements for core team meetings to brief my successor. This situation will thus be re-examined once the transition is complete and a new team leader appointed.

Keith Bezanson

10 September 2006

On behalf of the IEE Core Team

ANNEX V: PROPOSAL OF THE CC-IEE ON INTER-SESSIONAL MEETINGS OF FRIENDS OF THE CHAIR TO ASSIST THE COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS ON THE INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF FAO (IEE)

1) Recalling:

- a) the report of the ISWG for the IEE¹² as approved by the Council and Conference in November 2005, which stated in paragraph 23:

“The Council will receive the final report of the IEE together with the response of the Director-General. The Council may decide (if necessary, even during the course of the evaluation) on whether it would wish any organ(s) of the Council to comment on the process of the evaluation and available findings and recommendations and advise the Council, prior to, or after the discussion of the final evaluation report by the Council itself.”

- b) the decisions of the Council and the Conference in November 2005 which insisted upon timely outputs from the IEE to allow the Governing Bodies to make use of the findings in reaching decisions in November 2007;

- Conference Resolution 6/2005 – Reforms in the Organization, stated:

“Looking forward to the results of the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO as a guide to enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Organization; and stressing that the IEE and the reform proposals should be mutually supportive”;

- c) the terms of reference and mandate of the CC-IEE have limited its role to oversight of the quality, independence and objectivity of the IEE process¹³.

2) The CC-IEE thus suggests to the Council that it may wish to invite its Independent Chairperson to informally convene, as he considers necessary between Council sessions, Friends of the Chair with appropriate regional representation. The Friends of the Chair, without prejudice to the work of the standing committees of the Council, would discuss, in preparation for Council sessions, issues pertaining to follow-up to the IEE. This may include inter alia consideration of:

- a) findings conclusions and recommendations of the IEE, as contained in the emerging issues paper to be completed in April 2007 and the drafts and final report expected from July 2007;
- b) management response(s) of the Director-General to the IEE findings, conclusions and recommendations of the IEE; and
- c) the interface between the IEE recommendations, reforms being undertaken in FAO, and reform in the UN System as a whole as it relates to FAO.

3) Meetings of the Friends of the Chair would be open to all members of the Organization with a core group of representatives per region. The Director-General would be invited to designate a representative to present his views. Essential documents would be made available in all languages. In view of the very major budgetary constraints and the flexible and collegiate nature of the Friends of the Chair, members are invited to limit meetings with interpretation in line with the support which can be provided within the Regular Programme Budget of the Organization.

¹² CL129/10 paragraph 23

¹³ CL 129/10 para 18

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AFSP	Procurement Service
AMO	Administration Management and Organization
BIS	Bank for International Settlements
CC-IEE	Council Committee for the Independent External Evaluation of FAO
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
EIB	European Investment Bank
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAO-CP	FAO/World Bank Cooperative Programme
GEF	The Global Environment Facility
GSP	Generalised System of Preferences
HLCM	High-level Committee on Management
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IAPSO	Inter-Agency Procurement Services Office
ICSC	International Civil Service Commission
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IEE	Independent External Evaluation of FAO
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IICA	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
IUCN	World Conservation Union
JIU	Joint Inspection Unit
LDC	Least Developed Countries
MDG	Millennium development goal information tool
MTP	Medium-Term Plan

NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OED	Operations Evaluation Department
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PWB	Programme of Work and Budget
RBM	Results-Based Management
SSC	Shared Services Centre
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme
TORs	Terms of Reference
TRIPS	Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
Unesco	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
WAICENT	World Agricultural Information Centre
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization