

Methodology

1. The evaluation began with an in-house inventory of emergency-related activities to determine the scope of the work being conducted. The evaluation itself consisted of four main steps:

1. *Evaluation of FAO's normative work in relation to Strategic Objective A3*

This part consisted of collecting and reviewing materials produced by FAO and others, and included an examination of relevant literature on the subject by an external consultant. The review of written materials was complemented by interviews with technical officers of key lead units.

2. *Survey of Member Nations, implementing partners and donors*

A questionnaire was submitted to Member Nations, implementing partners and donors for emergency activities to assess developing countries' needs and the quality of FAO's response from the various points of view. The results of the questionnaires appear in Annex 1.

3. *Evaluation of country needs and performance of field assistance*

Field visits to 15 countries were made in five missions, each with an FAO Evaluation Service (PBEE) staff member and an independent external consultant, to produce an in-depth assessment, including review of individual FAO interventions, most of which were relief and early rehabilitation projects funded by TCP or Trust Fund donors.

The 15 countries were selected with the aim of achieving a balance in the types of disasters covered. Therefore, some countries (those that suffered primarily natural disasters) had relatively few interventions, mostly funded by TCP. Others (with mostly complex emergencies) had a far larger number of interventions, the majority of which were financed by bilateral donors. In each country, the entire gamut of the FAO interventions was reviewed, regardless of the sources of funding. These interventions included agricultural relief projects, crop and food supply assessment missions, other activities related to preparedness and, when applicable, transition to rehabilitation.

Regional coverage was:

Asia¹ – mostly on flood emergencies;

Africa² – mostly complex emergencies caused by civil conflict, some drought and plant pests;

Near East and Europe³ – mostly on drought and pest problems;

Latin America and the Caribbean⁴ – mostly storm-related emergencies, but also some drought.

The evaluation also drew on other recent (2001) field evaluation experience of FAO emergency activities in Mozambique, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Tajikistan. The evaluation included a study of FAO transitional assistance in the post-relief period in Kosovo, where there was a large programme of emergency assistance.

Evaluation missions met with other UN agencies, donors and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in all countries. The choice of interlocutors varied from place to place, but in all cases missions met with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). They also met with the World Food Programme (WFP), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) in all countries where these organizations were present. The NGOs that were met were those implementing FAO projects, carrying out similar activities with FAO, or both.

As well as interviewing people involved with the design, implementation and follow-up of project interventions in the selected countries (including intended beneficiaries, on a sample basis), missions also met with implementing partners to obtain their assessments of country needs and of the work carried out in the country.

¹ Bangladesh, Cambodia, Thailand, Viet Nam.

² Burundi, Eritrea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone.

³ Georgia, Kazakhstan, Mauritania.

⁴ Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua.