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Executive Summary

Introduction

1. This is the final evaluation of the ‘Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics’ (GSARS), also referred to as ‘Global Strategy’. The project was implemented between August 2012 and December 2018 with funding of USD 44.07 million from the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and the Italian Cooperation. The Global Office of Global Strategy was hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

2. This evaluation assessed the progress made in achieving programme objectives, taking into account progress reported as well as the shortcomings/concerns raised in the mid-term evaluation report. Furthermore, the evaluation identified lessons learned from programme implementation that can be applied to the programme’s second phase, including operating models, priority areas, partnership arrangements and financial models. Finally, the evaluation examined the extent to which normative values such as gender equality and disadvantaged groups, including youths and women, were mainstreamed.

3. This evaluation used a consultative and transparent approach involving internal and external stakeholders throughout the process. The initial findings were validated with stakeholders at various levels with evidence, which was gathered through different methods and sources, triangulated to prepare findings and strengthen conclusions. A mixed-method approach to data collection was employed. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation were presented at the 17th Global Steering Committee (GSC) and at the final conference for Global Strategy (14–16 November 2018).

Main findings

4. Key contributing factors to the achievement of results included flexible resource partners, a strong Global Office team, institutional commitment and support at a regional level from the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO RAP), and partnership with regional statistical institutions among others. Hindering factors included inability to report and show evidence, remote disconnection of the African Development Bank (AfDB)/FAO country offices in Africa. There is enhanced coordination between Ministry of Agriculture and National Statistics Office (NSO) but a lack of awareness about Global Strategy and its contribution remains, which could affect resource mobilization.

5. Project governance served its purpose but had a complex structure and mechanism for decision-making. Staffing issues affected implementation and institutionalization. In spite of advocacy, communication and dissemination efforts, Global Strategy was largely unknown beyond its primary stakeholders. National coordination mechanisms were set-up in several countries but they may have to be revitalized for future use.

6. The Strategic Plan for Agricultural and Rural Statistics (SPARS) development was 38 percent (of the 40 targeted countries) in Africa and 80 percent (of the 20 targeted countries) in Asia-Pacific. Completed SPARS were integrated into the National Strategy for the Development of Statistics (NSDS); however, they were not aligned to NSDS and/or sector/national development plan cycles. In most countries, the endorsement of SPARS
by government takes a long time but it has been more effective and systematic in the Asia-Pacific region.

7. Global Strategy met or exceeded the intended outputs of its research component. Work was completed on 45 research topics and 16 research themes. A total of 119 documents, including guidelines, handbooks and training materials, were produced. Still, a more inclusive process in identifying topics in a wider agricultural-rural nexus is needed for better policy linkage and resource mobilization. A total of 99 technical assistance initiatives on a combination of cost-effective methodologies were provided in 46 countries with Computer-assisted Personal Interview (CAPI), Cost of Production (COP), Master Sampling Framework (MSF) and Food Balance Sheet (FBS) as the leading topics. Technical assistance has been critical for the uptake of cost-effective methodologies.

8. A total of 82 countries (53 in Africa and 29 in Asia-Pacific) benefitted from the training component – a total of 960 participants. 79 emerging agricultural statisticians in 40 countries benefitted from scholarship initiatives. Statistical institutes in Africa have been strengthened to provide training and technical assistance. Although there was evidence of increased knowledge and skills, evidence of institutionalization and use of capacity to produce data was still nascent. In fact, whilst Agricultural and Rural Integrated Survey (AGRIS) has been integrated fully into FAO for roll-out, it has only been launched and tested in one country (Ghana).

9. SPARS implementation is vital for the continued functionality of the national coordination mechanism. Endorsement by government and integration of SPARS with NSDs, sector/national development plans and national investment plans are important to ensure adequate budget for SPARS implementation. Demand-driven, timely technical assistance is required for the uptake of cost-effective methodologies/tools. In addition to research, data production, dissemination and use will be the ultimate indicator for the institutionalization of cost-effective methodologies/tools.

10. Global Strategy complemented and contributed to the respect of UN normative values of gender equality and in particular youth and female empowerment. Evidence could be seen from Global Strategy’s research work on youth, technical report/guidelines on gender-disaggregated data, scholarship initiatives empowering young women and men and a higher proportion of female participation in scholarship initiatives and training/workshops when compared to the proportion of women currently working in the statistics profession.

Conclusions

11. Global Strategy has raised the profile of agricultural and rural statistics globally, especially in Africa and Asia-Pacific. On a practical level, it has been instrumental in integrating agricultural and rural statistics systems into national statistical systems. However, it is largely unknown beyond its primary stakeholders despite its contribution as the largest-ever global effort to improve sustainable agricultural and rural statistics in developing countries.

12. SPARS is a key document providing policy focus and a framework for national governments to produce and use good quality agricultural and rural statistics. Ensuring linkage between statistical and policy work requires building the capacity of policymakers in using data for more informed decision-making.

13. Global Strategy’s initial efforts to provide technical assistance (TA) on cost-effective (CE) methodologies have shown some early evidence of uptake and use but continuous
support is required for ensuring a sustained statistical development process in countries. Intended results have been affected by a lack of accountability and appropriate capacity within implementing partners. However, updating agricultural and rural statistics will not take 20-25 years if there is a concerted/coordinated effort and a commitment of resources under a global platform.

14. At a grassroots level, simple initiatives, such as the scholarship and Masters’ programmes in Agricultural Statistics, are providing sustainable capacities in institutions and stakeholders. The drive for UN normative values of gender equality and, in particular, youth and female empowerment, Global Strategy has proven effective with higher participation of both groups than numbers currently working in the sector.

**Recommendations**

15. This report makes eight recommendations, the first of which is that the Globaly Strategy should be expanded to other regions to be truly global, as currently it is only in two regions. Moreover, Global Strategy should be supported for a longer period to sustain and build on improvements made in agricultural and rural statistics with a horizon at least until 2030, aligned with the Sustainable Development Goal’s (SDGs) time frame, split into two phases\(^1\) - one to consolidate and expand and the other to fine-tune and exit.

16. SPARS (process/development/implementation) should be supported to establish itself as a practical planning document guiding the integration of agricultural and statistical activities into the national development process. In addition to the endorsement of SPARS by the government, alignment of the SPARS cycle to NSDS, sector and national development plans, national agricultural investment plan cycles and development partner cycles is critical for national ownership and sustainability. This linkage should be internalized in SPARS design to ensure implementation and the use of data collected through cost-effective methodologies.\(^2\) Handholding to ensure a sustained statistical development process and use could be provided by a development partner in the country.

17. Focussed demand-driven technical assistance on cost-effective methodologies should continue by ensuring a more inclusive approach to identify research topics for cost-effective methodology development to facilitate uptake and use. Timing and need for technical assistance in a country will be crucial for institutionalization. Linkage of the need/demand and SPARS should be established, as applicable. Technical assistance should include a blend of cost-effective methodologies developed in the first phase and be at a country level. Country readiness to implement the cost-effective methodology as immediately as possible should be a key criteria for selecting countries for technical assistance. Inclusiveness should be two-pronged – in terms of people/region and topics.

18. In addition to agriculture (crops), it is important to look at rural as well as other aspects of agriculture, such as forestry, fisheries, environment, post-harvest losses and emerging topics and technology.\(^3\) Receiving inputs on regional needs and gaps (from the regions) to identify research topics will increase the relevance of topics for which cost-effective

---

\(^1\) Phase II and III.

\(^2\) IdCA should be promoted in more countries as first step to develop SPARS.

\(^3\) Global Strategy should tap into and strengthen collaborations with other FAO divisions – on forestry, fisheries, etc. (beyond FAO ESS which is more focussed on crops and livestock).
methodologies/tools are produced and are likely to increase uptake and use. Furthermore, Global Strategy should put more focussed effort on mainstreaming gender and youth issues because these have important connections to the growth of the agricultural and rural development sector.

19. Shifting/expanding focus from data generation to data use. Develop the capacity of policymakers to use data for decision-making. Utilization of data for information programmes and policy development will be the ultimate success of Global Strategy. Building capacity on the utilization of data for development planning and on the cost of data generation and maintenance will help countries to make realistic investment decisions on national statistics in areas that are most critical to their development needs.

20. Develop and implement a strategic advocacy, communication and dissemination plan to improve awareness about Global Strategy activities and success across countries. At country level, in addition to the government, there are development partners, civil society, producer organizations and private sector funding and/or management programmes/projects in the food system. Agriculture and rural statistics also extends into health, environment and gender aspects/domains. Many of them are users of data.

21. Globally advocating and highlighting success stories at various high-level forums/committees on a regular basis could help attract funding. Furthermore, the Plan should address the issue of creating awareness in the country offices of partners. Global Strategy could also act as a more effective knowledge sharing hub/portal.\textsuperscript{4} Having partners provide a link to the Global Strategy website would enhance traffic in addition to social media presence. Better linkage of methodologies to official statistics modernization initiatives\textsuperscript{5} could enhance visibility and use of data.

22. Efficient models of training in Global Strategy should be scaled up. Capacitating statistical institutes and selected universities in various regions will help deliver training more efficiently with better adaptation to the regional context. This will also facilitate training being offered in a greater number of languages. Scholarship initiative should be scaled-up in Africa and replicated in other regions, as appropriate.

23. Ensure continued but enhanced involvement and contribution from FAO as a technical partner at various levels (especially at regional, subregional and country levels for the short-term and long-term sustainability of improvements made in agricultural statistics). This could include facilitation of SPARS implementation and development of SPARS II. FAO decentralized offices could play a key role in supporting the continued use of the updated methodologies and tools to collect and use data.

24. Revisit and fine-tune existing business model. Push for a simple governance and programme management mechanism. This could include having only one decision-making and monitoring body at global level. The Global Office should manage the programme with accountability and authority to monitor implementation. Regions could have multiple implementing partners but all of them should report to the Global Office with respective plans and budgets. All resource partners’ funding should be through multi-donor trust funding mechanisms. Stronger and frequent monitoring with a feedback mechanism should be set-up, including a results framework with clear

\textsuperscript{4} Multiplier effect as more/wider stakeholders discuss about it.

\textsuperscript{5} https://www.unece.org/stats/mos.html
indicators to measure results at various levels, output, outcome (immediate and intermediate) and impact.

25. Global Strategy should continue its three components - technical assistance, training and research. The key focus should be on regional and national capacity building to produce and use data. Research could have a reduced focus but should continue to develop methodologies on emerging topics and those that have not been updated. Advocacy and communication could become the fourth component.

26. Find alignment with other development partners’ strategic focus by expanding the scope of Global Strategy’s activities beyond the narrowly-defined agriculture one would enhance alignment with other development activities and facilitate resource mobilization. Country-clustering could be either on the basis of need/demand or by subregion, to develop initiatives. Aligning to subregional economic plans should also be explored. Use champion states (preferably from the same region) for peer support and South-South cooperation. The involvement of regional economic bodies and institutions should be considered for broader influence (including political) and having a presence in regional initiatives such as CAADP\(^6\) and SHaSA\(^7\).

---


1 Introduction

1. This is the final evaluation report of the ‘Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics’ (GSARS; also referred to in the report as ‘Global Strategy’) – MTF/GLO/373/MUL. Global Strategy’s\(^8\) Global Office was hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and was implemented between August 2012 and December 2018\(^9\) with funding from the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and the Italian Cooperation.

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

2. The final evaluation at the end of the first phase of Global Strategy was planned to serve the twin purpose of accountability and learning; at the same time, to inform the planning and development of the second phase. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the results of Global Strategy at national and regional levels, as well as their value and relevance to targeted beneficiaries, national needs and priorities, in addition to identifying lessons learned for future interventions on agricultural and rural statistics.

3. The primary audience and users of the evaluation are expected to be the Global Steering Committee (including FAO and resource partners), the Global Office (GO) of the Global Strategy, regional implementing partners, national and regional counterparts, academia/research institutes involved in the programme and development partners.

1.2 Scope and objective of the evaluation

4. Scope: The evaluation was envisaged to cover the work of GSARS at a global, regional and country level with a focus on the period following the mid-term evaluation (MTE)\(^{10}\) – January 2016 to September 2018. The final evaluation specifically paid attention to assessing results achieved at a global, regional and country level, including their sustainability and replicability. The evaluation also identified useful lessons learned during the second phase planning and implementation and the future work of FAO on food, agriculture and rural statistics. The evaluation assessed all three components of Global Strategy – research, training and technical assistance. The geographical scope of the evaluation was global. Country missions were undertaken in the Africa and Asia-Pacific regions (see methodology section for more details).

5. Objectives: The objectives of the evaluation were to: i) assess the progress made in achieving the programme objectives, taking into account the progress reported as

\(^{8}\) Global Strategy is an international partnership.

\(^{9}\) The original time frame was from March 2012 to December 2016. Due to a slow start, the timeframe was extended to December 2017, as noted in the Mid-term Evaluation (p.20) and further extended at no-cost to December 2018.

\(^{10}\) The MTE was conducted between June and December 2015.
well as shortcomings/concerns raised in the mid-term evaluation; ii) identify lessons learned from programme implementation that can be applied to the second phase of the programme, including the operating model, priority areas, partnership arrangements and financial models; and iii) examine the extent to which normative values such as gender equality and disadvantaged groups, such as youths and women, were mainstreamed.\(^{11}\)

6. The evaluation addressed the following key evaluation questions to respond to the evaluation objectives (See Box 1).\(^{12}\)

**Box 1: Key Evaluation Questions**

1. What results, intended and unintended, has Global Strategy achieved under its stated objectives?
2. How sustainable are Global Strategy’s achieved results in terms of national awareness, ownership, uptake and use of cost-effective methodologies, knowledge, transfer, enabling environment creation, resource partners’ support, partnerships and coordination?
3. To what extent has Global Strategy promoted UN normative values, gender equality issues in particular, and contributed to youth and women empowerment throughout its implementation?
4. What factors have contributed to or hindered the achievement of expected results?
5. What are the key lessons learned from Global Strategy’s implementation that can help the second phase and future FAO work in statistics?

### 1.3 Methodology

7. Overall, the evaluation adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards\(^ {13}\) while being guided by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) Manual\(^ {14}\) and FAO Policy on Gender Equality,\(^ {15}\) to address the key evaluation questions. The evaluation used a consultative and transparent approach and involved internal and external stakeholders throughout the process. The initial findings were validated with stakeholders at various levels with evidence gathered through different methods whilst sources were triangulated to arrive at findings and strengthen conclusions.

8. A mixed-method approach was used to collect data/information, as a best practice, to aid in the triangulation of evidence.

---


\(^{15}\) [http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf)
a. A desk review of available documents and reports was completed to understand the context, project background and structure, as well as identify reported progress against key intended results and key achievements (see Appendix 3 for a complete list of documents reviewed).

b. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants and stakeholders at a national, regional and global level to gather diverse perspectives and insights on various aspects of Global Strategy. This included Global Strategy team members at various levels, the FAO Statistics Division (ESS) Director and key staff, other implementing partner representatives, resource partners, selected Global Steering Committee (GSC)/Global Executive Board (GEB) members, national stakeholders from ministries of agriculture, national statistical offices (NSO) and training institutes, development partners at country level and relevant FAO staff at various levels. Appropriate interview guides were developed to interview various stakeholders. Interviews and consultations were conducted in-person where feasible and by Skype (see Appendix 2 for the complete list of the stakeholders interviewed).

c. Online surveys were developed and implemented to reach out to scholarship recipients (in the Africa region) and to training/workshop participants (in Africa and Asia-Pacific regions) to gather data from a broader range of national stakeholders to better understand the relevance, results and impact of Global Strategy, specifically with regard to national capacity building.

d. Results at a national level were assessed through country visits in the Africa region (Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Mali and Tanzania) and in the Asia-Pacific region (Bangladesh, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Thailand) and also through Skype interviews in Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Senegal and Zambia (see Appendix 1 for the list of people/organizations consulted in each country).

9. Evaluation missions in Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Mali and Tanzania (16-27 July 2018) and in Bangladesh, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Thailand (1-12 September 2018) were undertaken. Visits in Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia and Thailand also enabled the evaluation team to conduct in-person-consultations with implementing partners - African Development Bank (AfDB), United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO RAP) and UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UN ESCAP).

16 This includes ministries of agriculture, food, livestock, fisheries, aquaculture and forestry.
17 SurveyMonkey was used.
18 Scholarship survey response rate was 48.1 percent (38/79). The scholarship component was only implemented in Africa by UNECA. Of the respondents, 28.9 percent were women.
19 Training participants’ survey response rate was 28.6 percent (186/650).
20 As mentioned in the TOR of this evaluation, the selection criteria for countries were: a) increase the number of countries visited as compared to MTE; b) assess the advancements in a focus country compared to the MTE; and c) allow evaluators to appreciate the extent of assistance provided by FAO regional offices and GS impact at national level policies and technical capacities.
10. Furthermore, the evaluation team consulted with Global Strategy Global Office team and selected the FAO Statistics Division (ESS) key staff and briefed the GSC in Rome, Italy (12-13 July 2018).21 A debriefing was done at the end of each country mission. Missions and meetings were arranged and coordinated through the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) and FAO representations in the countries.

1.4 Limitations

11. The long implementation period (2012-2018) of Global Strategy meant that there were turnover of champions and key stakeholders. Furthermore, the timing of evaluation meant that some stakeholders were away during the time of the mission. The evaluation team made efforts through FAO representations (country offices) to identify alternate persons for discussions. Assistance provided by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED), FAO representations in the countries and the Global Office helped overcome challenges in identifying stakeholders and having field missions organized, in what was on a project implemented by multiple agencies and spread over two continents.

12. For a final evaluation for a project of this scope, budget proved to be a constraint considering the number of days spent in a country (two to three days) and the number of sample countries to be visited. However, the lessons and results from the sample countries visited present valuable directions for the next phase. The evaluation also conducted Skype interviews in selected additional countries to get inputs from national stakeholders.

13. The availability of data on outcomes from training conducted under Global Strategy was a constraint. This was mitigated to an extent through online surveys and also through specifically focused questions during consultations in the country. Although the limited response rate was identified as a risk/limitation in the Terms of Reference (TOR), two reminders on each of the survey and specific follow-up efforts by UNECA with statistical institutes for the “scholarship survey” in Africa helped the evaluation team to achieve higher response rates on both surveys (see methodology section on online surveys).

1.5 Structure of the report

14. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 presents the background and context; Chapter 3 presents the evaluation questions and key findings, followed by lessons learned in Chapter 4 and conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 5.

---

21 The briefing to GSC (16th meeting on 12 July 2018) was by teleconference.
2 Background and context

15. This section provides an overall understanding of Global Strategy and the developmental context in which it was implemented.

2.1 Context of the project

16. The Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics (GSARS or Global Strategy) was developed after an extensive consultation process by the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) with national and international statistical organizations, NSOs, ministries of agriculture\(^2\) and other governmental institutions producing statistics. Global Strategy was endorsed by FAO (36th Session, 2009), the African Commission on Agricultural Statistics (AFCAS, 2009), the Asia and Pacific Commission on Agricultural Statistics (APCAS, 2010), the UNSC (41st Session, 2010) and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) Committee on Statistics (2nd Session, 2010).

17. Global Strategy was conceived at a time when agricultural statistics (including livestock, fisheries, forestry and aquaculture) faced multiple challenges. Old methodologies were used but most of them had not been updated in more than 20-25 years. Additionally, many developing countries lacked the capacity to provide reliable statistical data on food and agriculture. There was a great need for technical assistance, capacity building and a blueprint for long-term sustainable agricultural and rural statistical systems.

18. The Global Action Plan (GAP)\(^2\) which guided the implementation of Global Strategy, defined the core components of work – technical assistance, training and research – as well as the governance mechanism. The GAP targeted to reach 90 countries in five regions - 40 in Africa, 20 in Asia-Pacific, 20 in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), 5 in the Near East and 5 in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Regional action plans were developed ensuring alignment with global framework and adaptation to regional context and needs.\(^2\) The GAP was managed and implemented by Global Strategy’s Global Office (GO), hosted by the FAO Statistics Division (ESS).

19. The Global Office was responsible for delivering the research agenda, producing guidelines and training materials and for the overall coordination of the

---

\(^2\) This includes ministry of livestock, food, aquaculture, fisheries and forestry.

\(^2\) GAP (http://www.fao.org/docrep/016/i3082e/i3082e.pdf) was prepared by FAO and the World Bank in collaboration with the UNSC “Friends of the Chair” working group.

\(^2\) The regional action plans in Africa (http://www.fao.org/docrep/016/am084e/am084e.pdf) and in Asia-Pacific (http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3586e.pdf) were funded and implemented under the Global Strategy. However, in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) (http://gsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/LAC-Region-Implementation-Plan-2013-2017.pdf) and in Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) (http://gsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/CIS-Region-Implementation-Plan.pdf), Global Strategy funded only the preparation of plans through funds from the Italian Cooperation. No regional action plan was completed for Near East region, although efforts were taken. It must also be noted that the regional action plan for Africa was done before the GAP.
Implementation of Global Strategy. At the regional level, the work (currently only in Africa and Asia-Pacific) was carried out by regional implementation partners – African Development Bank (AfDB), UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), FAO RAP and UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific/Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP/SIAP) - see Table 1.\textsuperscript{25}

Regional implementing partners provided technical assistance and training in the regions. Since 2016, Global Office has also been involved in providing technical assistance in Africa, along with AfDB, as part of Accelerated TA.

**Table 1: Implementing partners and GSARS components\textsuperscript{26}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Research*</th>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Global Office (GO)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AfDB/GO\textsuperscript{+}</td>
<td>UNECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>FAORAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCAP/SIAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} Since 2016 GO provided technical assistance in Africa

\textsuperscript{2} Asian Development Bank (ADB) contributed to Global Strategy by conducting research using its own resources in the Asia-Pacific region

20. The budget envisaged to implement Global Strategy as per GAP was USD 83.8 million.\textsuperscript{27} However, as of May 2018, Global Strategy had mobilized a total of USD 44.07 million for the implementation of activities at global level (research) and in the two regions (technical assistance and training) – Africa and Asia-Pacific. DFID (USD 28.76 million), BMGF (USD 15.11 million) and the Italian Cooperation (USD 0.2 million) were the three resource partners for Global Strategy. Table 2 presents the funding provided by each resource partner to Global Strategy by year. The resources were managed by FAO acting as fund administrator through the establishment of a Multi-donor Trust Fund (MTF).

**Table 2: Funding by year and resource partner (in USD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID (62.2%)</td>
<td>6 811 234</td>
<td>10 567 131</td>
<td>5 990 584</td>
<td>3 957 607</td>
<td>1 428 571</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMGF (34.3%)</td>
<td>5 533 618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 587 500</td>
<td>2 993 763</td>
<td>15 114 881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Cooperation (0.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200 000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 344 852</td>
<td>10 767 131</td>
<td>5 990 584</td>
<td>3 957 607</td>
<td>8 016 071</td>
<td>2 993 763</td>
<td>44 070 009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: GSARS Financial Statement – 31 May 2018*

\textsuperscript{25} Donors have funded initiatives (complementing Global Strategy) directly in LAC (by Inter-American Development Bank) and in CIS (by the World Bank) but not through the Global Office/Multi-donor Trust Fund (MTF).

\textsuperscript{26} In the non-funded regions key implementing partners as per the regional action plans (which were not implemented) were – for LAC, it was FAO Regional Office for and FAO Sub-regional Office for the Caribbean for TA and Caribbean Community and Organization of Eastern Caribbean for training; and for CIS, it was CISSTAT for TA and training.

\textsuperscript{27} Revised integrated budget 2013-2017 (June 2015).
21. The allocation of funds to the regions (primarily to Africa and Asia-Pacific) and the Global Office has been based on geographic priorities and preferences indicated in respective resource partner agreements. The overall allocation of financial resources is presented in Figure 1. Less than one percent of the funding went to other regions.

Figure 1: GSARS fund allocation – USD 44.07 million

Source: Global Strategy – June 2018

22. The Global Strategy governance mechanism was multi-tiered and included a Global Steering Committee (GSC), Global Executive Board (GEB) and two regional steering committees (RSCs) – one in Africa and the other in Asia-Pacific. The Global Office and the regional offices (RO) of Global Strategy worked as the Secretariat of the global and regional governing bodies respectively.

23. The GSC was the highest decision-making body providing strategic guidance and oversight on the execution of the GAP. It was comprised of resource partners – DFID, BMGF and the Italian Cooperation – representatives of countries, participating partners, multilateral development banks and UN agencies. The GEB provided policy direction to activities and is a decision-making body between meetings of the GSC.28

24. Global Strategy was a comprehensive framework for improving the collection, the availability and the use of agricultural and rural data (including livestock, aquaculture, small-scale fisheries and forestry) in developing countries that is necessary for evidence-based decision-making. The three foundational pillars of Global Strategy were:

a. establishing a minimum set of core data (MSCD) that countries will collect and disseminate to meet current and emerging demands;

28 GEB was an executive committee of the GSC, which met between meetings of the GSC.
b. better integration of agriculture into national statistical systems to meet the requirements of policymakers, other data users for linked statistical information across economic, social and environmental areas (comparable data across locations and over time); and

c. improving the sustainability of agricultural statistical systems through national governance and statistical capacity building.

25. Although Global Strategy was conceived before the development of Sustainable Development Goals, it was aligned to SDG indicators 2.4.1 and SDG 2.3 (for which FAO is the custodian) and FAO Strategic Objective (SO) 6: Technical Quality, Knowledge and Services.

2.2 The theory of change

26. The logical framework of Global Strategy (Appendix 1) was found to be coherent in terms of its theory of change. Figure 2 presents the simplified theory of change. The causal links between inputs, activities, outputs, outcome (objectives) and the impact (goal) were clearly evident. The framework demonstrated how the lower level results contributed to a higher level. Additionally, the framework also showed the linkages between country/regional activities to global activities and programme outcome (e.g. research component linked to the technical assistance of cost-effective methodologies contributing jointly to the programme outcome).

---

29 The integration is expected to be achieved by implementing a set of methodologies that includes the development of a master sample framework for agriculture, the implementation of an integrated survey framework and with results available in a data management system (GSARS, 2010).

Figure 2: Global Strategy – Theory of Change

Outputs
- Effective governing bodies are setup and functioning at global and regional levels
- Coordinating bodies of the national statistical system, legal frameworks and strategic plans enable the integration of agriculture into the national statistical system
- New cost effective methods for data collection, analysis and dissemination developed
- Increased capacity of agricultural statistics staff in regional training centres and target countries
- Sustainable agricultural integrated surveys implemented in countries

Outcome
- Target countries are enabled to develop sustainable statistical systems for production and dissemination of accurate and timely agricultural and rural statistics, comparable over time and across countries

Impact
- Improved evidence-based decision-making for poverty reduction, increased food security, sustainable agriculture and rural development

Three Pillars
- Produce a minimum set of core data
- Better integrate agriculture into National Statistical Systems
- Sustainability of agricultural statistical systems through national governance and statistical capacity building

Source: Compiled from Global Strategy (See Appendix 1)

27. Output 5 was introduced at the time of the mid-term evaluation. Although Output 5 indicated “sustainable implementation of the Agricultural Integrated Survey (AGRIS) in countries,” the indicator was to develop AGRIS methodology and test in full scale in only one country.

28. It must be noted that all Global Strategy activities and outputs were connected to the three pillars of Global Strategy. Outputs 2-4 were directly linked to the three pillars individually or collectively.

29. Nevertheless, there was a strong need for more refined and better result measurement. Having two levels of outcomes – immediate (short-term) and intermediate (medium-term) could have possibly improved result measurement and reporting. For example:

a. In terms of the national coordination mechanism, the indicator in the results framework measured only “the number of coordination mechanisms in place.” It is a good indicator at the output level (completion of an activity) but there were no metrics to indicate if these mechanisms were formally established and were currently functioning or how frequently they met in various countries. The effective functioning of national coordination mechanisms could have been an immediate outcome for measurement.

31 Approved at the 11th GSC in June 2015.
32 In Cabo Verde, there was a Government Decree (see subsequent discussions).
b. Similarly, while completion of Strategic Plans for the Agricultural and Rural Statistics (SPARS) document could be an output level indicator, integration of SPARS into National Strategies for Development of Statistics (NSDS) and/or endorsement could be an immediate level outcome indicator (result). Furthermore, there was no clarity on what completion of SPARS meant – was it the completion of the draft document/printed document, or obtaining government endorsement? There was also no indicator for the number of countries implementing SPARS (to be considered in the next phase).

c. Research outputs have been measured at output level – “number of research topics, publications, etc. published/presented”. However, as pointed out in the mid-term evaluation, there was a scope to have had better-defined metrics for uptake and use of research to highlight the higher level of results achieved (at the immediate outcome level). This could include web downloads and printed copies distributed at a basic level. Additionally, the production of data using a particular cost-effective methodology in countries could be another metric (for the next phase, currently not measured in the first phase).

d. It was not clear as to why the number of missions should be an indicator as it was part of an activity and did not, in most cases, end in any result. A more effective measurement could have been, for example, “delivery of TA\textsuperscript{33} in a particular cost-effective methodology (say MSF)\textsuperscript{34} (with a target for x number of countries) and not the number of missions.\textsuperscript{35}

30. Areas of improvement suggested during the mid-term review still remain valid for consideration and action for future programming – metrics to measure benefits that have trickled beyond primary training participants, reach and use of publications.

31. The risks identified for each output, outcome and the impact with planned mitigation measures were found to be relevant and valid. The results framework has been revisited to adapt to the realities of the programming a few times during the life of Global Strategy (and approved by GSC).

\textsuperscript{33} TA as per Global Strategy delivery model.

\textsuperscript{34} As pointed out in the mid-term evaluation, achieving the number of missions does not necessarily mean that a development result has been achieved. However, it can reflect the level of effort. Furthermore, missions undertaken may have addressed multiple aspects of Global Strategy - leading to efficiency or double counting missions.

\textsuperscript{35} Cost effectiveness of a TA to a country could be a useful indicator in the future (with a caveat that context and conditions vary country to country).
3 Evaluation Questions: key findings

32. This section presents findings to address each evaluation question.

3.1 Evaluation Question 1: What results, intended and unintended, has Global Strategy achieved under its stated objective?

33. The main findings for this evaluation question have been presented by Global Strategy’s five Outputs and the Outcome based on evidence gathered and triangulated from various relevant sources.

Output 1: Effective governing bodies set-up and functioning at global and regional levels

Main finding 1: Project governance served its purpose and played its role but had a complex structure and mechanism for decision-making. Staffing issues affected the implementation and institutionalization of capacities in the regions. In spite of advocacy, communication and dissemination efforts, Global Strategy was largely unknown beyond its primary stakeholders. There were too many communication plans with not much harmonisation.

34. Global Strategy spent USD 14.61 million, 36 percent of its total spending, for this output which included governance, staffing for implementation, coordination, monitoring and evaluation, as well as communication, advocacy and dissemination.

Governance

35. Since the inception of Global Strategy, a total of 16 Global Steering Committee (GSC), 10 Global Executive Board (GEB) and 15 Regional Steering Committee (RSC) meetings (7 in Africa and 8 in Asia-Pacific) have been held, in addition to five coordination meetings. Discussions highlighted that more frequent meetings in Africa would have been beneficial. The coordination meetings at global level specifically brought the implementation partners together for information sharing and accountability.

36. Discussions with stakeholders at various levels indicated that the governance mechanism served its purpose and played its role. However, in general, it was complex in terms of structure and decision-making, including national stakeholders, enabled building ownership and wider buy-in from countries by rejuvenating the agricultural statistics, especially in developing countries around the world. Global Strategy set-up governance with a good opportunity to listen to countries and a platform to have a level field for development partners and developing countries (compared to the more prevalent donor-driven or top-down approach).

37. Key issues on governance that were noted during various discussions included:

   a. The GSC was very large (with too many members), which led to only about 35 percent of the members regularly participating in the meeting and one-third never participating.
b. The Global Office and implementing partners were part of GSC (as the Secretariat) and RSC (as an observer). However, there were no reporting lines between GSC and RSC\textsuperscript{36} – “it was blurred” as summarized by a key stakeholder. This meant there was no mechanism to push when a region and/or an implementing partner was lagging behind.

c. Lack of effectiveness of reporting and monitoring mechanisms in RSC’s work e.g. changes in work plan without adequately informing GSC.\textsuperscript{37}

d. The inability of RSC to push/take action when an implementing partner was not meeting targets or reporting/sharing information e.g. as in the case of Africa when AfDB had been slow in implementation or failed to share information/outputs (even though RSCs approved work plans).\textsuperscript{38}

e. In the Africa region, AfDB was not able to hire a full-time Regional Coordinator,\textsuperscript{39} which affected coordination, as there was no counterpart in the region for the Global Coordinator and the Global Strategy Regional Office (housed in AfDB) was the secretariat for the RSC.

f. The Global Office was accountable for overall Global Strategy but had no authority beyond Global Office activities.

g. GSC did not have oversight on European Union funding to AfDB, to carry out similar activities to the ones under Multi-donor Trust Funds, although it was the same RSC (in Africa) that approved the work plan for both fundings.\textsuperscript{40} Discussions highlighted issues of transparency at the implementing partner’s level (e.g. AfDB).\textsuperscript{41}

38. Discussions during the evaluation revealed that there was a need to revisit and simplify the governance structure and mechanism with clear guidelines on accountability/authority and reporting.

39. The regional coordination in Asia-Pacific should be seen as a good practice to be replicated in other regions. The mainstreaming of SPARS into the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) activities and inviting UNESCAP/SIAP and ADB to attend apparently gave room for better coordination and information sharing in

\textsuperscript{36} This is highlighted in the governance structure/institutional arrangements – Figure 5 (page 26 mid-term evaluation report of the Global Strategy).
\textsuperscript{37} It must be noted that RSCs functioned differently in Africa and Asia-Pacific.
\textsuperscript{38} Examples include nine months delay in presenting 2016 annual plans, AfDB chairing RSC for the first four years.
\textsuperscript{39} Only a consultant was hired (who performed the role of Regional Coordinator) and at times had gaps between his contracts due to AfDB hiring process and rules.
\textsuperscript{40} A recent PARIS21 report (http://www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/2017-10/PRESS2017_web2.pdf) does not distinguish agricultural statistics from other domains. It only segments, economic, social and environmental and other multi-domain statistics. This is proof that international coordination of funding for statistics (and/or agricultural statistics, in particular) is weak.
\textsuperscript{41} Although the 2018 work plan for Africa indicated the amount from EU funds and MTF funds for various activities. Potentially, RSC in Africa can continue after Global Strategy comes to an end in December 2018.
the region. The high-level commitment and mainstreaming of Global Strategy ensured the involvement of FAO country representations.

Staffing

40. Staffing issues have been highlighted throughout the life of Global Strategy in various reports and also during the discussions on this evaluation. None of the regional implementing partners (AfDB, FAO RAP, SIAP and UNECA) were able to entirely staff the approved and budgeted positions due to respective organizational processes, rules and procedures and this affected Global Strategy implementation in varying degrees, especially for technical assistance and training components in both Africa and Asia-Pacific regions. Consultants were recruited to manage staff positions, which affected the institutionalization of capacities. Some examples of bottlenecks related to recruitment/replacement by implementing partners included:

a. There has been no replacement of Global Strategy Regional Coordinator and the Technical Assistance Statistician for Global Strategy at FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) for the last two years (since 2016). This led to an initial slowing down of activities and new commitments taken. This also led to the direct oversight of Global Strategy Regional Office activities by FAO RAP (during 2017-2018), although the initial set-up saw it to be an independent unit housed within FAO RAP.

b. SIAP was not able to staff the position except for the period between July 2017 and June 2018.

c. AfDB did not staff the planned positions during the entire existence of Global Strategy. However, since 2016, AfDB has been able to retain a core team of consultants – lead consultant (who also acted as the Regional Coordinator), a technical assistance expert and a monitoring and evaluation expert.

d. UNECA was also not able to staff the position until 2017. The turnover of earlier recruitments also hindered continuity.

e. The hiring of consultants was also affected due to the shifting of focus from IdCA/SPARS to technical assistance on cost-effective methodologies, as different skill sets and capacity requirements were needed.

---

42 However, it was reported that these meetings were more frequent in the initial years of Global Strategy as compared to 2017 and 2018.

43 It was noted that the position covered by consultancy assignment in 2017 and a more direct involvement of the Lead Technical Officer of FAO RAP, than was originally envisaged.

44 Indicated by the decline in delivery rates of FAO RAP compared to 2015 (60 percent) and 2016 (88 percent) to 33 percent in 2017.

45 Initially the Regional Office of Global Strategy was set-up (housed within FAO RAP), with the Regional Coordinator having direct link to the Global Office. When the Regional Coordinator position was vacant, there was no counterpart for the Global Coordinator in the region.

46 It was noted that the long-term consultant (acting as Regional Coordinator for Africa) was, in June 2018, hired as a staff by AfDB in one of three agricultural statistician positions funded under the Feed Africa Strategy.
Advocacy, communication and dissemination

41. The Global Office implemented the 2015-2017 Communication Plan. A key ongoing activity as part of the plan were monthly e-bulletins (53)47 with each one sent to about 2 000 persons.

42. At the regional level, the Asia-Pacific region had a communication strategy.48 The Asia-Pacific Global Strategy newsletter was distributed to about 350 persons – there have been 18 issues thus far.49 The region also produced flyers and brochures to promote Global Strategy at regional events.

43. In Africa, UNECA had a communication strategy and disseminated information through its website and the GSARS website. UNECA has produced five newsletters which were sent electronically to about 250 people (in addition, hard copies were distributed during events to 200 people). While discussions highlighted that AfDB had developed a communication plan, the exact implementation status of this plan was not known (as it was shared). However, AfDB has produced and distributed a "Global Strategy Implementation Update Bulletin" since January 2011 – nine so far, with each issue sent to about 250 people.50

44. Global Strategy updated its website (http://gsars.org/en/) regularly and provided information on the activities, documents and publications, including guidelines, handbooks, technical reports, training course brochures, leaflets, plans, strategic plans and annual reports. All publications were made available at no cost. Except for AfDB (which hosted the Regional Office for Africa (RAF) region), all the other implementing partners – FAO RAP,51 SIAP,52 and UNECA53 had dedicated web pages (for Global Strategy-GSARS) to highlight their plans, meetings and work on Global Strategy. FAO RAP provided a link to the global website and also to SIAP pages, while providing links to the GSARS website. The interconnections between websites was seen as a good practice enabling access to documents and materials. FAO Rome also had a web page with a link to the GSARS website.54

45. There was no mention of agricultural and rural statistics or Global Strategy in AfDB Statistics Department’s web pages.

46. During several discussions and also as highlighted in several reports, Global Strategy outputs by AfDB (such as IdCA/SPARS) were not made available to the

---

48 http://www.uniaps.or.jp/e-learning/el_material/Aqri/1606_Advocacy_KOR/4_GSARS%20Asia%20Pacific%20Communications%20Strategy.pdf
49 It was noted that the recent issues of newsletters profile a statistical champion from the region.
50 Soft copies of the bulletins were shared with the evaluation team.
52 SIAP webpages on GSARS (http://www.uniaps.or.jp/programmes/as.html).
Global Office and GSC, with the exception of Cabo Verde, Tanzania and Malawi SPARSSs, the Agricultural Statistics Capacity Indicators (ASCI) reports of 2013, 2015 and the Africa Action Plan. However, at the time of the preparation of this evaluation report, AfDB provided eight additional SPARS reports. The ASCI reports have been viewed as a good practice/initiative that each region could replicate.

47. Discussions and review of GSARS documents/newsletters indicated that there was no standard use of the Global Strategy logo. Some examples include:
   a. of the ten AfDB bulletins, only the last two issues had a Global Strategy logo;
   b. UNECA newsletters featured the Global Strategy logo prominently (left top corner as per Global Strategy branding recommendation) in its newsletter; and
   c. Global Strategy newsletters in the Asia-Pacific region were in line with Global Office products, prominently featuring the Global Strategy logo. Other FAO RAP produced Global Strategy documents featured the FAO logo on the front cover page, while the Global Strategy logo was at the back following FAO rules.

48. Stakeholders met at country level in both regions but had mixed views on the newsletters/bulletins including on receipt, use, sharing and usefulness of information. Examples of opinion about Global Strategy communication ranged among stakeholders from downloading post-harvest losses material (in Mali) and other materials (in Cape Verde) to not being aware of the newsletter in Bangladesh, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Bhutan, Cote d’Ivoire and Tanzania. Opinions varied among stakeholders who met even within a country. For example, an NSO (Tanzania) was excited about being featured in one of the Global Strategy newsletters (however, some stakeholders have not seen the newsletter).

49. Visibility beyond the primary stakeholders (Ministry of Agriculture and NSO) was low. Development partners in the countries visited were not aware of Global Strategy, even if they had investments and long-term plans in agriculture development and agriculture statistics in the country. Examples include:
   a. FAO country representations in Mali, Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia and Tanzania were not aware of Global Strategy. Interestingly, agriculture statistics were a Country Programming Framework (CPF) priority in FAO Tanzania. In general, country offices of implementing partners (AfDB, FAO), even when they were

---

55 Tanzania and Malawi SPARSS were completed by Global Office/FAO – see later discussions.
56 The use of ASCI based on capacity pillars of IdCA (institutional infrastructure resources. Statistical methods and practices and availability of statistical information) could help in monitoring the outcomes of improved agricultural and rural statistics at the country level. There are similar statistical capacity indicators for general statistics (or overall statistics) by the World Bank.
57 Examples include the Asia-Pacific Global Strategy Results Brochure and the P-SPAFS. It was noted that this was the standard practice in FAO and could be negotiated in the co-publishing agreement.
58 Turnover of FAO staff also contributed to this. It could also be due to the potential lack of clarity at the country level on FAO headquarters project versus, the Global Office housed in FAO headquarters and the regional office for Global Strategy housed in AfDB for Africa and in FAORAP for Asia-Pacific.
aware, did not have much ownership, as it was seen as a regional/headquarter project.

b. Cote d’Ivoire and Tanzania had agriculture statistics subgroups within the larger Agriculture Working Group which included development partners. Development partners were invested in carrying out agricultural statistics activities in the country (e.g. European Union supporting agriculture census in Cote d’Ivoire and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) supporting agricultural surveys in Tanzania) or funding large agricultural projects (e.g. AFD in Cote d’Ivoire) but were not aware of Global Strategy. However, the development partners, even in the agriculture sector working group, were not aware of Global Strategy.

c. In Ethiopia, where SPARS development work was being undertaken, a key top official of Ministry of Agriculture and a long-standing key member of the agricultural sector working group (consisting of all development partners) was neither aware of SPARS nor Global Strategy.

d. In Lao People’s Democratic Republic, none of the donors (SDC, EU, ADF, World Bank – all members of the agriculture sector working group) were aware of SPARS or Global Strategy, including members of the agriculture sector working group.

e. Turnover of officials also meant the loss of corporate memory even in government line ministries – for example, in Bangladesh, the top officials in a key department were not aware of Global Strategy as they were relatively new and the focal persons from the department for Global Strategy had moved.60 Additionally, development partners (including World Bank) were not aware of Global Strategy in Bangladesh.

50. Discussions revealed that organizational policies limit communication - for example, social media policies of FAO sometimes limited opportunities to reach out to a wider audience.61

51. Additionally, although Global Strategy made efforts to involve regional economic communities, it was not as successful as envisaged. Global Strategy activities and implementation modality were primarily country-focused. One of the primary reasons often quoted by regional implementing partners was the “lack of statistical capacity” in these institutions. However, linkages between statistics and socio-economic development were evident in several landmark regional initiatives (including CAADP62 and SHaSA63).

---

59 SPARS development was noted to be carried out through the NSO, in Ethiopia.
60 A key issue in Bangladesh is that although the implementation of some SPARS activities has started, SPARS has not been disseminated (completed in 2016, endorsed by government in 2017, printed in March 2018) – as it was still looking for funds to organize a launch workshop.
61 Discussions at FAO RAP.
52. A key highlight of Global Strategy has been the work in the Pacific subregion in developing the Pacific Strategic Plan for Agricultural and Fisheries Statistics (P-SPAFS)\(^{64}\) for 14 Pacific small island states through joint efforts of FAO RAP and the Pacific Community (SPC).

53. Global Strategy also made an effort to present at various statistical forums such as UNSC, African Commission on Agricultural Statistics (AFCAS) and Asia-Pacific Commission on Agricultural Statistics (APCAS) in order to highlight its activities, even at the International Conference on Agricultural Statistics and the International Statistics Institute World Congress, over the past six years. At its forty-third session, the UNSC endorsed the creation of the Inter Agency and Expert Group (IAEG-ARS) on Agricultural and Rural Statistics as a new mechanism to develop and document good practices and guidelines on concepts, methods and statistical standards for food security, sustainable agriculture and rural development.

**Output 2: Coordinating bodies of the national system, legal frameworks and strategic plans enable the integration of agriculture into the national statistical system (NSS)**

**Main finding 2:** National coordination mechanisms were set-up in several countries but they may have to be revitalized for future use. SPARS development was 38 percent (of the 40 targeted countries) in Africa and 80 percent (of the 20 targeted countries) in Asia-Pacific. SPARS completed were integrated into NSDS but they were not aligned to NSDS and/or sector/national development plan cycles. In most countries, the endorsement of SPARS by government takes a long time - only 16 of 30 (53 percent) that completed SPARS have been endorsed, of which 12 were in Africa. The SPARS process was more effective and systematic in the Asia-Pacific region.

**National coordination mechanism**

54. Global Strategy spent USD 3.61 million, 9 percent of the total (as of June 2018) on Output 2 which included the setting-up of the national coordination mechanism, SPARS\(^{65}\) development and integration into National Strategies for the Development of Statistics (NSDS).\(^{66}\)

---


\(^{65}\) SPARS were developed to guide sectoral implementation and pave the way for robust agricultural and rural statistics production and use in developing countries. SPARS provided a basis for establishing policy strengths and priorities and respective data needs, critical gaps, deficiencies, duplication and inconsistencies. SPARS have been envisaged to help define future short and long-term statistical programmes and interventions in the sector [http://qsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/SPARS-final-3007.pdf](http://qsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/SPARS-final-3007.pdf).

\(^{66}\) The 2nd International Roundtable on Management for Development Results in February 2004 and the resulting Marrakech Action Plan (MAPS) emphasized the need for National Strategies in the Development of Statistics to improve on the evidence base to "manage results" by providing a strategic framework and a holistic approach for integrating statistics within national policy processes. An NSDS is expected to provide a country with a strategy for strengthening statistical capacity and a comprehensive and unified framework for continued assessment of user needs and priorities across the entire national
55. National coordination mechanisms were set-up in 49 countries in Africa and in 14 countries in Asia-Pacific (the target was 40 in Africa and 20 in Asia-Pacific). These mechanisms were created by bringing together ministries of agriculture, NSOs and other institutions collecting agricultural data. However, the effectiveness and the continued functioning of these national mechanisms, either in the form of national statistical coordination mechanisms or as sector coordination mechanisms have not been monitored by Global Strategy (as the target was only to set-up a crucial initial step to develop SPARS).

56. A few positive examples of continued working of the national coordination mechanism (in one form or another), after the completion/drafting of SPARS, was noted during country missions.

a. In Bhutan, a Technical (cross-sectoral) Working Group, which included representatives from the newly established Statistics Division within the Ministry of Agriculture, has been established.

b. In Tanzania, a sub-group within the Agricultural Working Group, which included development partners and government stakeholders including NSOs, met regularly and planned all activities to carry out agricultural data collection, such as annual agricultural surveys, agricultural census, etc. The group was also planning to develop SPARS II.

c. In Cabo Verde, the National Committee for the Coordination of Agricultural Statistics was created by a Government Decree in 2013. It met regularly (four times a year), supervised the national agricultural statistics system and to ensure linkage with the National Statistical Programme. Additionally, a technical working group was also created to support the National Committee.

d. As reported during discussions at the country level (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cote d’Ivoire, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Mali and Tanzania), the relationship/coordination between ministries of agriculture and NSOs have greatly improved since the start of Global Strategy/SPARS activities, even if the national mechanism might not be as active as expected. Collaborations in the country could be seen for a specific activity between two or more ministries/agencies depending on the need – e.g. in Bangladesh, the Department of Agricultural Extension and the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS) for crop-cutting experiments or the Ministry of Livestock may collaborate independently with BBS for data reconciliation.

---

statistical system (NSS). It is envisaged to provide a vision of where the NSS should be in five to ten years and a framework for mobilising and leveraging resources - both national and international (http://www.paris21.org/national-strategy-development-statistics-nsds).

67 As of June 2018 – updated GSARS implementation report.

68 Members of the group were not aware of Global Strategy (e.g. FAO, EU – discussed earlier)

69 Tanzania was one of the first countries to develop SPARS under Global Strategy.

70 Comprised of the Director General of the Ministry of Agriculture, the NSO, the Institute for the Development of Fisheries and the National Agricultural R&D Institute.
57. The effectiveness of the continued work of the national coordination mechanism has been affected due to some or all of the following reasons, as indicated during various discussions at regional and country levels:

   a. In many countries, the coordination mechanism worked until the SPARS document was prepared; after that, there were no push/resources to implement SPARS – an issue when the work was viewed as an external initiative by country offices of the implementing partners of Global Strategy. For example, in Bangladesh a Technical Working Group and a Steering Committee is set-up at the inception of any project and stops functioning upon the completion of the project, as in the case of SPARS[71] - this was a standard process in the country.[72]

   b. SPARS has been a critical process in setting-up and improving national coordination. Nevertheless, it was not evident as to how the coordination mechanism would be effective in 23 African countries where SPARS was not being developed by AfDB/Global Strategy. SPARS was developed or being developed only in 26 countries; while the national coordination mechanism was reported to have been established in 49 countries (in Africa).

   c. Turnover of key champions in NSOs and/or the ministries of agriculture.

   d. “Fast-track” SPARS development in Africa may help reach the target SPARS development but it was expected to be less inclusive and not as participatory.[73] This could lead to a situation where at times top officials in all related ministries may not be aware of the work.[74]

58. Statistical legislations were improved in 25 countries in Africa.[75] However, the direct contribution of Global Strategy was not very evident. Additional funding has been received by ten countries in Africa and four in Asia-Pacific for agricultural statistics.

**SPARS development**

59. Based on discussions at the regional level with implementing partners (FAO RAP and AfDB), SPARS was expected to be completed/drafted in 26 countries in Africa[76] (the original target was 40 countries,[77] and in 15 countries in addition to the

---

[71] SPARS in Bangladesh was completed and endorsed by the government.
[72] A similar mechanism was seen for the “Strengthening AMIS” project in Bangladesh, which complemented Global Strategy.
[73] Global Strategy/SPARS guidelines have envisaged the SPARS development as an inclusive and participatory process that is country-driven and country-owned. The SPARS guideline (June 2014) was revised in 2018 to address gaps and address unforeseen issues/emerging issues, based on feedback from the countries.
[74] As noted in Ethiopia.
[76] This includes Tanzania and Malawi. It should be noted that FAO and USDA worked together to support the finalization of the Action Plan for the Master plan Agricultural Statistics and the GO worked with USDA in finalising the Action Plan on Agricultural Statistics in Malawi. It also includes 11 work-in-progress SPARS.
[77] It was reported that the target was reduced to 30, but no documentary evidence was found.
subregional SPARS in Asia-Pacific (target of 20 countries) by the end of December 2018 (Table 2).

60. IdCA which was part of the SPARS process was initially carried out as a distinct pre-SPARS phase. However, to provide continuity and expedite SPARS development, IdCA was integrated to enhance efficiency. This was a mid-term correction by Global Strategy.

**Table 3: Summary of SPARS Status – September 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPARS Status</th>
<th>Africa†</th>
<th>Asia-Pacific‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPARS planning started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benin, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, Cote d’Ivoire, Congo, DRC, Ethiopia, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Lesotho, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome, Senegal, Seychelles, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo and Zambia</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Bangladesh Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Fiji, Georgia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Maldives, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Tonga and Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARS drafted (document completed)</td>
<td>15 (+17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ (reported to be completed by December 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benin, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, Cote d’Ivoire, Congo, DRC, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania and Zambia</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Bangladesh Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, Georgia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Maldives, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Samoa, Sri Lanka and Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad, Ethiopia, Gambia, Congo, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Lesotho, Niger, Sao Tome, Seychelles and Togo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARS endorsed by the government</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benin, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Senegal, Tanzania and Zambia</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Georgia, Lao PDR†† and Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARS implementation started</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benin, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Senegal, Tanzania and Zambia</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Lao PDR Pakistan, Myanmar and Sri Lanka,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Includes Malawi and Tanzania – work completed by FAO/Global Office and USDA
‡ Additionally, a multi-country subregional “SPARS” – Pacific Strategic Plan for Agricultural and Fisheries Statistics (P-SPAFS) was also developed
†† In Laos People’s Democratic Republic, the endorsement by the Minister of Agriculture and not the Prime Minister’s Office may affect the commitment of government funding

Source: Global Strategy Reports and consultations with AfDB and FAO RAP

61. While Asia-Pacific completed 14 SPARS (in addition to one subregional SPARS) since the mid-term evaluation, Africa completed only 8 during the same period. The Asia-Pacific region managed the entire SPARS development process in a more efficient and systematic manner\(^79\) compared to the Africa region. Nevertheless, more SPARS were endorsed by the respective governments in Africa (12), as compared to Asia-Pacific (4). Furthermore, both regions\(^80\) fell short of their targets in SPARS development due to a combination of some or all of the following reasons:

a. as discussed earlier, AfDB and FAO RAP were not able to staff the approved/budgeted (funded) positions;

b. inability to attract technically qualified consultants and retain them, which was compounded by respective institutional human resource/procurement policies and a reported shortage of consultants;

c. country readiness and the political context (elections, change of government, political unrest, etc.) in the countries;

d. Asia-Pacific region received only 55 percent of the originally planned budget in GAP (to complete 20 countries);\(^81\)

e. GSC decision to focus more on technical assistance of cost-effective methodologies compared to SPARS development (in additional countries);\(^82\) and

f. organizational expertise, capacity and focus.

62. The whole SPARS process took about 15 to 18 months on average including the IdCA phase. During discussions in regions, it was revealed that though the merged process gave room for process continuity and improved efficiency, it still took time due to various reasons (consultant turnover, political changes, replacement of government officials, a shift in priorities at country level, etc.).

63. A highlight of the Asia-Pacific SPARS development process (including IdCA) was the preparation of Country Project Proposals prepared in 16 countries,\(^83\) based on IdCA. In many cases, it was endorsed by the respective national government. The projects helped carry out statistical activities during the SPARS process and also subsequently on cost-effective methodologies through funds from Global Strategy.

---

\(^79\) Asia-Pacific – 80 percent SPARS completion with only 55 percent funding (plus the value addition of country project proposal).

\(^80\) That Africa region will fall short of SPARS development and NSDS integration targets was already highlighted in the mid-term evaluation report (p32).

\(^81\) The original integrated budget for Asia-Pacific was USD 13.8 million. However, MTF funding available for Asia-Pacific was only USD 7.68 million. All the funding for Asia-Pacific came from DFID (through MTF). The funding gap of 45 percent was identified early in the programme (also highlighted in the mid-term evaluation report).

\(^82\) Although viewed by regional implementing partners as one of the hindering factors, there was a need in Global Strategy to provide TA on CE methodologies (for uptake and use to produce data) before the end of the first phase.

\(^83\) Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, Georgia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Pakistan, Samoa, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam.
FAO country offices and/or other donors. The country proposals helped push priorities in the country (also refer to regional coordination highlights discussed earlier in the report).

64. SPARS provided the policy focus for the national government to produce and use good quality agricultural and rural statistics. Discussions at the country level highlighted that SPARS provided the basis for establishing priorities, data needs and gaps, duplication and inconsistencies in agricultural data. All countries visited during this evaluation viewed SPARS as a vehicle to introduce statistical initiatives to better inform policy design and decision-making. It was also seen as a key (“useful”) national document to approach development partners for technical and financial support (whether endorsed by the government or not, although better if endorsed).

65. With cost-effective methodologies ready to be taken to the countries after the mid-term evaluation, both Global Strategy regional technical assistance implementing partners were expected to provide TA for both SPARS and cost-effective methodologies in parallel as per the initial commitments. While the implementing partners understood the need to introduce the research methodologies to countries before the (first phase) end of Global Strategy, they felt there was a shift in focus as there was now a requirement at their end to add more consultants/staff to carry out both TAs simultaneously. They viewed that SPARS laid the foundation for all the activities of agricultural and rural statistics (including the use of cost-effective methodology and tools) in the country in a holistic and cohesive manner. Country project proposals (in the Asia-Pacific region) and the SPARS propelled technical assistance activities in these countries.

66. The findings from the survey (of training participants) also highlighted the importance of SPARS – 72 percent (out of 97 respondents) indicated that SPARS is used in the country/organization currently and 91 percent (of 98 respondents) that it will be used in the future.

67. Integration of SPARS into NSDS has not progressed as envisaged, mainly due to the slow progress of SPARS development and the late endorsement of completed SPARS by governments. Global Strategy reported that all completed SPARS (15 in Africa and 15 in Asia) had been integrated into NSD. A review of selected SPARS (endorsed by respective governments) in Africa indicated a strong process for coordination and steps to integrate SPARS into NSD. It was expected that the additional 11 SPARS being developed (in Africa) would also be integrated into

84 With funding locked-in due to CPF priorities of the FAO country offices, it was difficult to get funding
85 Linked to the idca/SPARS process – unique to the Asia-Pacific region.
86 Top choice for current and second choice for the future.
87 An NSDS is expected to provide a country with a strategy for developing statistical capacity across the entire national statistical system (NSS). PARIS21 focuses its efforts on encouraging and assisting all low-income and lower middle-income countries to design, implement and monitor NSD and to have nationally owned and produced data for all SDG indicators. While most countries have NSD, the primary reasons for having an NSDS were due to lack of budget of statistics and/or lack of Statistical Act.
NSDS in respective countries when completed. Additionally, it was noted that Ethiopia and Uganda NSDS had integrated agricultural statistics even without SPARS.

68. However, some interconnected key questions about the reporting for the indicator of “SPARS integration into NSDS” included:

a. Stakeholders were aware that aligning the time frame for SPARS and NSDS was essential for effective SPARS implementation. Three regional workshops (Burkina, Zambia and Bangkok) discussed the SPARS-NSDS alignment. However, SPARS development cycle was not fully aligned with the NSDS cycle in many countries and there was no clear indication of how or when the cycles will be aligned.88

b. NSDS development was based on consultations with key stakeholders from diverse sectors, many of whom may not have an interest in the development of a strategy for agricultural statistics.89 This may affect SPARS integration with NSDS – particularly in countries that already had an NSDS and the schedules for the development of both documents were different (as mentioned above). At present, Global Strategy does not have an explicit mechanism to ensure that the SPARS document was considered as an addendum to the existing NSDS (when the two cycles of development were different), as per SPARS guidelines (pp. 26-27 discussed the issue and scenarios).

c. Government endorsement of SPARS would be another key factor for the integration of SPARS with NSDS. As shown in Table 3, endorsement has taken long and only 16 countries have SPARS (about 50 percent of the SPARS completed) endorsed by the government. While linking SPARS to NSDS governance could be ideal, it could take longer to get approvals and endorsement (following due process) and may not be ideal for time-bound targets as in the Global Strategy. Moreover, it was noted from discussions that involving the appropriate government officials from the beginning (in the SPARS process) was vital to expedite the endorsement of SPARS – a lesson learned.

69. Different approaches (all SPARS endorsed by their respective governments), noted during country mission discussions, of how countries have “addressed” or viewed the integration of SPARS into NSDS included:90

a. In Tanzania, SPARS was seen by the NSO91 as a stand-alone document and was expected to remain the same in the next version also (to give importance and focus to agriculture and the rural sector and the large rural population in

88 A key lesson is that the regional TA implementing partners should ensure that consultants follow and apply the standard methodology and guidelines.
89 Some stakeholders noted that NSDS was more top down and SPARS was more inclusive and participatory – more bottom-up.
90 These could be lessons/models for other countries in the future and also for ongoing SPARS development.
91 National Bureau of Statistics, Tanzania
Tanzania). However, SPARS was linked to the Tanzania Statistical Master Plan (TSMP) and thereby had access to TSMP funding. For example, the funding for agricultural statistics activities came from the TSMP donor basket fund and the Government of Tanzania.

b. In Bangladesh, SPARS, in addition to highlighting the coordination mechanism of NSDS and the links with NSDS in the document, was developed for a longer period - 15 years (2016-2030). The period also coincided with three five-year National Plan Cycles.

c. In Cabo Verde, the NSDS covered the periods 2012-2016 and 2017-2021. SPARS has been planned to end in 2021, coinciding with the NSDS time frame, although SPARS was prepared during NSDS (2012-2016). It is also specifically recommended that agriculture, livestock fisheries and food security data collection activities were included in the National Statistical Programme implemented by NSDS.

d. In Bhutan and Lao People’s Democratic Republic, SPARs have not been fully integrated into NSDS as they are not aligned with national development plans. However, institutional arrangements have been made to ensure that agricultural statistical departments will be more directly involved in the next NSDS (through participation in technical working groups).

70. Unintended outcomes of SPARS included: a) Samoa Ministry of Education doing a SPARS for the education sector; and b) Rwanda NSO requesting other sectors to develop a similar (SPARS) document.

71. SPARS development was a key component to the second pillar of Global Strategy. The sustainability of SPARS ultimately depends on the implementation of the actions/roadmap (see sustainability section).

Output 3: New cost-effective methods for data collection, analysis and dissemination developed

Main finding 3: Global Strategy met or exceeded the intended outputs on the research component. Work was done on 45 research topics and 16 research themes. A total of 119 documents including guidelines, handbooks and training materials were produced. There was a need for better dissemination. A more inclusive process in identifying topics in a wider agricultural-rural nexus would be needed for better policy linkages and resource mobilization.

72. The Global Office carried out the research activities to develop new/updated methodologies and tools for data collection. The research work was carried out on

---

92 The research coordinator in the Global Office monitored the work of the consultants and/or research institutions hired to work on a specific research topic until the research is completed and published.
a total of 4593 research topics (target 36) to develop methodologies covering 1694 research themes – both domain-specific (cost of production, livestock statistics (production and productivity), crop (area and yield), wood fuel, gender, agricultural environment, youth employment and decent working conditions, productivity, farm typology, post-harvest losses and sustainability) and cross-domain (survey framework, reconciling census and surveys, quality and use of administrative data, master sampling framework for fisheries and agriculture) (see Annex 1).95

73. Field tests (including in non-funded regions and countries) were carried out on 18 research topics (see Annex 1). Additionally, desk studies were conducted on eight research topics. On 21 research topics, field tests were conducted only in the Africa region. Three research topics (cost of production, area-yield-production in mixed crops and sustainability) were field tested in the Asia-Pacific, Africa, Latin America and Caribbean regions. Field tests have been carried out in 11 countries in Asia-Pacific, 18 in Africa and 6 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean region, in addition to three OECD countries (see Annex 1). The countries were reported to have been chosen based on statistical capacity (various levels), availability and regional representation.

74. By the end of December 2018, a total of 119 documents,96 guidelines and handbooks were expected to have been produced in English, French and/or Spanish including one in Russian97 (see Box 2). It was noted that while the initial responsibility to translate Global Strategy documents was with AfDB (an appropriate decision, given the regional context and francophone countries covered by AfDB), the work had to be undertaken by GO, with slow progress in this regard at AfDB.98

75. Global Strategy ensured that the Scientific Advisory Committee99 reviewed all technical papers and guidelines before they were published and disseminated.

---

93 Includes work on AGRIS and Strengthening AMIS. The latter was funded separately by BMGF.
94 Gender was included under Sustainability and Productivity.
95 Wood fuel, decent youth employment agricultural environment, productivity and typology were new additional topics (included in the 45) that were undertaken during 2017-2018.
96 As at September 2018, 100 documents were produced.
97 Only about 10 percent of the documents were in French and less than 3 percent in Spanish.
98 During the missions in Africa, it was noted that the statistical institutions (e.g. ENSEA and AFRISTAT) would be interested in facilitating translation to French (more understandable to Francophone Africa).
99 SAC consisted of ten members and met once or twice a year. Seven SAC meetings held as of February 2018.
Furthermore, 42 expert meetings have been organized by the Global Office to further the research agenda and also a total of 44 research topics have been peer reviewed.

On average, about 18 months were required to complete the activities of a research topic – 47 percent of research topics were completed within one year; while 29 percent took one to two years and 20 percent took two to three years. Only 4 percent of the research topics took more than three years.

The Global Office has produced 15 training materials. Additionally, two e-learning courses – “Using Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) for Agricultural Survey,” and “Linking Population and Housing Censuses with Agricultural Censuses.” The latter was developed by Global Strategy in collaboration with FAO and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Furthermore, an e-learning course on Food Balance Sheet (the new methodology developed by Global Strategy) was offered by SIAP.

The primary dissemination of Global Strategy documents and cost-effective methodologies has been through the website and e-bulletins sent to an estimated 2 000 stakeholders (per issue). Additionally, hard copies have been distributed at events (including regional and country-specific technical assistance workshops). Making the documents available in multiple languages will help use in regions, as relevant (an area of improvement).

During discussions with stakeholders at regional and country level, the following, which should be considered as areas for improvement for future research activities, were highlighted:

a. While the topics/cost-effective methodologies were considered relevant and good, more inputs from countries/regions on the key areas/needs was seen as an area of improvement. It was mostly seen as top-down or a decision based on expert-availability/opinion.

b. Most examples, in methodologies/handbooks, were from Africa (despite being a “Global Strategy”).

Echoed by all stakeholders during discussions at various levels was the weak focus (“unintended neglect” as indicated by some stakeholders) on rural statistics (compared to the focus on agricultural/crop statistics). More work on livestock, forestry and fisheries was indicated as areas of research focus in the next phase in addition to emerging issues such as climate change and tools with newer technology.

100 Expert groups were put together to discuss research topics. The expert groups varied in size depending on the topic. The groups for rural and sustainable agriculture had 40-50 members (countries and institutions).
81. The key cost-effective methodologies rolled out during Phase 1 of Global Strategy were: Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI), Master Sampling Framework (MSF), Food Balance Sheet (FBS), Cost of Production (COP), Post-harvest Losses (PHL) and Livestock Statistics including Nomadic Livestock (LIVE) – see subsequent pages for more details on the roll-out and technical assistance. One of the lessons noted in rolling out cost-effective methodologies, based on discussions in the regions, was that the countries did not understand the “cost-effective” part of CE methodologies at the outset. There was need for this to be explained to them (countries). Everyone easily understood CAPI and its cost-effectiveness. It was not the same, for example, with COP and FBS, which led to clarifications for countries to understand better.

82. The ultimate success/impact of these documents (methodologies, technical guidelines and training materials) will be in the uptake and use of the content in the countries for data collection/production (see next section for more details).

83. Global Strategy spent USD 7.33 million, 18 percent of the actual expenditure, on Output 3 (research to develop cost-effective methodologies/tools).

Output 4: Increased capacity of agricultural statistics staff in regional training centres and target countries

Main finding 4: Global Strategy provided a total of 99 technical assistance initiatives on a combination of cost-effective methodologies in 46 countries in Africa and Asia-Pacific. CAPI, COP, MSF and FBS were the leading technical assistance topics. Technical assistance has been critical for the uptake of cost-effective methodologies. A total of 82 countries (53 in Africa and 29 in Asia-Pacific) benefitted from the training component – a total of 960 participants. 79 emerging agricultural statisticians in 40 countries benefitted from scholarship initiatives. Statistical institutes in Africa have been strengthened to provide training and technical assistance. Although there was evidence of increased knowledge and skills, evidence of institutionalization and use of capacity to produce data was still nascent.

84. Increasing capacity on agricultural statistics has been at the core of Global Strategy and has been mainstreamed in all its activities – technical assistance, strengthening national coordination mechanisms, training/workshops and scholarships. Global Strategy spent USD 12.47 million (31 percent of its actual expenditure) on Output 4 (as of June 2018).

Technical assistance (TA)

85. Technical assistance was one of the three components of Global Strategy with one implementing partner responsible for it in each region – AfDB for Africa and FAO RAP for Asia-Pacific. Global Office was subsequently (since late 2016) involved in Accelerated TA in Africa (with support from AFRISTAT) as activities were not moving in Africa as expected. Global Strategy provided technical assistance in two areas –
SPARS (including In-depth Country Assessment\textsuperscript{103}) and on cost-effective methodologies.

86. The focus of technical assistance since the mid-term evaluation was both on IdCA/SPARS and cost-effective methodologies, as Global Strategy began to establish itself with more products. It should be noted that SPARS development was also a key capacity building process in terms of improving agricultural and rural statistics (discussed earlier in this report).

87. The delivery model for technical assistance for cost-effective methodologies in Global Strategy (as in SPARS) involved three to five missions to a country depending on the need/capacity at country level.

88. Key missions for cost-effective methodologies included: inception, technical training/gap analysis, development/improvement of tools/methodologies, field tests, analysis and the final report. During report discussions and reviews at various levels, it was noted that all implementing TA partners, including AFRISTAT, followed a similar delivery model. Alternatively, AfDB organized regional workshops\textsuperscript{104} (referred to by AfDB as “multilateral TA”), in addition to covering selected countries (based on demand) using the Global Strategy delivery model. Furthermore, FAO RAP also used a similar model (to AfDB) in terms of regional workshops during the last six months.

89. Key regional workshops organized by FAO RAP included: two workshops on GIS,\textsuperscript{105} one on MSF and one on post-harvest losses, in addition to another on Gender\textsuperscript{106} scheduled for December 2018.\textsuperscript{107} Most of the funding for post-harvest losses and gender workshops came from SIAP. An expert workshop for implementing countries was organized to share experience on methodologies and approaches.

\textsuperscript{103} Country Assessments have been the starting point for the implementation of Global Strategy at the country level. The IdCA was envisaged to assess the agricultural statistics needs and capabilities of the country and to evaluate the data collection methodology used for agricultural statistics. It also provided information on the capacity of each country to produce MSCD on a sustainable basis. The framework for assessing statistical capacities for agricultural statistics was similar to other capacity assessment framework such as UNSC’s Generic National Quality Assurance Framework (NQAF), the PARIS21/IMF Task Team Statistical Capacity Building Indicators and those used by the World Bank (http://gsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/IdCA-final-3007.pdf).

\textsuperscript{104} Seven of the 22 regional workshops organised by AfDB since the inception of Global Strategy have been in the last one year (between July 2017 and July 2018).

\textsuperscript{105} It was noted that it was not part of Global Strategy.

\textsuperscript{106} The workshop also covered the core work of FAO RAP.

\textsuperscript{107} The objective of each workshop was to identify countries for follow-up activities in 2019, and later through FAO, existing and new projects, including through planned Agriculture surveys and censuses.
90. Key regional workshops organized by AfDB, on cost-effective methodologies since 2016 included:\(^{108}\)

a. one workshop on MSF\(^{109}\) with 24 participants from 11 countries;

b. two workshops on CAPI\(^{110}\) (one for Anglophones and the other for Francophones) attended by 46 participants from 16 countries; and

c. two workshops on COP\(^{111}\) (one for Anglophones and the other for Francophones) attended by 61 participants from 21 countries.

91. Two key issues noted on regional workshops (“multilateral TA”) were:

a. These regional workshops created awareness for multiple countries and as reported, were also used to identify countries for TA; however, it was not explicitly evident how these workshops provided technical assistance and built capacity to use cost-effective methodologies in-country.\(^{112}\) There was no hands-on application at specific country levels (as in Global Strategy TA delivery model).

b. The high burn rate of funds for AfDB did not reflect progress on intended and budgeted results, which were indicated by low SPARS completion and the need to introduce Accelerated TA with the involvement of GO. It indicated the need for a better mechanism to monitor progress made against results and release of funds instead of releasing based on the expenditure (delivery) rate. A key lesson learned here was that the expenditure rate should be viewed in connection with the achievement of the budgeted results within the main framework.

92. Technical assistance on various updated and cost-effective methodologies/tools were provided (or in the process of being provided) to a total of 28 countries in Africa (Table 4) and 16 countries in Asia-Pacific (Table 5) – 53 TA initiatives in Africa and 46 TAs in Asia-Pacific.\(^{113}\)

---

\(^{108}\) The Anglophone workshops on CAPI and COP were organized jointly along with Global Office.

\(^{109}\) Master Sampling Frame (MSF) is a survey framework that forms the basis for the selection of probability-based samples and that can be used for several surveys or several rounds of the same survey. In the context of agricultural surveys, an MSF covers both commercial and non-commercial farms (http://gsars.org/en/tag/mastersamplingframe/).

\(^{110}\) CAPI is technology that uses mobile devices (such as personal digital assistants, laptops, tablets and smartphones) and internet or cellular networks to assist interviewers in collecting data in the field. Interview data, collected through electronic questionnaires on mobile devices are transmitted to survey headquarters in real-time for quality control and analysis (http://gsars.org/en/capi-e-learning-course-on-using-computer-assisted-personal-interviewing-for-agricultural-surveys/).

\(^{111}\) Cost of Production (COP) refers to the value of all inputs – purchases or not, fixed or variable – used in the crops and livestock production process. It starts with the first activity needed to produce a commodity to the end at the farm-gate, when the product is ready to leave the farm or to be consumed on the farm (http://gsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/GS-AgCop-BROCHURE-13-Web.pdf).

\(^{112}\) These regional workshops mirrored/duplicated training component activities carried out by UNECA.

\(^{113}\) One TA initiative = one topic completed/ongoing (may include multiple missions).
As part of the Accelerated TA, Global Office along with AFRISTAT has been able to cover 20 of the 53 TA initiatives given on cost-effective methodologies in Africa, within a short period of less than two years (Table 4).

Technical assistance provided was mostly on CAPI, COP and MSF in Africa (13 countries each) while in Asia-Pacific it was CAPI and FBS\(^{114}\) (ten countries) followed by MSF (seven countries). Technical assistance on CAPI reached the most countries (26) in total in both regions (refer to Tables 4 and 5).

Discussions with/information from AfDB indicated that it had completed only exploratory missions in the countries it covered,\(^{115}\) especially for technical assistance on COP, MSF and FBS. On another note, AfDB informed that it had issues on access to the FBS tool as it was “owned by FAO.” This eventually hindered progress on TA on FBS in countries. AFRISTAT also indicated issues due to constant revisions of the FBS tool during the TA period. The Asia-Pacific region also highlighted the non-availability of TA materials/guidelines on time, when regions were asked to provide TA on cost-effective methodologies. Furthermore, additional time was required for the region to adapt for use at country level. Getting FAO headquarters experts to build capacity at FAO RAP on new methodologies at times proved to be difficult (as they were overstretched).

It was evident from discussions at country level that knowledge and skills have been gained by individuals and organizations/institutions due to the initial technical assistance efforts. Although in nascent stages of institutionalization, there were some positive examples evident as indicated in subsequent discussions.

**Table 4:** Technical assistance (provided or in-progress) in Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>CAPI</th>
<th>COP</th>
<th>MSF</th>
<th>FBS</th>
<th>PHL</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{114}\) FBS is an aggregated and analytical data set that presents a comprehensive picture of the pattern of a country’s food supply and utilisation during a specific period ([http://gsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/GS-FBS-Guidelines-ENG-completo-03.pdf](http://gsars.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/GS-FBS-Guidelines-ENG-completo-03.pdf)).

\(^{115}\) TA covered by AfDB indicated by pink cells in Table 4.
### Table 5: Technical assistance provided or in-progress in Asia-Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>CAPI</th>
<th>COP</th>
<th>MSF</th>
<th>FBS</th>
<th>PHL</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Crops</th>
<th>AMCP</th>
<th>Admin Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Countries</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMCP – Agri Module in Population Census

Source: Global Strategy reports, FAORAP discussions

97. Among various cost-effective methodologies, there have been more uptakes on CAPI, FBS and MSF. Some examples of institutionalization due to technical assistance in Africa and Asia-Pacific based on discussions at the regional and country level included:
a. CAPI\textsuperscript{116} has been a success – Bhutan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Fiji and Samoa have adopted in Asia-Pacific; Cabo Verde\textsuperscript{117} and Tanzania in Africa. Although CAPI has been used for small-scale agricultural surveys in Tanzania and Bangladesh, Tanzania did not plan to use CAPI for the upcoming Agricultural Census, in spite of budgeting for it. Bangladesh did not budget for the use of CAPI for the Agricultural Census.

b. Bhutan, Cabo Verde and Fiji have adopted MSF. Tanzania and Bangladesh were integrating MSF into their upcoming agricultural census. Cabo Verde has used MSF to run pilot surveys on irrigated and non-irrigated crops. In Cote d’Ivoire, while Ministry of Agriculture found MSF useful, it was introduced to them after their agricultural census.\textsuperscript{118}

c. Mali indicated that it was going to prepare FBS with a new methodology and tool. It was noted that Benin and Guinea, where the FBS TA has been completed, would start producing FBS soon.\textsuperscript{119} It was also reported that countries that received TA in Asia-Pacific (Cambodia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam) are in the process of producing FBS.\textsuperscript{120}

d. Zambia added questions in the national survey due to COP training. Cabo Verde is expected to use COP. Bangladesh has been using COP methodology (currently used for 11 crops) and did not find much value addition in the new Global Strategy methodology (compared to what they have been doing).

e. Malawi with support from Norway was able to carry out an estimation of post-harvest losses.

98. With the next round of the agricultural census starting in 2020, despite the fact that the agricultural census is not a Global Strategy priority, there would be a huge potential (based on demand from IdCA and SPARS), for the use/integration of CAPI and MSF among other methodologies/tools in the Census activity (if provided on time).

Training in Africa

99. The training component was implemented by UNECA in Africa. UNECA was able to train stakeholders/statisticians in 53 countries in Africa (target 44). A total of 17 training/workshops were conducted and attended by 385 participants (see list of

\textbf{Global Strategy Training}

- 82 countries
- 960 participants

\textsuperscript{116} It was noted that there were two software for CAPI – Survey Solutions (developed by the World Bank) and CS Pro (which was more preferred in Asia).

\textsuperscript{117} CAPI has been used in Cabo Verde since 2010. However, Global Strategy materials specific to agricultural statistics facilitated its use by the country for Agricultural Census 2015.

\textsuperscript{118} It was however noted that countries could use census information to create a master sampling framework for an integrated survey programme.

\textsuperscript{119} AFRISTAT indicated a challenge in providing TA on FBS – as the new tool was constantly evolving, with different versions from one mission to another.

\textsuperscript{120} FBS TAs were provided in many cases using FAOSTAT data – data may not be current.
100. UNECA played a key part in managing the scholarship initiative, strengthening of statistical institutes’ capacities and the development of the Master’s programme in Agricultural Statistics (see subsequent discussions). UNECA also conducted Trainer Training workshops in enabling statistical institutions to conduct short-term training/workshops.

101. Topics covered by UNECA training/workshops included FBS, nomadic livestock, sampling for agricultural census and surveys, MSF, integrated survey framework and fisheries statistics. Some key examples of countries that benefitted/reported increased capacity due to the training (otherwise left behind) included Cabo Verde, Comoros, Djibouti, Lesotho, Madagascar and South Sudan.

102. From a training perspective, an unintended effect indicated by UNECA was that the Portuguese speaking countries in Africa were being left behind, due to language issues, although they participated in some training/workshops. The language issue was highlighted during discussions with stakeholders in Cabo Verde.

Training in Asia-Pacific

103. SIAP has conducted a total of 27 training/workshops since 2013 (ranging from 4 to 10 days – with an average of 5.6 days, attended by 575 participants - 321 men and 254 women). Participants were from Ministry of Agriculture (41 percent), NSOs (53 percent) and others (6 percent) - (see Annex 4 for a list of training courses conducted).\[121\]

104. Key training topics that benefitted country and experts are summarised in Table 6.

Table 6: Summary of key In-person training topics in Asia-Pacific (SIAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>No. of Training/Workshops</th>
<th>Total Number of Countries</th>
<th>People Trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling methods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>118 (59M/59F) &amp; (50 MOA/67 NSO/1 Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69 (33M/36F) &amp; (17 MOA/52 NSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Production (COP)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54 (28M/26F) &amp; (7 MOA &amp; 47 NSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Balance Sheet (FBS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (12M/12F) &amp; (12 MOA/12 NSO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from SIAP Training Information – September 2018 (See Annex x for complete list)

\[121\] During discussions it was noted that it was likely that the same individual could have been trained on multiple topics.
105. In all, a total of 38 countries (target 20 countries) benefitted from the training courses; nevertheless, ten of them - Bangladesh, Bhutan, Indonesia, Iran, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Philippines, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam - benefitted the most by having participants in at least 20 of the 26 training/short-term courses.

106. SIAP was also able to collaborate with statistical institutes in China, India, Iran and the Republic of Korea and also with the Pacific Community for providing training. World Bank support for CAPI in the Pacific Community and Iran was noted.

Overall training

107. A survey of training participants (182 respondents from Africa and Asia-Pacific – 30 percent women) indicated that SPARS workshop (42.5 percent) and the Master Sampling Framework (MSF)/Survey Sampling (39.4 percent) were the most attended by respondents followed by Food Balance Sheet (31.3 percent) MSCD (25 percent) and CAPI (23 percent) – see Annex 8. Most of the respondents came to know about the training through their Directors (44 percent), through previous trainings/workshops attended or internal office memo/circular (14 percent).

108. The majority (93 percent) of the 160 respondents indicated that they were either very satisfied (31 percent) or satisfied (62 percent) with the design of Global Strategy training/workshops that they attended. A very high proportion (89 percent) of them indicated that the training/workshops increased their knowledge and skill (to either a medium degree or greatly) on an individual level.

109. Discussions at the country level largely mirrored the survey results (of training/workshop participants) on how Global Strategy training and workshops have helped the countries in terms of building capacities. It has helped the countries in - better methodology (71 percent), the use of better technology (53 percent) and improved sampling (52 percent), which were the top three capacities developed in the country (see Figure 3).
Figure 3: Benefits to the country due to Global Strategy Training/Workshops (n=157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better methodology</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of better technology</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved sampling</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better analysis and use of data</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected from a wider/larger area</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-effective data collection</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better/Timely data on crops</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased frequency of data collection</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better/Timely data on livestock</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better/Timely data on fisheries</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Results of Africa and Asia-Pacific Training Participants (October 2018)

110. Training ensured that Global Strategy guidelines and tools were known to NSOs and the statistical divisions of ministries of agriculture. However, during the country missions, there was still limited evidence of the use of methodologies to collect data (the potential was there) but it could be too early to assess the use.

111. Nevertheless, the survey of training/workshop participants (149 survey respondents) indicated that cost-effective/updated methodologies for which they attended the training/workshop are currently used/applied by their organization/institution. The proportion of participants indicating the use of methodologies in the future increased – highlighting the relevance and the perceived effectiveness of the methodologies. CAPI, MSF and FBS were the most used and were also expected to lead the way in the future. (Figure 4).
**Figure 4:** Use of Global Strategy methodologies by country (n = 149)

[Diagram showing the use of methodologies by country]

*Source: Survey Results of Africa and Asia-Pacific Training Participants (October 2018) – 149 respondents*

112. Survey results mirrored the technical assistance findings on the use/integration of CAPI, MSF and FBS as the front-runners of Global Strategy adopted methodologies. With the exception of CAPI, evidence of data production using other methodologies was still at early stages (see earlier discussions).

**Masters in Agricultural Statistics and Statistical Institutes in Africa**

113. One of the key achievements of Global Strategy was the development of a specialization programme in agricultural statistics through a peer review and validation process in January 2016 – for the first time in Africa (offered through ENSEA, EASTC, ENEA-DSD, INSEA and Makerere University). Discussions at ENSEA and EASTC noted that the programme was suitable for an agronomist and a general statistician. Ninety-one percent of the students (scholarship recipients) who responded to the survey found the post-graduate programme in agricultural statistics highly relevant (81 percent) with only a minority finding it irrelevant (10 percent).

114. The top highlights of the programme as viewed by scholarship recipients were new tools to collect and analyse data (55 percent) and new methodologies in agricultural statistics (52 percent) as indicated by scholarship recipients; in addition to an experienced teaching staff (52 percent) and a practically-oriented programme (48 percent).

---

122 Makerere University (in Kampala) is the oldest Agricultural University in Africa. ENSEA - Abidjan, EASTC – Dar es Salaam, ENEA-DSD – Dakar and INSEA – Rabat.

123 It was noted that while designing the course statisticians who have been doing statistics for years but with no theoretical background were kept in mind.
115. As part of Global Strategy, the capacity of statistical institutes in Africa has been strengthened. The agricultural statistics curricula were harmonized using Global Strategy material. The statistical institutes and universities were using old material. Global Strategy materials gave them wider/newer perspectives. The material was taken and adapted. The statistical institutes and universities had Masters in Official Statistics – which now also included new material on Agricultural Statistics due to Global Strategy (refer to Annex 5 for EASTC brochure, as an example).

Scholarships

116. The Scholarship initiative was a unique feature of Global Strategy in Africa implemented through UNECA. As one key GSC member remarked – "The scholarship initiative was impactful – not fancy but effective." A total of 79 scholarships were given to students across 40 countries to pursue Agricultural Statistics in one of the seven statistical institutes (see Annex 9 for scholarship beneficiary by country).

117. The survey of scholarship recipients indicated the following, which also mirrored the perspectives of a small sample of students interviewed.

a. Relevance: The top three reasons for pursuing the post-graduate programme were demand for a qualified statistician/agricultural statisticians in the country (66 percent), opportunities to grow with international organizations (56 percent) and opportunities to grow within their organizations/institutions (47 percent). Despite the demand for statisticians, only 29 percent would have pursued a Master’s programme in statistics whilst only 12 percent would have studied agricultural statistics without the scholarship.

b. The high proportion (84 percent) of the scholarship recipients indicated very high (47 percent) or high (37 percent) satisfaction in getting the scholarship to study the post-graduate programme in agricultural statistics.

c. Results: A vast majority (84 percent) of the students went back to the place of work after completion of the studies. The agricultural statistics post-graduate programme increased knowledge (as reported by 97 percent of the respondents) and skills (as reported by 84 percent of them) of the scholarship

---

124 UNECA (the Secretariat of AGROST) had prepared the compendium of institutes in Africa and had the information on the curricula and the content. "So Global Strategy was a boon at the right time".
125 Response rate of 47 percent was higher than average for online surveys in general (29 percent - Survey Gizmo the average of online survey to external people is only 10 to 15 percent). 71 percent of the scholarship respondents were male and 29 percent female. Key survey results are presented in Annex 6.
recipients. A majority (81 percent) of the respondents indicated that they were able to use the knowledge and skills learned in their current work and 94 percent of them indicated a very high/high level of use in the future. A third of them (32 percent) indicated that increased responsibility and/or promotion had been an outcome after the completion of the studies.

d. Scholarship students have been hired by other organizations including FAO (e.g. female students from Nigeria and Botswana) and a male student by EASTC. Global Strategy also hired two students for its technical assistance in Africa. This was seen as an unintended positive outcome.

118. As part of the post-graduate programme, students (scholarship recipients) submitted a thesis demonstrating their learning (see Box 3 and Annex 7).

**Box 3: Sample of thesis work produced by scholarship recipients**

- "Aggregate analysis of maize production by smallholders in Tanzania."
- "Assessment of the contribution of the agriculture sector to Gambia’s economic growth."
- "The methodology of economic accounts for agriculture."
- "Nutritional and environmental impact of post-harvest losses in Burundi."
- "Typology of farms of farmers on the dams of North Cote d’Ivoire: Case of okra and pepper."
- "Impact of the passion of land and women's participation in decision-making within farming households in Cameroon."

119. The scholarship initiative provided participants with a network to share knowledge/experience on agricultural and rural statistics, receive clarification from peers and statistical institutes. The continued connection between statistical institutes and scholarship recipients was seen as a welcome support mechanism.

**Minimum set of core data (MSCD)**

120. It was noted that the focus of MSCD, one of the three pillars of Global Strategy, dwindled after the initial year, as noted from discussions with stakeholders at various levels. The result was reflected on the low progress on the indicator. According to the Global Strategy narrative report (2017), the number of countries producing MSCD was 12 (7 in Africa and 5 in Asia-Pacific).\(^\text{126}\)

121. AfDB had organized three regional workshops on MSCD. Discussions at AfDB indicated that 50 African countries\(^\text{127}\) have reported on MSCD, which has been published on the African Information Highway, a public web-based system initially started on spreadsheets.\(^\text{128}\) This mirrored the findings from the training/workshop.

---

\(^\text{126}\) Five countries was the baseline for Asia Pacific. However, Asia-Pacific Global Strategy team reported that all countries that completed an IdCA would have possibly completed an MSCD. Not tracked and reported.

\(^\text{127}\) It was not clear from the discussion as to why AfDB had not reported this information to GSC and the Global Office earlier.

survey in which 52 percent of respondents indicated that their country was collecting MSCD but another 38 percent were not sure.

122. Although AfDB, intends to have MSCD published every year, a key issue for both regions on MSCD was the reconciliation of the data from the countries, and additionally, the indicators were still based on Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and had not been revised to align with SDGs.129

123. It was noted that MSCD had not been the main focus in Asia-Pacific – it was considered more as part of IdCA and SPARS. There was no monitoring from the Global Strategy Regional Office for Asia-Pacific, whether the countries were producing the data – on time or quality. However, it was noted that MSCD helped countries to identify data gaps and what they need to do.

124. Key issues on MSCD were – not much focus (“talk”) globally (from Global Strategy); different interests and focus between the two regions; and no harmonized platform globally on MSCD for comparison among countries in addition to not being aligned to SDGs.130

Output 5: Sustainable agriculture integrated surveys (AGRIS)131 implemented in countries

Main finding 5: AGRIS has been launched and tested in one country (Ghana). Lessons indicated simplification, where feasible. AGRIS has been integrated fully into FAO for roll-out.

125. The AGRIS methodology, developed as part of the Global Office research component, was published in May 2018.132 The initial testing of questionnaires started in 2016 in Ghana. Subsequently, full-scale testing of the customized AGRIS methodology to the Ghanaian context was completed (to meet the target to implement in one country).133 AGRIS provided a methodology for producing basic data for the monitoring and reporting of five SDG indicators for which FAO is the custodian.134 Furthermore, it also provided essential information for another 15 SDG indicators.

126. AGRIS has been one of the key achievements of Global Strategy.135 It was noted during discussions that no methodology was developed despite demand from

129 It was noted that alignment required that all SDG indicators are finalized – which is still a work in process.
130 Number of countries producing MSCD with corresponding metadata could be a useful indicator to monitor countries.
131 AGRIS is a farm-based modular ten-year survey programme designed as a cost-effective tool for national statistical agencies (http://gsars.org/en/tag/agris/). Among others, AGRIS provides information on profitability and productivity and collected information on environment and greenhouse gases.
133 The report is expected later in 2018.
134 SDG indicators 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.1, 5.4.1 and 5a.1
135 The introduction of AGRIS is fully coherent with the ideas of modernizing statistical production by avoiding “silos” of different, non-integrated surveys. However, is the explicit linkage of AGRIS
countries for several years. GS was able to get this crucial methodology developed and tested full-scale within three years. Global Strategy spent USD 2.20 million, 5 percent of its total expenditure as of June 2018 on Output 5.

127. Although a key challenge faced while testing AGRIS (in Ghana) was the availability of qualified human resources in the country and hence the high demand for training due to a lot of new definitions, AGRIS enables a coherence of systems – agriculture, marketing, GIS, etc. It was reported that AGRIS provided a flexible structure (best suited for situations constrained by resource availability) and was a feasible option to be carried out based on the master sampling framework (MSF), even if there was no census. Lessons from testing in Ghana indicated that the AGRIS questionnaire were long, training was required for data cleaning and tabulation due to a lack of in-country capacity, clarification on institutional farms was needed (as they are currently left in Africa) and a need for improved governance (Technical Group) including all ministries and NSO.

128. The two-person team of AGRIS in Global Strategy has now evolved into a five-person team, in addition to consultants, in FAO ESS. Global Strategy has handed over AGRIS and its roll-out to countries to FAO Statistics Division (ESS) team (see sustainability section). FAO ESS viewed AGRIS as its “new line of work.” Discussions at FAO headquarters and also with national stakeholders (e.g. Bangladesh and Tanzania) revealed the high demand for AGRIS from countries.

3.2 Evaluation Question 2: How sustainable are Global Strategy’s achieved results in terms of national awareness, ownership, uptake and use of cost-effective methodologies, knowledge transfer, enabling environment creation, resource partners’ support, partnership and coordination?

Main finding 6: There is enhanced coordination between Ministry of Agriculture and NSO. SPARS implementation is vital for the continued functionality of the national coordination mechanism. Endorsement by government and integration of SPARS with NSDS, sector/national development plans and the national investment plans is important to ensure adequate budget for SPARS implementation. Demand-driven, timely technical assistance is required for the uptake of cost-effective methodologies/tools. In addition to research, data production, dissemination and use will be the ultimate indicator for the institutionalization of cost-effective methodologies/tools. A lack of awareness about Global Strategy and its contribution could affect resource mobilization. Involvement of FAO in Africa is an area for improvement for the long-term sustainability of improved agricultural and rural statistics.

129. National coordination mechanisms created at the time of the IdCA/SPARS development process, even if they might not be functioning well or existing, have

methodology with the international initiatives to modernize official statistics such as the introduction of the Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM), the promotion of the use of administrative registers, the need for metadata management and quality reports, etc. is not evident.

136 Another methodology developed by Global Strategy (see later in the research section for more details).
enhanced the relationship and coordination among ministries of agriculture and NSO in moving forward. They have increased national awareness for agricultural and rural statistics. Increased cooperation between Ministry of Agriculture and NSO, in recent years, was highlighted by national stakeholders in the countries visited for agricultural statistics where SPARS have been completed – Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Tanzania.

130. For the sustainability of SPARS to be seen as a “living document”, it has to be implemented and monitored. Government endorsement and integration into NSDS (and other national documents) are all key to SPARS implementation and sustainability. It must be kept in mind that it was the first time this has been done in these countries and hence countries like Indonesia and Tanzania are looking at the second round of SPARS (a positive sign of sustainability). Some countries have seen the importance of SPARS and allocated a budget for it, e.g. Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Indonesia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Samoa and Tanzania. For the long-term sustainability of SPARS, it should be linked to and complement the sector development plan and investment plans in these countries. However, the first round of SPARS was not yet implemented. Other countries visited, Bangladesh and Tanzania, viewed SPARS as a crucial (policy) document to receive budget allocated from the government or request funding for agricultural and rural statistics. In both these countries SPARS is endorsed by the government.

131. As part of SPARS implementation, Bhutan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Tanzania have created agricultural statistical units in the Ministry of Agriculture. In Bangladesh, the Chair and Co-chair\(^{137}\) have been identified for the SPARS implementation committee but members have not been identified. Bangladesh also decided to create two units within NSO (one for crop and one for non-crop agricultural statistics).

132. Even though activities related to (planned in) SPARS were undertaken in the country, it was not seen as part of SPARS implementation, e.g. Agricultural Census in Cote d’Ivoire (with funding from the European Union and Government) as funder was not aware of SPARS or Global Strategy. In Tanzania, NSO and Ministry of Agriculture have been carrying out agricultural surveys (with funding from USAID/USDA and the Government) and are planning the Agricultural Census as part of SPARS implementation. However, FAO Tanzania,\(^ {138}\) which was providing technical assistance for the agricultural census, was not aware of SPARS or Global Strategy. This does not bode well for the overall sustainability of SPARS and improved agricultural and rural statistic activity. In Bangladesh, BBS viewed the forthcoming Agricultural Census as part of SPARS activity (implementation).

133. Without further facilitation and/or support, with no endorsement from the Government for 50 percent of SPARS already completed (30) and questions about

\(^{137}\) Secretary and Director General of NSO (BBS) are chair and co-chair respectively.

\(^{138}\) FAO Tanzania has been providing support on agricultural statistics as it is one of its CPF priorities.
integration into NSDS (see earlier discussion), it would be too early to expect SPARS to be the policy framework to guide the agricultural and rural statistics activities in several countries. This is compounded by the fact that many development partners and the newer staff/top officials in the government, even in ministries of agriculture, were not aware of SPARS.

134. On the positive side, SPARS has led to, directly or indirectly, increased awareness about agricultural statistics. Establishing SPARS as the policy document in the broader national agenda is critical for the continued improvement of agricultural and rural statistics.

135. While research has to continue in terms of updating or producing new methodologies, the ultimate proof of concept will depend on the data produced and used for decision-making. For Global Strategy, this was at a very early stage. Technical assistance and adequate availability of staff in NSOs and ministries of agriculture would be key for the focused uptake and use of cost-effective methodology.

136. CAPI and MSF have shown signs of uptake in a few countries in both regions (Africa and Asia-Pacific). Continued production of data using these methodologies/tools will be the ultimate indicator of institutionalization and sustainability.

137. The Food Balance Sheet has been revitalized in terms of methodology and new web-based tools due to Global Strategy. As this was done towards the end of Global Strategy (first phase), further support from Global Strategy may be required to roll-out the new tool and methodology in the countries. There has been interest in uptake by countries, which is a positive indication towards sustainability.

138. Agricultural, environmental and sustainable agriculture indicators have been integrated into FAO teams due to Global Strategy.

139. As part of the Global Strategy, the statistical training institutes have been capacitated. The agricultural statistics curricula have been harmonized across statistical institutes and universities. The institutes highlighted the need to have a mix of long-term and short-term courses in order to be sustainable. Institutionalization of agricultural statistics capacities was evident including their plan to promote and develop capacities in the country. Capacity to conduct short-term courses on agricultural statistics and/or Global Strategy cost-effective methodologies (e.g. conducting the survey, MSF and crop-forecasting, CAPI) has already been demonstrated by the Statistical Institutes. The Institutes also have high staff retention and poor ability to attract experts/contract lecturers. Beyond

---

139. Explicitly linking the SPARS with the tools for planning statistical programmes such as PARIS21 ADAPT (http://www.paris21.org/advanced-data-planning-tool-adapt) would help integrating agricultural statistics into the NSDS.

140. It was highlighted during some discussions that bridging statistical plan development to the framework of existing policy mechanisms at country level would be critical. The teams developing SPARS should not be limited to statisticians but also include people aware of/with experience in policy and programming contexts.
collaboration among statistical institutes, no peer-to-peer mechanism was evident (e.g. country to country).

140. The Master’s Programme in Agricultural Statistics (the first of its kind in Africa thanks to Global Strategy) was expected to be sustainable. Discussions with ENSEA and EASTC indicated that even without ECA funding an intake of 10-15 students would be enough to sustain the programme. Even in past intakes, they had few students who attended with their own funds, donor funds (e.g. AFD, Germany) or government sponsorship (e.g. Gambia, Niger).

141. Global Strategy has not well publicized the short-term training courses and the Master’s Programme in Agricultural Statistics and this could affect attendance and use of materials. Global Strategy has to become more cognisant and strategic in the overall advocacy and visibility of its work for sustainability.

142. FAO has to be flexible in terms of having Global Strategy documents for long-term sustainability and making available documents to stakeholders or being prepared to maintain the GSARS website (after Global Strategy phases).

143. AGRIS has been fully integrated into the FAO Statistics Division (ESS) for roll-out. The roll-out is carried out by a five-person team in FAO ESS, which integrated two former Global Strategy staff who worked on AGRIS development and testing. Although funding has been secured until 2021 from BMGF and USAID, it was not evident how FAO could manage roll-out without external funding.141 Rolling-out has begun in Senegal (2016), Uruguay (2018) and Ecuador (2018). Furthermore, institutional framework assessment has been done in Armenia, Cambodia, Georgia and Kazakhstan and user/producer workshops have been organized as part of the roll-out. Support as part of the roll-out is for three to five years, after which countries are expected to take over. Country involvement and commitment and Ministry of Agriculture and NSO involvement is a must right from the start of the roll-out. The demand for AGRIS among countries has already been created by requests presented in UNSC, AFCAS and APCAS.142

144. Another important step taken for long-term sustainability is the establishment of the Global Rural and Agricultural Integrated Surveys (GRAInS) Partnership by FAO, the World Bank and other partners to facilitate the governance and implementation of agricultural surveys (such as AGRIS) and integrated household surveys (LSMS-ISA) in addition to reducing the cost of data collection and promoting the usability and relevance of survey data with other data sources. Linking population and housing census data with agricultural statistics was seen to be consistent with Global Strategy, facilitating long-term sustainability.143

145. The FAO Regional Office for Africa (RAF) has to be more involved in Africa either by itself and/or through its subregional offices if Global Strategy results and improved

---

141 It was noted that FAO has planned for 50 countries by 2030. Discussion on funding with USAID. Germany, Australia are already in progress for funding.

142 FAO ESS has sent questionnaire to countries to facilitate prioritization.

143 http://www.fao.org/docrep/015/i2680e/i2680e00.htm
agricultural and rural statistics are to be sustainable. The non-involvement of FAO in Africa as a technical partner of Global Strategy has resulted in the disconnection of FAO country representations in Africa even though agricultural statistics has been its mandate historically. The contrast could be seen between Asia-Pacific (where FAO RAP was involved) and Africa. At the start of Global Strategy, there was only one statistician covering 54 countries in Africa. FAO’s regional offices have to play a key technical and facilitative role (though it’s subregional and country offices in short-term "fixes" and long-term "servicing" for the sustainability) for SPARS and uptake/use of cost-effective methodologies and data production.

### 3.3 Evaluation Question 3: To what extent has Global Strategy promoted UN normative values, gender equality issues, in particular, and contributed to youth and women empowerment, throughout its implementation?

**Main finding 7:** Global Strategy complemented and contributed to the respect of UN normative values of gender equality and in particular youth and female empowerment. Evidence could be seen from Global Strategy’s research work on youth, technical report/guidelines on gender-disaggregated data, scholarship initiatives empowering young men and women and a higher proportion of female participation in scholarship initiatives and training/workshops when compared to the proportion of women working in professional statistics.

Global Strategy had mainstreamed values of gender equality and addressed youth and female empowerment in all its works. Specific research work was also undertaken on youth and gender by Global Strategy. Highlights included:

- a. Research work on Measuring Decent Youth Employment (a topic added in 2017) with field testing in Kenya and the development of Guidelines for collecting data to measure decent youth employment.

---

144 Even in regional meetings (including RSC) as technical partners. The historical context of donors wanting to have two different implementation models – one through FAO in Asia-Pacific and the other through AfDB in Africa should be noted.

145 A recommendation from mid-term evaluation.


147. The scholarship initiative of Global Strategy equipped a new generation of 79 young statisticians with knowledge and skills in agricultural statistics in Africa. These young statisticians had an average of eight years of experience (ten for Anglophone countries and six for Francophone countries). During discussions at the statistical institutes (EASTC, Dar es Salaam and ENSEA, Abidjan) and at UNECA, it was noted that the total number of women scholarship recipients ranged between 20–25 percent among institutes, marginally higher than the statistical institutes’ overall enrolment of women (about 20 percent). It was also in line with the proportion of women working in the statistical domain

148. With reference to the training component, discussions indicated that efforts were made to increase the participation of women at events, although it was difficult to target (because participants at the events are selected by the country’s government). While there is no exact gender-disaggregated data on training participants for Africa, the information from Asia-Pacific indicated that 44 percent of the 575 participants were women.

149. In the survey of training/workshop participants, 30 percent of the 182 respondents were women (combined for Africa and Asia-Pacific regions). Both survey responses and actual participation in training highlights a higher proportion of female participation in Global Strategy than in the statistical domain/profession.

150. Regarding staffing (and/or consultants hired to work on approved staff positions), except Global Office which was gender-balanced, all the regional implementing partners (AfDB, FAO RAP, SIAP and UNECA) were more male-dominated.

151. Global Strategy worked in Bangladesh, Ghana, Malawi and Tanzania, which had women as the top person in the respective NSOs but this was not directly attributable to Global Strategy.

---

148 Information from the survey of Scholarship recipients conducted as part of this evaluation.

149 It was noted that it was difficult for Global Strategy/UNEC to target – first of all as candidates are identified by respective countries (Ministry of Agriculture/NSO) and then they go through a competitive process. For the Francophone countries, the selection is carried out in Paris.

150 Reported to be about 20-25 percent UNECA indicates that only 30 percent of those in all research were women.
3.4 Evaluation Question 4: What factors have contributed to or hindered the achievement of expected results?

Main finding 8: Key contributing factors to the achievement of results included flexible resource partners, “adequate” funding, a strong Global Office team, institutional commitment and support at a regional level from UNECA and FAO RAP and partnership with regional statistical institutions among others. Hindering factors included staffing issues across all regional implementing partners, turnover of national staff/officials, a shift in country priorities, inability to report and show evidence, remote disconnection of AfDB/FAO country offices in Africa and the overall visibility of Global Strategy, including poor awareness on Ministry of Agriculture and NSO.

152. Key factors that have enabled and contributed to progress towards the achievement of intended results have been summarized in Table 7. The flexible approach/consideration by resource partners “adequate”\(^\text{151}\) funding, every year, was a key enabling factor. The GSC, GEB and Global Office were drivers in guiding and pushing the implementation (within limitations beyond their control – also see hindering factors).

153. A strong Global Office team enabled overall coordination, achievement of research component results and accelerated technical assistance in Africa. Good institutional support from regional implementing partners, UNECA and FAO RAP helped progress in respective activities in spite of staffing issues with Global Strategy regional positions. FAO RAP involvement from the top management also facilitated better coordination among the regional implementation partners and institutionalization within FAO RAP to some extent.

154. The inclusive and participatory SPARS process created a high level of ownership among the ministries of agriculture and NSOs as evidenced during country visits/discussions in Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cabo Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Laos People’s Democratic Republic and Tanzania and.

155. Involvement of statistical institutions in Africa and the addition of scholarship initiatives facilitated the achievement of the result in terms of national stakeholder capacity building. Contribution to the intended results by SIAP (training) and country proposals in the Asia-Pacific region as part of SPARS process have been discussed in detail earlier in this report.

\(^{151}\) GO had adequate funding; while Africa got support from the European Union to bridge the gap. However, Asia-Pacific got only 55 percent of the original budget.
Table 7: Snapshot of contributing and limiting factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing factors</th>
<th>Overall/Global</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia-Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Flexible resource partners</td>
<td>✓ Institutional support and commitment (UNECA)</td>
<td>✓ Institutional support (FAO RAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ “Adequate” funding</td>
<td>✓ Including statistical institutions</td>
<td>✓ Involvement of FAO country offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The strong Global Office team</td>
<td>✓ Development of scholarship initiative</td>
<td>✓ Country proposal papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Research component</td>
<td>✓ Partnership with AFRISTAT</td>
<td>✓ Training by SIAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Ability to undertake Accelerated TA in Africa (by GO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindering factors</th>
<th>Overall/Global</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia-Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Visibility of Global Strategy (advocacy, branding, communication and dissemination)</td>
<td>- Staffing issues (AfDB and UNECA)</td>
<td>- Staffing issues (FAO RAP and SIAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Inability to mobilize additional resources to bridge the gap in other regions</td>
<td>- Turnover of national stakeholders and officials</td>
<td>- Turnover of national stakeholders and officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Complex governance structure</td>
<td>- Shift/change in country priorities/context</td>
<td>- Shift/change in country priorities/context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lack of awareness of Global Strategy beyond ministries of agriculture and NSO</td>
<td>- Inability to report results and show evidence (AfDB)</td>
<td>- Limited funding (only 55% of the original budget)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Not aligned with national plans and institutional infrastructure</td>
<td>- Regional (“multilateral”) TAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The disconnection between AfDB and FAO country offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from interviews and surveys

156. Certain factors affected the achievement of intended results (Table 7). The main hindering factor has been the staffing issues of implementing partners in the regions (FAOP RAP, SIAP, AfDB and UNECA) – even the approved/budgeted positions (with funding available) – discussed in detail earlier in the report.

157. While turnover of national stakeholders (staff and key officials) was beyond the control of Global Strategy, it slows down progress towards intended results. Country priorities and change in country context (political/economical) also hindered progress towards achievement of outcomes. A capacity gap between NSO and ministries of agriculture was also a hindering factor.

158. While overall governance worked well, generally speaking, it was a complex mechanism/structure which at times slowed down decision-making (discussed in detail earlier). The RSC layer provided an additional level of complexity which was coupled with a lack of transparency in reporting (especially with AfDB).

159. Despite good work, Global Strategy was not visible enough, even in countries where it has carried out activities. National stakeholders beyond the ministries of
agriculture and NSO were not aware of Global Strategy – this included development partners, producer organizations, civil society, etc.\textsuperscript{152} Furthermore, non-alignment with national plans and institutional infrastructure was also seen as a hindering factor. Even AfDB and FAO country offices in Africa do not have much awareness about Global Strategy. This will affect future funding and thereby activities and long-term outcomes/impact as well as sustainability.

160. Though not a major hindering factor, it is important for Global Strategy to have a common understanding with implementing partners on the use of its logo (on the front page). This should be agreed upon for any documents/newsletters/bulletins that will be produced using Global Strategy materials and funding.\textsuperscript{153} There is a need for more harmonization.

161. Global strategy was managed well within the funding available from two resource partners (DFID and BMGF). However, it was not able to mobilize additional resources to cover more countries in Asia-Pacific, as planned, or cover other regions as intended in GAP.

162. Implementation of SPARS including the use of cost-effective methodology and sustainability GS results would depend on funds available in the country from the government budget and/or support from a development partner. While the budget for SPARS implementation may or may not be an immediate hindering factor in the first phase, it is likely to be in the second phase. There was a need to facilitate this in participating countries through implementing/development partners who are working with national stakeholders at country level on a continuing basis.

\textsuperscript{152} Big users of data in the private sector and investors in the sector have been largely left out (not yet targeted).

\textsuperscript{153} FAO’s decision not to have Global Strategy documents on its website because its logo is not present is not a good enough reason not to further the cause of improved agricultural and rural statistics.
4 Lessons learned

163. This section also addresses Evaluation Question 5. Global Strategy provided key lessons for the future phase/programming not only at a global level but also at regional and national/country level.

164. Simplified governance mechanism with one decision-making authority (e.g. GSC) will make it more efficient, transparent and less bureaucratic. Overall programme management and coordination accountability without authority (as in Global Office) did not help effective monitoring and implementation.

165. Global Strategy (or any programme) cannot be implemented without adequate staffing or sustained without an institutionalized capacity. Managing implementation with consultants left the institutions with no capacity or corporate memory when there was a turnover.

166. Availability of adequate funding is a key factor for successful implementation but it does not guarantee successful implementation (e.g. AfDB). Adequate funding for staffing was assured for five years; nevertheless, none of the implementing partners in the regions (FAO RAP, SIAP, AfDB and UNECA) were able to staff the approved positions entirely.

167. Linked to the above, was the importance of the identification of implementing partners with a proven institutional capacity/focus on agriculture/agricultural and rural statistics along with the ability to staff positions. The right partners are vital for the delivery of intended results.

168. The SPARS development process, and particularly endorsement by government, takes time. The inclusive and participatory process is lengthy but it ensures national ownership. Moreover, it creates the experience of various national stakeholders working together, who otherwise would not have come together, and national coordination.

169. Uptake of research outputs (methodology and tools) takes time and requires focused technical assistance (including training) in countries for uptake and use. The timing of technical assistance will be crucial for effective uptake and institutionalization at country level.

170. Simple initiatives could provide higher impact, e.g. the scholarship initiative and Masters’ programme in agricultural statistics.

171. The country project proposals undertaken (with funding from FAO representations and other donors) as part of the SPARS process in the Asia-Pacific region proved to add value and complement Global Strategy in taking up activities during SPARS development, including driving cost-effective methodology uptake.

---

154 Though the funding was made available annually, there was commitment from donors for funding.
155 Includes crops, fisheries, aquaculture, livestock and forestry.
172. Capacitating and involving statistical institutes including AFRISTAT to provide training (short- and long-term) and technical assistance in Africa was a good practice in building sustainable and localized capacities, cost-effectively.

173. Non-involvement of FAO in Africa (in the first phase) was a missed opportunity for Global Strategy and FAO.\textsuperscript{156} FAO through its Regional Office for Africa (FAO RAF) has historically played a key role in Africa as the technical lead on agriculture and agricultural statistics including organizing the Africa Commission on Agricultural Statistics (AFCAS). It also led FAO country representations to not being aware of/largely disconnected from Global Strategy.

174. Agricultural and rural statistics methodology updating does not have to wait 20-25 years if there is a concerted effort coupled with commitment resources.

\textsuperscript{156} Exception was noted in three research activities – reconciliation of census and surveys, data and field testing on horticulture of crops and in some AGRIS field testing activities.
5 Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

175. These conclusions have been based on evidence that emerged from the data collected and analysed and the lessons identified.

Conclusion 1. Global Strategy has raised the profile of agricultural and rural statistics globally, especially in Africa and Asia-Pacific. However, it is largely unknown beyond its primary stakeholders\(^{157}\) despite its contributions as the largest ever global effort to improve sustainable agricultural and rural statistics in developing countries.

176. Since 2013, Global Strategy has played a facilitative role in increasing stakeholder awareness and capacity at regional and national levels (particularly in Africa and Asia-Pacific) in agricultural and rural statistics, while contributing to the achievement of its overall objective and intended results. It has demonstrated the potential and laid the foundation to emerge as a global integrating platform for various complementary and synergistic initiatives in agricultural and rural statistics to achieve greater efficiency and impact on sustainable development.

177. In spite of moving the agricultural and statistics agenda significantly since its inception, Global Strategy is largely unknown beyond its primary stakeholders. Advocacy, communication and dissemination have not been strategic and adequate enough to ensure that Global Strategy is recognized/viewed as an international reference point for its work in improving agricultural and rural statistics. Lack of broader dissemination could affect the overall perception of the benefits of Global Strategy. Inadequate advocacy at a global and regional level has hindered resource mobilization.

Conclusion 2. Global Strategy has been instrumental in integrating agricultural and rural statistics systems into national statistical systems

178. The development of SPARS in a more inclusive and participatory manner involving relevant national stakeholders through a national coordination mechanism was found to be effective. The key focal points in countries were Ministry of Agriculture and NSO as they enabled broader coordination. SPARS integration into NSDS will facilitate the mainstreaming of agricultural and rural statistics.

Conclusion 3. SPARS is a key document providing policy focus and a framework for national governments to produce and use good quality agricultural and rural statistics. Ensuring the linkage between statistical and policy work requires building the capacity of policymakers in using data for more informed decision-making.

179. SPARS provided a roadmap and the basis for identifying priorities, needs, gaps and duplication in agricultural and rural data. SPARS is viewed as a vehicle to introduce

\(^{157}\) Ministry of Agriculture and NSO.
statistical initiatives to policymaking. If the SPARS cycle is not aligned with NSDS, sector plans and national investment plan cycles, it will affect the ability to secure funding from the government and development partners for SPARS implementation – thereby affecting its impact and sustainability.

Conclusion 4. Continuous support is required for ensuring a sustained statistical development process in countries (including SPARS development and implementation).

180. In the current design, a country is left on its own to implement, once the SPARS document is completed, with the assumption that it is integrated into NSDS (even if the endorsement of the Government and alignment with the national planning cycle are absent). While few countries have succeeded in implementing SPARS on their own, many countries require continued support by developing partners. FAO country offices, with support from FAO regional/subregional offices, could assist in the implementation of SPARS and the development of SPARS II, where relevant. They could also facilitate resource mobilization/technical linkage with other development partners for SPARS implementation.

Conclusion 5. Global Strategy’s initial efforts in technical assistance on cost-effective methodologies have shown some early evidence of uptake and use.

181. Among the countries that have received technical assistance on cost-effective methodologies, some countries have shown uptake and use (e.g. mainly CAPI, MSF and FBS). Not all countries will use all cost-effective methodologies. The ultimate success of technical assistance and/or the cost-effective methodology is cost-effective and timely data collection.

Conclusion 6. Global Strategy’s simple initiatives such as the scholarships and Masters’ programme in Agricultural Statistics in Africa provided higher (compounded) impact and sustainable capacities in institutions and stakeholders.

182. Not originally conceived by Global Strategy, the scholarship initiative proved to be a simple but a very effective and successful initiative. Similarly, the development of a Master’s programme in Agricultural Statistics (the first of its kind in Africa) involving statistical institutes provided a harmonized syllabus across universities and statistical institutes in Africa.

183. Building the capacities of statistical institutes and offering training through them (as in Africa) provides a cost-effective and sustainable capacity building model in regions.

Conclusion 7. The governance of Global Strategy served its purpose and performed its role but it had a complex structure and mechanism for decision-making.

184. Although governance served its purpose and performed its role during the first phase, it was a complex structure and mechanism for decision-making. The lines of reporting between GSC and RSC were blurred. Global Office had overall programme management and coordination accountability but no authority.
Conclusion 8. Global Strategy’s ability to achieve intended results was affected by lack of accountability and inadequate technical capacity within implementing partners.

185. Transparency and accountability are essential in partnerships. Inadequate technical capacity in agriculture and rural statistics or inability to staff the approved positions by implementing partners affected implementation of Global Strategy. Staff positions were at times filled by consultants, which affected the institutionalization of capacity due to high turnover. Some implementing partners’ inability to share information on output produced in a timely manner made it difficult for Global Strategy to monitor the progress or disseminate the lessons learned.

Conclusion 9. Global Strategy was effective in promoting and contributing to the work of UN normative values on gender equality and, in particular, youth and women empowerment.

186. Global Strategy’s research work on decent youth employment and technical guidelines on gender-disaggregated data and the scholarship initiative for emerging young statisticians are some examples. Even though it was difficult to target female attendees (as participants were selected by countries), Global Strategy’s efforts ensured equal or higher than statistical industry standards in the participation of women in training/workshops. Staffing at regional implementing partners was male-dominated reflecting the gender ratio of the statistical sector.

Conclusion 10. As a technical partner to Global Strategy, FAO could have been more involved at various levels (particularly in Africa) to further strengthen and continue Global Strategy work with ministries of agriculture and NSO and its work in the region and countries.

187. In Africa, technical assistance under Global Strategy was provided by AfDB. Nevertheless, FAO’s technical expertise and its historical relationships and mandates in the country/region could have added value and facilitated continuity and long-term sustainability in Africa. Examples of TCP support by FAO representation (country offices) in Asia-Pacific linked to Global Strategy, which complemented and added value, highlights the importance of involvement.

Conclusion 11. Agricultural and rural statistics updating will not take 20-25 years if there is concerted/coordinated effort and the commitment of resources under a global platform.

---

158 Includes crops, fisheries, aquaculture, livestock and forestry.
159 Global Office was involved in Africa through the accelerated technical assistance plan in the last two years.
160 FAO RAF organizes the AFCAS in Africa.
161 In Africa, even if there was support from FAO in a country for agricultural statistics (more in connection with agricultural census) it was in isolation and not connected or linked to Global Strategy. FAO country offices were largely unaware of Global Strategy.
188. The development of SPARS (for the first time in many countries), the number of new/updated cost-effective methodologies/guidelines developed and the number of TAs provided (during the first phase) are key evidences of how the agricultural, rural statistics world has changed for the better due to resource, implementing and technical partners coming together for Global Strategy. It has even expanded the work of FAO (e.g. AGRIS, new FBS tool and agricultural environment indicators).

5.2 Recommendations

189. These recommendations have been based on evidence, conclusions and lessons learned during the first phase of Global Strategy. Recommendations are all targeted to the GSC, Global Strategy, “task team” and resource/development partners.

190. While Recommendation 1 should be seen as an overarching recommendation, others provide specific recommendations relevant to the next phase and sustainability. Recommendations 2 and 7 in particular, may be of interest to FAO as a technical partner, among others.

Recommendation 1. Global Strategy should be supported for a longer period to sustain and build on the improvements made in agricultural and rural statistics.

191. Global Strategy has made significant strides, within a short period, improving the situation with reference to agricultural and rural statistics. The first phase has laid a good foundation in supporting countries to have a policy framework for agricultural statistics for the first time, updated/new methodologies and tools and building national capacities on agricultural and rural statistics among others. Building on this to enable the use of data for informed decision-making will require continued support and facilitation.

192. Currently, Global Strategy is only in two regions; it should be expanded to other regions to be truly “global.” Global Strategy should have a longer horizon at least until 2030, aligned with SDGs’ time frame, split into two phases (one to consolidate and expand and the other to fine-tune and exit). The demand and need for data and statistics is more evident, especially in the SDGs era.

Recommendation 2. SPARS (process/development/implementation) should be supported to establish itself as a planning document guiding the integration of agricultural and statistical activities into the national development process.

193. In addition to the endorsement of SPARS by the government, alignment of the SPARS cycle to NSDS, sector and national development plan, national agricultural investment plan cycles and development partner cycles is critical for national ownership and sustainability. This linkage should be internalized in the SPARS design to ensure SPARS implementation and the use of data collected through cost-effective methodologies. Handholding to ensure a sustained statistical

162 Phase II and III.
163 IdCA should be promoted in more countries as first step to develop SPARS.
development process and use could be provided by a development partner in the
country (as part of a national mechanism – not necessarily funded by Global
Strategy). For example, FAO decentralized offices (country/subregional/regional)
can take the lead in providing technical assistance in this regard.

Recommendation 3. Focussed demand-driven technical assistance on cost-effective
methodologies should continue. Ensure a more inclusive approach to identify research
topics for cost-effective methodology development to facilitate uptake and use.

194. A key focus of Global Strategy in the future should be on providing demand-driven
technical assistance to countries on cost-effective/updated methodologies. Timing
and need for TA in a country will be crucial for institutionalization (uptake and use).
Linkage of the need/demand and SPARS (including IdCA) should be established, as
applicable. TA should include a blend of cost-effective methodologies developed in
the first phase. Technical assistance should be at country level, not regional.
Workshops should not be considered as TA.

195. Country readiness to implement the cost-effective methodology as immediately as
possible should be a key criteria for selecting countries for TA. It will ensure
institutionalization and sustainability. The number of countries collecting data using
different cost-effective methodologies (e.g. MSF, CAPI and COP) should be the
measure for the success of TA on each cost-effective methodology.

196. Inclusiveness should be two-pronged – in terms of people/region and topics. In
addition to agriculture (crops), it is important to look at rural (the other part of
Global Strategy) as well as other aspects of agriculture, such as forestry, fisheries,
environment, post-harvest losses and emerging topics and technology.164

197. Receiving input on regional needs and gaps (from the regions) to identify research
topics will increase the relevance of topics for which cost-effective
methodologies/tools are produced and is likely to increase uptake and use. Having
examples/case studies from all regions (as relevant) would make the guideline more
relevant to the user, across the globe.165 Having guidelines in more languages
would enable wider use.

198. Continue research work on youth and women
(empowerment/employment/statistics) in agricultural and rural contexts.
Furthermore, Global Strategy should put more focussed effort to mainstream
gender and youth aspects because these aspects have important connections to the
agricultural sector’s growth and rural development.

Recommendation 4. Shifting/expanding focus from data generation to data use. Develop
the capacity of the policymakers to use data for decision-making.

199. Utilization of data to direct programme and policy development will be the ultimate
success of Global Strategy. The focus of the first phase was primarily on the

164 Global Strategy should tap into and strengthen collaborations with other FAO divisions – on forestry,
fisheries etc. (beyond FAO ESS which is more focussed on crop and livestock).
165 The reader/user relates better if there are examples from their region.
producers of data (statisticians). Future capacity development should also target the
decision makers, in particular those who use data to formulate policies and those
who make investment decisions on data generation. Building capacity on the
utilization of data for development planning and on the cost of data generation
and maintenance will help countries to make realistic investment decisions on
national statistics in areas that are most critical to their development needs.

**Recommendation 5. Develop and implement a strategic advocacy, communication and
dissemination plan to improve awareness about Global Strategy activities, benefits and
success in countries.**

200. Sending a tailored message to a wider audience highlighting the benefit of Global
Strategy activities is important. Agricultural and rural statistics are relevant and
essential beyond the ministries of agriculture and NSOs. At country level, in
addition to the government, there are development partners, civil society, producer
organizations and private sector funding and/or management programmes/projects in the food system. Agriculture and rural statistics also
extends into health, environment and gender aspects/domains. Many of them are
users of data. A detailed plan is required to create awareness at various levels about
activities and how it could help them specifically.

201. Globally advocating and highlighting success stories (of data produced and used
using cost-effective methodologies) at various high-level forums/committees
(beyond statistical forums) on a regular basis could help attract funding.
Furthermore, the Plan should address the issue of creating awareness in the country
offices of partners (implementing, technical and resource partners).

202. Global Strategy could also act as a more effective knowledge sharing hub/portal
(with discussion forum). Global Strategy should also monitor activities on its
website including views and downloads among others to assess the effectiveness of
its website. Having partners provide a link to the Global Strategy website would
enhance traffic in addition to social media presence.

203. Better linkage of methodologies to official statistics modernization initiatives could enhance visibility and use of data.

**Recommendation 6. Efficient models of training in Global Strategy should be scaled up
(e.g. scholarships).**

204. Capacitating statistical institutes and selected universities in various regions will
help deliver training more efficiently with better adaptation to the regional context.
This will also facilitate training being offered in more languages.

205. The scholarship initiative should be scaled-up in Africa and replicated in other
regions, as appropriate.

---

166 Multiplier effect as more/wider stakeholders discuss about it.
167 [https://www.unece.org/stats/mos.html](https://www.unece.org/stats/mos.html)
Recommendation 7. Ensure continued but enhanced involvement and contribution from FAO as a technical partner at various levels (especially at regional, subregional and country levels) for the short-term and long-term sustainability of improvements made in agricultural and rural statistics.

206. FAO as a technical partner can play a key role in all the regions. The involvement of FAO regional and country offices have demonstrated added value in Global Strategy implementation in the Asia-Pacific region. The country project proposal model could be replicated in other regions, as appropriate.

207. FAO country offices have been providing technical assistance in agriculture and rural development in countries, as part of its historical mandate. Good agricultural statistics are important for the development of agricultural and rural development policies and programmes. This could include facilitation of SPARS implementation and development of SPARS II, where relevant. FAO Regional/sub-regional Offices should support (as part of its policy work) the development and implementation of SPARS in each country through its country representation (offices) as an ongoing task (even without Global Strategy).168

208. FAO decentralized offices (country, subregional and regional) could play a key role in supporting the continued use of updated methodologies and tools to collect and use data. FAO headquarters should internalize Global Strategy methodologies into the normative work for the sustained utilization of the benefit of Global Strategy.

209. In the medium- to long-term FAO should become the custodian of Global Strategy documents (new/updated methodologies and guidelines) and continue to promote the use of guidelines and methodologies in all countries/regions as applicable. FAO should also ensure that methodologies and guidelines are updated and adapted, as required.

Recommendation 8. Revisit and fine-tune the existing business model.

210. Ensure simple governance and programme management mechanism.169 This may include the following:

a. Only one decision-making and oversight body globally for Global Strategy: Global Steering Committee with no more than 15 to 20 members. There can be observers invited, as required. If the GSC meets less than two times a year and more frequent decisions are required, a GEB can be created from GSC membership (no more than five members) to meet three to four times a year (as required) with authority to make decisions on behalf of GSC, which will be subsequently ratified by GSC.

b. A Global Office should manage the programme, be accountable and have authority to monitor implementation. The regions could have multiple

168 FAO can play a key role in all regions/countries to provide short/medium-term fixes and long-term servicing, continued improved agricultural and rural statistics production and use through TCPS and collaboration with other development partners.

169 Global Strategy should continue to remain a global initiative.
implementing partners. However, all of them should report to the Global Office with respective plans and budgets.170

c. Advisory committees/groups could be established for each region, in the model of a Scientific Advisory Committee but with stakeholders/experts from the respective region.

d. All resource partner funding for Global Strategy should be through a Multilateral Trust Fund mechanism.

e. A results framework with clear indicators to measure results at different levels - output, immediate outcome, intermediate outcome and impact. Monitoring of implementing partners should be more frequent. Closer monitoring (with authority) is critical to ensure delivery by implementing partners. Monitoring and feedback mechanism should be strengthened and should be outcome-oriented.171

211. The three components of Global Strategy – technical assistance, research and training - should continue. The key focus should be on regional and national capacity building (technical assistance and training) to produce and use data. Research could have a reduced focus but it should continue to develop methodologies on emerging topics and topics that have not been updated yet.172 Increasing the number of e-training modules will help reach and train more people cost-effectively. Advocacy and communication could be the fourth component.

212. Find alignment with other development partners’ strategic focus by expanding the area of Global Strategy’s activities beyond the narrowly-defined agriculture mandate. Focusing on the agriculture-rural-sustainable development nexus would enhance alignment with other development activities and facilitate resource mobilization.

213. “Modular” approach or clustering of countries (either by need/demand or by subregion) could prove to be an easier/efficient and/or more effective way to develop initiatives and find resource partners. Aligning to regional/subregional economic plans could be explored while clustering.

170 Not recommending a Global Strategy Regional Office model – one, it creates an additional layer and two, it does not go with the modular approach. With funding going from Global Office to the implementing partner, they should be accountable directly (in this approach FAO RAP and SIAP would report directly to Global Office). Global Office can have regional coordination meetings periodically globally/regionally. However, this could be tweaked, to the needs of the region.

171 Impact stories could be collected and compiled as part of monitoring.

172 Developing ready-to-use tools based on methodologies of Phase 1, such as harmonized questionnaires, validation rules, data processing software, etc. would enhance the uptake by countries.
214. Use champion states\textsuperscript{173} (preferably from the region) for peer support and South-South Cooperation, where appropriate.

215. Involvement of regional economic bodies and institutions should be considered for broader influence (including political) and having a presence in regional initiatives such as CAADP and SHaSA.

