

July 2010



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food  
and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of  
the  
United  
Nations

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

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная  
организация  
Объединенных  
Наций

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

## PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

### Hundred and Fourth Session

Rome, 25 – 29 October 2010

### STRATEGIC EVALUATION OF FAO COUNTRY PROGRAMMING

### MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

#### A. GENERAL RESPONSE

1. FAO Management welcomes this strategic Evaluation, which was requested by the Programme Committee, in view of the key role country programming in general, and the National Medium Term Priority Framework (NMTPF) in particular, are expected to play in FAO's new results-based planning and operational framework.
2. Management appreciates the Evaluation process and methodology, as well as its forward-looking approach. The Evaluation report is the result of a comprehensive consultative process which involved extensive dialogue with a wide-range of stakeholders, as well as visits to all five FAO regional offices, nine subregional offices and fifteen country offices. This process helped to arrive at a consensus on a number of key issues.
3. This Management Response has been prepared through a consultative process under the guidance of the Deputy Director-General (Operations) and involving representatives of concerned headquarters departments/offices and decentralized offices. Management fully accepts 16 of the 20 recommendations, partially accepts two, rejects one and suggests deferring one, as detailed in the attached matrix.
4. In particular, Management agrees with the integrated character of the country programming process with its three proposed components, i.e.: (i) FAO's support to the process of national priority setting; (ii) the Country Programming Framework (CPF); and (iii) the FAO Country Workplan. Management agrees that the term Country Programming Framework (CPF) should be used instead of NMTPF and will use the term CPF in the remainder of this Management Response where appropriate.

#### B. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

5. Management considers that the evaluation's conclusions are in line with the Rome Declaration adopted at the World Summit on Food Security (November 2009), which stressed "that any plans for addressing food security challenges must be nationally articulated, designed, owned and led, and built

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

W0000

on consultation with all key stakeholders.”<sup>1</sup> The Summit participants further stated that “we will intensify international support to advance effective country-led and regional strategies”<sup>2</sup>.

6. The Evaluation confirms the original NMTPF concept included in the Vision on Decentralization that the Secretariat proposed in 2005 as a part of the management response to the *Independent External Evaluation of FAO’s Decentralization – Further Management Response Decentralization in FAO: The Way Forward*<sup>3</sup>. The Evaluation’s conclusions are also compatible with the latest Vision on Decentralization currently under discussion by the Regional Conferences (e.g. ERC/10/2 Add.1) in particular that the different parts of the Organization “*respond rapidly to evolving demands emanating through Country Offices (COs) in a synergized and timely manner*”.

7. Management welcomes that the Evaluation has duly considered the FAO commitment to the implementation of the two resolutions of the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System (TCPR) and to the UN system reform and coherence processes at country level, including the changes resulting from the Aid Effectiveness agenda, and how these processes are expected to influence and benefit FAO country programming.

8. The Evaluation’s findings and recommendations are also in line with the Immediate Plan of Action (IPA) for FAO Renewal, which considers NMTPFs together with subregional and regional areas of priority action as important mechanisms for focusing FAO’s action on meeting Members’ needs within the Strategic Framework.<sup>4</sup>

### C. IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

9. The Evaluation builds on and further informs ongoing change under the IPA and other reform initiatives. Linking the country programming changes to the IPA reform process will help to improve the likelihood of sustainable outcomes in the medium-term, with support from Members and staff. This will require additional effort relating to: (i) advocacy and communication with staff on new country programming approaches; (ii) staff training throughout the Organization; (iii) rebalancing and clarification of responsibilities and tasks between departments at headquarters, regional and country offices; (iv) establishment of stronger corporate coordination arrangements for support to country programming; (v) piloting of new country programming and implementation modalities; and (vi) rethinking of current funding modalities.

10. The Evaluation’s conclusion that “*FAO’s institutional capacities for implementing a planning and programming system are not strong*” must also be seen in the context of ongoing FAO reform, which may require further adjustment to achieve the full implementation of this evaluation’s recommendations, in particular the comprehensive country programming process.

11. Management acknowledges that the follow-up to this Evaluation on country programming cannot entirely be separated from the follow-up to the recommendations of the *Evaluation of FAO’s activities on capacity development in Africa*<sup>5</sup> as some of the latter’s recommendations affect the

---

<sup>1</sup> WSFS 2009/2 para 9

<sup>2</sup> WSFS 2009/2 para 10

<sup>3</sup> Document PC 94/3 – FC 110/26 In particular the Vision states that “*the starting point for the country-focused approach will be the national medium-term priority frameworks (NMTPFs)*” that “*will outline how FAO can best assist the country in meeting its priorities, including MDG targets, taking into account the interests and programmes of partners and donors as well as other frameworks which might already exist*”. It also stated that “*the NMTPFs would indicate the key opportunities where TCP resources could be catalytically used*” and that “*the NMTPFs will also serve as the building blocks for FAO’s Subregional and Regional programmes*” which “*will subsequently be melded into the Organization’s corporate Programme of Work and Budget and Medium Term Plan.*”

<sup>4</sup> C 2009/7 para 72

<sup>5</sup> PC 104/5 and Sup.1

content of the country programming process. It is proposed that the follow-up to these two evaluations be addressed, in greater detail, in the context of the overall IPA change agenda.

12. The guidance of membership will be sought on the funding implications of this Evaluation as the implementation of some recommendations may require a reallocation or growth of resources, as indicated in the attached matrix.

#### **D. PROPOSED FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS**

13. The recommendations of this evaluation will, to the extent possible, be implemented through the change management arrangements already in place in the IPA.

14. IPA Project 3 on Reform of Programming, Budgeting and Results-based Monitoring will further develop the corporate planning process to ensure bottom-up linkages among country priorities as reflected in CPFs, subregional and regional priority areas of action, Regional Conferences, the corporate results framework, as well as top-down accountability between the Medium Term Plan and Programme of Work and Budget (MTP/PWB) and regional, subregional and country office workplans<sup>6</sup>. It will also ensure that, as suggested by the Evaluation, national project activities, as well as country support to FAO's regional/global programmes and functions performed by country offices, are duly included in the Country Office Workplan.

15. Management will prepare (Recs.1, 2, 3, 4) policy guidelines to ensure that FAO's country programming process: (i) is driven by national priorities; (ii) is aligned with UN country programming; (iii) addresses disaster risk management challenges; (iv) incorporates programming of FAO's national investment strategies for agriculture, rural development and food security, including National Programmes for Food Security; (v) functions as an integral part of FAO's corporate planning and accountability system; and (vi) reflects global, regional and subregional priorities.

16. As recommended, FAO's country programming would comprise: (i) FAO's support to national priority setting; (ii) the CPF; and (iii) the country workplans. The Country Programming Guidelines will describe these three components and their programmatic inter-relationships. It will be a living document updated in accordance with changes in the international community's development assistance policies (e.g. the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action), UN and FAO reform. The first version of the guidelines will, as recommended by the Evaluation, be light, flexible and forward-looking; their preparation will require extensive work by Management. They will describe:

- a) FAO's support to national priority setting processes, including policies and procedures, also giving due recognition to the role played by FAO's current policy assistance modalities and the potential role of various in-house contributors (Rec. 8);
- b) The programmatic linkages of the CPF with the other components of country programming (Rec. 7) as well as the procedures for government approval/endorsement of the CPF (Rec. 10), the modalities for inclusion of outcomes (Rec. 11), indicative resource requirements or joint FAO/government budgetary commitments (Rec. 12), the modalities for the CPF's alignment with national planning cycles and the UNDAF (Recs. 6 and 14), and the CPF review procedures (Rec. 14);
- c) The Country Work Planning process resulting from the current pilot exercise will address *inter alia* the issues of alignment of country work plans with the CPF and the conditions under which activities, not foreseen in the CPF, can be included in the country work plan (window of flexibility - Rec. 9).

---

<sup>6</sup> As detailed in Figure 3 under paragraph 100 of the Evaluation's report

17. Country programming and resource mobilization strategies will be developed to be mutually supportive. IPA project 4 on Resource Mobilization will take on board the related recommendations (Rec. 18 to 20) to: (i) assure due prominence of national priorities in country programming while ensuring mechanisms for a constructive dialogue with donors; (ii) empowering regional offices to take a pro-active role in regional resource mobilization; and (iii) develop a comprehensive corporate resource mobilization strategy that integrates the results of the country programming process into regional and global initiatives.

18. IPA project 6 on Decentralization will incorporate in the new version of the Circular on Responsibilities and Relationships the new roles of FAOR (Rec. 10) and the Regional Offices (Rec. 15) in the country programming process. Under IPA action item 3.88, project 6 will address the evaluation's suggestion that the criteria for evaluation of country office performance duly relate to quality of projects and outputs rather than exclusively to quantity of resources mobilized and/or managed.

19. Modifications to the timing of the Regional Conferences (Rec. 5) and to the Technical Cooperation Programme (Rec. 17), are addressed to the membership. It is proposed that action on Recommendation 5 be deferred pending assessment of the workings of the governance reforms in the next two biennia, in line with IPA action 2.74.

20. The funding of the costs of country and regional programming (Recs. 15 and 16) could be addressed together with additional recurrent resource requirements arising from concerned IPA actions, based on guidance to be provided by Members, in the preparation of the Programme of Work and Budget 2012-13.

21. Management does not accept recommendation 17, which essentially proposes to eliminate the agreed TCP criteria. It is recalled that the Council in 2005<sup>7</sup> agreed a modified set of criteria ("special rules" referred to in recommendation 17) for the appraisal of requests for TCP assistance, while ensuring continued conformity with FAO's mandate, including that country-level priority setting for the use of TCP resources should be fully integrated into NMTPFs.<sup>8</sup> Thus the provision of Regular Programme support to selected priority areas of work under the NMTPF is addressed under the existing TCP criteria, which were reaffirmed during the review of the TCP project cycle and TCP approval guidelines in accordance with the IPA by the Programme Committee and Council in 2009.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, the key role of the NMTPF in the country programming process will ensure that TCP projects support national priorities and, through the country work plans, contribute to FAO's corporate objectives and results, as foreseen in the TCP criteria. Management cautions that the abolition of the TCP criteria and the aggregation of TCP resources with other funds to be managed through the overall corporate programming system would in essence compromise the nature and purpose of the TCP, as it would transform the TCP into a source of financial rather than technical support. This would significantly reduce the ability of the Organization to respond to the requests of governments for technical assistance as foreseen in the Basic Texts.

22. As stated in the New Vision for the Decentralized Offices Network,<sup>10</sup> FAO policy advice and its support to capacity development have to be based on the best technical knowledge and experience. It is therefore crucial for FAO's country offices to have, in developing country programmes, easy access to FAO's global technical knowledge and to best practices from around the world through communities of practice and knowledge networks. Therefore, Management wishes to highlight the

---

<sup>7</sup> CL 129/REP paragraph 34

<sup>8</sup> CL 129/3 paragraphs 41-47

<sup>9</sup> CL 136/9 paragraphs 20-28 and CL 139/REP paragraph 37

<sup>10</sup> ARC/10/2 Add.1 para 24.

important role that technical units (be they at FAO headquarters or in the decentralized offices) need to play, together with OSP, the TC Department, decentralized offices and OSD, in the country programming process.

23. Under the overall guidance of the Deputy Director-General (Operations), the implementation of the agreed recommendations will be coordinated by the Strategy Team responsible for Organizational Result X1<sup>11</sup> under Functional Objective X (FO-X1), which comprises representatives of OSD, OSP, TC and some regional offices. The coordination arrangement will also involve other concerned units (e.g. technical departments and other decentralized offices) as necessary. The initial experience with this arrangement will contribute to the adjustment of FO-X1 scope, formulation and leadership in the next PWB to incorporate the full country programming process. In following-up on the Evaluation's recommendations, Management will benchmark its approach against best practices in other UN Specialized Agencies.

---

<sup>11</sup> Entitled: Effective programmes addressing Member's priority needs developed, resourced, monitored and reported at global, regional and national levels

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<b>1. FAO Country Programming: Processes and Main Components</b>					
<p><b>REC 1:</b> Having identified the three main components of Country Programming and defined their nature and content, it would be appropriate to consider standardizing the names for each component, especially in the case of the term “NMTPF,” where there is a universal consensus that the name is difficult to pronounce and not very attractive. The Evaluation Team proposes the following names:</p> <p><b>1. Country Programming (CP)</b> to describe the whole process;</p> <p><b>2. National Priorities</b> to identify the issues and areas of work that the <b>government</b> has identified as its main priorities;</p> <p><b>3. Country Programming Framework (CPF)</b> to substitute for “NMTPF”;</p> <p><b>4. Country Workplan (CWP)</b>, for the two-year workplan (no change in this case)</p>	Accepted	1.1 Include a Glossary of country programming terminology in the corporate country programming guidelines.	TC	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<b>2. The Place of Country Programming in FAO's Corporate Programming and Accountability System</b>					
<p><b>REC 2.</b> The current intense work being carried out by separate units in defining new guidelines that refer to different components of country programming activities should be organized to ensure that the result is one single "Country Programming Guidelines" document. This Country Programming document should have clear statements regarding:</p> <p>a) the definition and characterisation of Country Programming as an institutional process that is fully integrated with the corporate planning, programming and accountability system, b) the identification of the three programming components (national priority setting, NMTPF, Country Workplan), specifying the nature and content of each, and the processes by which they must be developed, and c) the definition of the interrelations that must exist between them.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Management recognizes the importance of corporate guidelines for FAO country programming that cover:</p> <p>(i) FAO's contributions to national priority setting;</p> <p>(ii) FAO's contribution to UN Country Programming;</p> <p>(iii) FAO's work on disaster risk management; and</p> <p>(iv) the integration of country programming into the corporate planning, programming and accountability process.</p>	2.1 Prepare and introduce corporate country programming guidelines, including principles and policies to ensure programmatic links between the three components.	FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and technical departments	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N
		2.2 Implement the Country Office Work Planning Pilot and produce the resulting guidelines (IPA Project 3) as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.	OSP	June 2010- June 2011	N
		2.3 Produce the new NMTPF/CPF guidelines as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.	TC	October 2010- June 2011	N
		2.4 Develop guidelines for FAO's contribution to national priority setting as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.	TC	June 2011	N