\textsuperscript{173} Champion states for different topics should be identified by Global Strategy. This is seen to work effectively in the aviation sector, where the champion states are identified by international organizations and they provide peer support using their own funds.
6 Appendices

Appendix 1. Results framework of Global Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Indicator – Average score on the use of statistics in the policymaking process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved evidence-based decision-making for poverty reduction. Increased food security, sustainable agriculture and rural development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target countries are enabled to develop sustainable statistical systems for the production and dissemination of accurate and timely agricultural and rural statistics, comparable over time and across countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of countries producing an agreed minimum set of core data of adequate quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of target countries that have integrated agricultural and rural statistics into their NSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of target countries that have improved national coordination mechanisms and statistical legislation to foster the sustainability of statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of target countries with improved agricultural statistical capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1</th>
<th>Output 2</th>
<th>Output 3</th>
<th>Output 4</th>
<th>Output 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective governing bodies set-up and functioning at global and regional levels</td>
<td>Coordinating bodies of the national statistical system, legal frameworks and strategic plans enable integration of agriculture into NSS</td>
<td>New cost-effective methodologies for data collection, analysis and dissemination developed</td>
<td>Increased capacity of agricultural statistics staff in regional training centres and target countries</td>
<td>Countries supported in the design and implementation of an integrated agricultural survey system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of governance meetings organized at global and regional level (G/R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Regional Action Plans developed (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of annual consolidated narrative reports and financial reports submitted (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of target countries that improved national coordination mechanisms and statistical legislation (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of target countries that have integrated agricultural and rural statistics into their NSDS (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of target countries where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of research topics completed by the Global Office (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of countries that adopted a minimum of 5 cost-effective methods (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries producing agreed minimum set of core data of adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRIS developed and tested in full scale in 1 country (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for linking LSMS and AGRIS developed (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Evaluation of the Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics

### Key Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of annual work plans (global/regional) endorsed by GSC/GEF (G)</td>
<td>Additional government funding is provided to support agricultural statistics (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of countries who received appropriate training on the use of cost-effective methods (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (G) – Global level; (R) – Regional level

*Source: Global Office – Revision of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (pp.13-17)*
### Appendix 2. List of people consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ms Valérie Dizier</td>
<td>Training and TA Coordinator, Global Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ms Rachele Brivio</td>
<td>Food Balance Sheet Specialist, ESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr Christophe Duhamel</td>
<td>Global Strategy (GS) Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ms Weronika Forowicz</td>
<td>Finance Officer, Global Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ms Neli Georgieva</td>
<td>Statistician - AGRIS Team, ESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr Asfandiyar Khan</td>
<td>Research Coordinator, Global Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr David William McSherry</td>
<td>Global Trust Fund Administrator/Senior Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ms Velda Nylander</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr José Rosero</td>
<td>FAO Statistics Division (ESS) Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ms Diana Sotomayor</td>
<td>Global Strategy Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr Mukesh Srivastava</td>
<td>Senior Statistician, ESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr Salar Tayyib</td>
<td>Food Balance Sheet Team Leader, ESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ms Marcellina Chijoriga</td>
<td>Liaison Consultant, BMGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr Albina Chuwa</td>
<td>Director General National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr Retsu Hagiwara</td>
<td>Team Leader - ARDS, JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ms Liesl Inglis</td>
<td>Programme Manager, Agriculture/Food and Nutrition Security, EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr Fred Kafeero</td>
<td>FAO Representative (FAOR), Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mr T. M. Kantunzi</td>
<td>Rector, EASTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr Daniel Masolwa</td>
<td>Acting Director – Economics and Statistics, NBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr F. A. Mkumbo</td>
<td>Deputy Rector EASTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mr Philemon Mwenda</td>
<td>Senior Statistician, National Bureau of Statistics (EASTC, Alumni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mr M. Nyanda</td>
<td>Head – Statistics Unit, Dept. of Policy and Planning, MOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mr Toshiaki Suzuki</td>
<td>Data Management Coordinator - ARDS, JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mr Charles Tulahi</td>
<td>Assistant FAOR, Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mr Hassan Ali</td>
<td>Assistant FAOR, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr Winston Anderson</td>
<td>Consultant – Global Strategy EU Monitoring Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mr Kafkas Caprazi</td>
<td>Statistician, Sub-regional Office – East Africa FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr Biratu Yigezu Gutema</td>
<td>Director General, Central Statistical Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mr Zena Habetwold</td>
<td>Director Planning and Programming, MOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr Ibrahim Mamma Hussein</td>
<td>GS Training Coordinator, UNECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mr Joseph Ibioudo</td>
<td>Head of Statistics Development, UNECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dr Chimimba David Phiri</td>
<td>Subregional Coordinator for Eastern Africa, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mr Ernest Ruzindaza</td>
<td>Senior Advisor &amp; CAADP Team Leader, DREA, AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mr Adam Abdoulaye</td>
<td>TA Consultant - Africa, Global Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ms Estella Addiko</td>
<td>M&amp;E Consultant - Africa, Global Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ms Mosso Rosine Addy</td>
<td>Director – Etudes ITS, ENSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mr Ouattara T. Albert</td>
<td>Assistant Director - Information, DSDI MOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mr Kouakou Jean Arnaud</td>
<td>Director – des Etudes, ENSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mr Germain DaSylva</td>
<td>FAOR, Côte d’Ivoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mr Kouarre Koffi Gabriel</td>
<td>Assistant Director - Documentation, DSDI, MOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mr Konan Hilaire</td>
<td>Assistant Director - Statistics, DSDI, MOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mr Patrick Houben</td>
<td>Team Leader, Rural Development/FS/Environment, EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mr Moussa Issak</td>
<td>Student from Djibouti, ENSEA (UNECA scholarship recipient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mr Jean-Rock D. Kouadio</td>
<td>Chief of Department – Sustainable Development, CCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mr Soro Kouhonan</td>
<td>Director, Statistics, Information &amp; Documentation (DSDI), MOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mr Herve Lago</td>
<td>Chief Intelligence and Economic Affairs, CCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mr Fessou E. Lawson</td>
<td>Manager (OIC), Statistical Capacity Development Division, AfDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ms Nejma Lazlem</td>
<td>ECA seconded – Africa, Global Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mr Atsin Yao Leon</td>
<td>Executive Director, FIRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mr Joachim Lezou</td>
<td>Team Lead – Projects, AFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mr Charles Leyeka Lufumpa</td>
<td>Director Statistics Department, AfDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mr Kouadja Jean Marc</td>
<td>ENSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mr Comara Moussa</td>
<td>Chief of SME Support – Chamber of Commerce (CCI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mr Vincent Ngendakumana</td>
<td>Global Strategy Regional Coordinator - Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dr Angiman Ackah Pierre</td>
<td>Past Executive Director, FIRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ms Eloi Somtinda</td>
<td>CAPI Expert - Africa, Global Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mr Christian Tape</td>
<td>Asst. Director General, National Institute of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mr Mahama Zoungrana</td>
<td>Policy Officer, FAO Côte d’Ivoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mali</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Mr Seydou Doumbia</td>
<td>Chief – Division of Agricultural Statistics, INSTAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mr Madior Fall</td>
<td>International Technical Expert/Advisor AFRISTAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Mr Balla Keita</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Ministry of Agriculture – Planning &amp; Statistics Unit (CPS/SDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Mr Paul-Henri Nguema Meye</td>
<td>Deputy Director General, AFRISTAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mr Amsata Niang</td>
<td>Expert in Agricultural Statistics, Global Strategy – FAO/AFRISTAT (also ENSEA alumni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Mr Audrier Bakari Sanou</td>
<td>Expert in Agricultural Statistics, Global Strategy – FAO/AFRISTAT (also ENSEA alumni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bangladesh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mr Md. Mahbob Ahmed</td>
<td>DG (Addl. Secretary) Dept. of Agrl. Marketing (DAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Mr Mir Nurul Alam</td>
<td>Director, Planning, Project Implm. and ICT Wing, DAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Dr Md Sainar Alam</td>
<td>District Fisheries Officer, Dept. of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mr M Badrul Arefin</td>
<td>Director General, Food Planning and Monitoring Unit (FPMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mr Bidhan Baral</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary (Cord-3), ERD (former focal point for SPARS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Dr Hiresh Ranjan Bhowmik</td>
<td>Director General, Dept. of Livestock Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Mr Junayed Bhuayan</td>
<td>Statistical Officer, BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Mr David W. Doolan</td>
<td>Acting FAOR, Bangladesh (FAOBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mr B.M. Refat Faisal</td>
<td>Senior Scientific Officer, SPARRSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Dr Krishna Gayen</td>
<td>DG (Addl. Secretary), Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mr Md Abdul Halim</td>
<td>Deputy Director, BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Mr Md Emdadul Haque</td>
<td>Joint Director, BBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of the Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mr Joarder Anowarul Haque</td>
<td>Principal Scientific Officer (Planning), Dept. of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Mr Ziaul Hasan</td>
<td>Chairperson (Additional Secretary), SPARRSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Mr Gazi Sipar Hossain</td>
<td>Programme and Monitoring Associate, FAOBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Mr Dewan Asraful Hossen</td>
<td>Deputy Director (MI &amp; Research), DAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mr Hajiqul Islam</td>
<td>Research Director, FPMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Mr Md Shafiqul Islam</td>
<td>Deputy Director, BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Dr GM Shamsul Kabir</td>
<td>Assistant Chief, Dept. of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Dr ABM Khaleduzzaman</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Dept. of Livestock Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mr Md Zafar Ullah Khan</td>
<td>Member (Application) (Joint Secretary), SPARRSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Ms Shaleha Khatun</td>
<td>Deputy Director, BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Mr Anil Kumar</td>
<td>National Consultant (Programme), FAOBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Ms Ayesha Akther Mily</td>
<td>Statistical Officer, BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mr Naoki Minamiguchi</td>
<td>Chief Technical Adviser - MUCH, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mr Mohammad Mohshin</td>
<td>Director General, Dept. of Agricultural Extension (DAE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Dr Md Abdul Muyeed</td>
<td>Director, Field Services Wing, DAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Ms Begum Nurun Naher</td>
<td>National Operations Officer, FAOBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Ms Shahnaz Begum Neena</td>
<td>Deputy Director, DAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Mr Golam Rabbani</td>
<td>Upazila Livestock Officer, Dept. of Livestock Services Programme and Monitoring Associate, FAOBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Dr Hafizur Rahman</td>
<td>Member (Technology 1), SPARRSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Mr Md Abdus Samad</td>
<td>Secretary (Deputy Secretary), SPARRSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Mr Emmanuel Sene</td>
<td>Senior Rural Development Specialist, GFADR, World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Ms Irin Siddika</td>
<td>Upazila Fisheries Officer, Dept. of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Dr Md Abu Sufan</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Dept. of Livestock Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ms Rehana Sultana</td>
<td>Agricultural Economist, DAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Ms Samina Yasmin</td>
<td>Agricultural Economist, World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Ms Homayora Yeasmin</td>
<td>Research Assistant, FAOBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Mr Sumiter Broca</td>
<td>Senior Policy/Programme Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Mr Anthony Burgard</td>
<td>Programme Management and Statistical Capacity Development International Consultant, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ms Sangita Dubey</td>
<td>Regional Statistician, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Ms Rikke Munk Hansen</td>
<td>Chief, Economic and Environment Statistics Section, UNESCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Ms Shaina Hasan</td>
<td>Global Strategy Communication Consultant, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Mr Weimin Miao</td>
<td>Aquaculture Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Mr Alick Mjuma Nyasulu</td>
<td>Statistician, UNESCAP (also interviewed by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Ms Clara Park</td>
<td>Gender Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Mr Kenichi Shono</td>
<td>Forest Resources Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Sobey</td>
<td>Budget Holder for Global Strategy/Liaison and Operations Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Mr Matthieu Bommier</td>
<td>Head of Office, AFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Dr Bounthong Bouahom</td>
<td>DG, National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Mr Xaypladeth Choulamany</td>
<td>DG, Department of Planning and Finance (DOPF), MAF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thailand (FAORAP and UNESCAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Mr Sumiter Broca</td>
<td>Senior Policy/Programme Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Mr Anthony Burgard</td>
<td>Programme Management and Statistical Capacity Development International Consultant, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ms Sangita Dubey</td>
<td>Regional Statistician, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Ms Rikke Munk Hansen</td>
<td>Chief, Economic and Environment Statistics Section, UNESCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Ms Shaina Hasan</td>
<td>Global Strategy Communication Consultant, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Mr Weimin Miao</td>
<td>Aquaculture Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Mr Alick Mjuma Nyasulu</td>
<td>Statistician, UNESCAP (also interviewed by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Ms Clara Park</td>
<td>Gender Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Mr Kenichi Shono</td>
<td>Forest Resources Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Sobey</td>
<td>Budget Holder for Global Strategy/Liaison and Operations Officer, FAORAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lao People’s Democratic Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Mr Matthieu Bommier</td>
<td>Head of Office, AFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Dr Bounthong Bouahom</td>
<td>DG, National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Mr Xaypladeth Choulamany</td>
<td>DG, Department of Planning and Finance (DOPF), MAF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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| 116 | Ms Morgane Cournarie | Project Officer, AFD |
| 117 | Ms Karan Courtney Haag | Nutrition Specialist, UNICEF |
| 118 | Mr Savanh Hanephom | Deputy DG, Department of Planning and Finance (DOPF), MAF |
| 119 | Mr Martin Hasler | Deputy Director of Cooperation, Head of Agriculture and Food Security Domain, SDC |
| 120 | Mr Chansom Manythong | Agriculture Specialist, World Bank |
| 121 | Mr Konesawang Nghardsaysone | Trade Economist, World Bank |
| 122 | Mr Koryang Pamah | Deputy Director General, Department of Economic Statistics (DES), Lao Statistics Bureau |
| 123 | Mr Phonesavanh S | Programme Manager, EU |
| 124 | Mr Chanthalath Pongmala | Assistant FAOR, FAO Lao PDR |
| 125 | Mr Inpone Senekhamty | Programme Manager, EU |
| 126 | Mr Somxay Sisanonh | Director General, Department of Policy and Legal Affairs (DOPLA), MAF |
| 127 | Ms Vivanh Souvannamethy | Director, Centre for Agricultural Statistics, MAF |
| 128 | Mr Phonesavanh Vanmixay | Deputy Director, Centre for Agricultural Statistics, MAF |

**Country Skype Interviews**

| 129 | Mr Inussa Barry | Director of Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, Cabo Verde |
| 130 | Mr Geoffrey Chomba | Assistant, FAOR, Zambia |
| 131 | Ms Chencho Dukpa | Specialist III Ministry of Agriculture and Forests (MoAF), Bhutan |
| 132 | Mr Jamyang Kuenzang | Statistical Officer, Department of Agriculture, MoAF, Bhutan |
| 133 | Ms Emanuela Santos | Institute of National Statistics (INE-CV), Cabo Verde |

**Global Steering Committee and Other Stakeholders (Skype Interviews)**

| 134 | Ms Olivia Beecham | Deputy Programme Manager, Data for Development Team, DFID |
| 135 | Ms Arturo Blancas | Director General of Statistics and Economics, INEGI, Mexico |
| 136 | Mr Oliver Chinganya | UNECA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia |
| 137 | Mr François Colson | Team Leader, EU Monitoring Team on Funding to AfDB |
| 138 | Ms Julianna Drinan | Programme Manager, BMGF |
| 139 | Ms Pilar Garcia | Director of International Affairs, INEGI, Mexico |
| 140 | Mr Johannes Jutting | Senior Economist, OECD, Paris, France |
| 141 | Mr Naman Keita | Consultant, Global Strategy 2nd Phase Task Team |
| 142 | Ms Carol Ann Munn | Senior Statistics Adviser & Team Leader – Data for Development Team, DFID |
| 143 | Mr Allan Nicholls | Former Asia-Pacific Regional Coordinator of Global Strategy |
| 144 | Mr Alick Nyasulu | Statistician, ESCAP (former SIAP) |
| 145 | Ms Susana Pérez | Director, INEGI, México |
| 146 | Mr Mauricio Rebolledo | Director of Census, INEGI, Mexico |
| 147 | Mr Romeo Recide | Chair, Global Steering Committee (Retd. Asst. Secretary/Deputy National Statistician, Philippine Statistics Authority) |
| 148 | Mr Makoto Shimizu | Manager, SIAP |
| 149 | Mr Yanhong Zhang | Chief, Data Analysis and Innovation Unit, UNICEF (former UNESCAP) |
Appendix 3. List of documents consulted

Global Strategy Programming Documents and Reports
- Global Strategy to Improve Agricultural and Rural Statistics, - Action Plan Phase 2 – 2020 – 2015, November 2018
- Project Closure Plan and Budget for 2019 (17th GSC) – 13 November 2018
- Final Allocation of Funds for 2018 (16th GSC) – 12 July 2018
- Preparation of the 2nd Phase of Global Strategy – Report of the Task Team, 12 October 2017
- GSARS Annual Consolidated Narrative Reports – 2015, 2016 and 2017
- Global Strategy – Global Office Work Plan 2018
- GSARS Regional Action Plan in Asia and the Pacific – Work Plan 2018
- GSARS Africa Region Narrative Consolidated Work Plan 2018 (under GTF and EU funds)
- Progress Towards the Recommendation that Emerged from the Mid-term Evaluation, Item 8 of 13th Meeting of the Global Steering Committee (GSC), 8 February 2017
- Draft Summary Record – 17th GSC – 13 November 2018
- Summary Record – 16th GSC – 12 July 2018
- Summary Financials per Partner – June 2018
- Consolidated Year-end Financial Report - 2017
- Financial Ratios – Year-end 2017
- Draft Summary Record – 15th Meeting of the GSC, 14 December 2017
- Draft Summary Record – 14th Meeting of the GSC, 12 October 2017
- Justification and Proposal for the Revision of the Integrated Budget, Global Office – 12th GSC, 26 February 2017
- Summary Record – 13th Meeting of the GSC, 8 February 2017
- Proposal for Strengthening the Results Framework – 13th GSC, 8 February 2017
- Allocation of Funds – 13th GSC, 8 February 2017
• Allocation of Funds – Global Office and Asia-Pacific Region (12th GSC) – 23 February 2016
• Management Response to the Mid-term Evaluation of the GSARS (12th GSC) – 23 February 2016
• Summary Record – 12th GSC, 23 February 2016
• Summary Record – 8th GEB, 8 February 2017
• Summary of Record – 7th GEB, 21 January 2016
• Revision of the Logical Framework of Global Strategy – 12th GSC, 23 February 2016
• Global Strategy – Global Office Work Plans 2015, 2016 and 2017
• GSARS Regional Action Plan in Asia and the Pacific – Work Plans 2015, 2016 and 2017
• Programme of Activities for Region Africa along with Global Office – 2016 and 2017
• GSARRS Asia-Pacific Region Budget – 2016, 2017 and 2018
• GSARS Africa Region Updated Budget - 2018
• GSARS Africa Region Narrative Work Plan 2015
• Summary Record – 11th GSC, 22 June 2015
• Summary Record – 10th GSC, 12 March 2015
• Latin America and the Caribbean Region Implementation Plan for Global Strategy 2013-2017, June 2015
• Asia-Pacific Regional Action Plan – February 2013
• An Action Plan for Africa – May 2011

Other Documents
• DFID Annual Review of Global Strategy - 2016, 2017 and 2018
• BMGF – Global Strategy Progress Narrative – 2017
• FAO Policy of Gender Equality – Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development, 2013
• Global Strategy: An Overview and Summary of Progress – APCAS/16/5.1.1, APCAS 26th Session, February 2016
• Report of the FAO on Recent Developments in Agricultural and Rural Statistics, UNSC 49th Session, March 2018
• Report of the FAO on Recent Developments in Agricultural and Rural Statistics, UNSC 48th Session, March 2017
• FAORAP – Global Strategy Brochure 2018
• FAORAP – Global Strategy Newsletters
• UNECA Quarterly Newsletters
• AfDB – Implementation Update News Bulletins on Action Plan to Improve Statistics for Food Security and Sustainable Agricultural and Rural Development in Africa.
• UNECA - Statistical Training Needs and Capacity Assessment, AGROST, December 2011
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