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<b>REC 3.</b> Given the present situation in terms of FAO's capacities and an evolving internal and external context, the first draft of the Country Programming Guidelines should have the following three attributes: a) be light regarding the specific demands for information and detail, b) allow for flexibility in response to existing capacities and particular conditions at country level, and c) encourage new ideas and testing. A new version of the guidelines could be planned after a period of, say, three years, once the corporate planning and programming system has been completely implemented and some experience in Country Programming has been gained.	<b>Accepted</b>	3.1 Recommendation to be reflected in the corporate Country Programming Guidelines.	FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and technical departments	October 2010- June 2011	N
<b>REC 4:</b> In order to provide the necessary strength to the RO and the individual country offices to organize and carry out the full programming process from strategy to workplan in each country, the Country Programming Guidelines defined in Recommendation 2 should be approved and endorsed by the appropriate FAO Governing Body, probably the Programme Committee, or the Council. In addition, Management should institute a mechanism for informing all staff and the relevant Permanent Representative when each country NMTPF has been finalised. The NMTPFs should be made available to staff on the FAO intranet	<b>Partially accepted</b>  Governing bodies should review the general principles and policies governing country programming.	4.1 Prepare a document on general principles for country programming for consideration by the Programme Committee at its October 2011 session.	FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and technical departments	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N
		4.2 Include in the NMTPF/CPF component of the corporate Country Programming Guidelines a mechanism to ensure FAO staff and concerned Permanent Representatives are duly informed of the finalization of country NMTPF/CPFs. Ensure relevant documents are available in the FPMIS.	TC	October 2010- June 2011	N



Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<b>REC 5:</b> In order to make it possible for Country Programming to feed effectively as intended into FAO's corporate priority setting work, FAO's Governing Bodies should consider scheduling the Regional Conferences to be held as close as possible to the FAO Conference, so that the decisions made at the regional level (which include national concerns) can serve as inputs to the decision-making process in the Conference	<b>Deferred</b>  The implementation of FAO's governance reform, including changes to the roles of Conference, Council, Programme and Finance Committees, Regional Conferences and Technical Committees, has only started recently after approval by the 2009 Conference. To date, only three Regional Conferences have been held under the new regime, none of which requested a change in timing. Management is of the view that the role and timing of Regional Conferences should not be considered in isolation from the overall governance system, and that it is too early in the governance reform process to make judgements about their timing. It is suggested to defer the consideration of this recommendation until the assessment of workings of the governance reforms, foreseen by the IPA under action 2.74, is undertaken in the next two biennia.				
<b>3. The Relationship between FAO Country Programming and UN Country Teamwork</b>					
<b>REC 6:</b> FAO should (continue to) make every possible effort to fully integrate into the UN country programming process. In order to maximize its active participation and influence in that process, the NMTPF process should be initiated just ahead of the start of the UNDAF process as a means of providing the FAORs with substantive elements on agricultural issues and priority areas that may tabled in the discussions.	<b>Accepted</b>  As suggested by the evaluation, the final decision on the timing of the NMTPF is a joint decision made between the government and the FAO Representative.	6.1 Reflect this recommendation in the corporate Country Programming Guidelines.	FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and technical departments	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N
		6.2 Prepare in close collaboration with WFP and IFAD a guidance note on integration of food security in the UNDAF guidelines.	TC	December 2010	N
		6.3 Ensure mechanisms and resources are in place to enable FAO's country offices to simultaneously: (i) align with	TC and ROs	End 2013	Y (\$)

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
		national priorities and planning processes; (ii) integrate with corporate planning process; (iii) integrate UN country programming process; and (iv) integrate disaster risk management challenges.			
<b>REC 7:</b> Because the NMTPF component of Country Programming fulfils several key purposes for FAO that go beyond country level work, the Evaluation Team recommends that FAO should maintain and strengthen its own independent Country Programming procedures, while keeping them aligned and responsive to the evolution of UN Country Programming processes.	<b>Accepted</b>	7.1 Reflect this recommendation in the corporate Country Programming Guidelines.	FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and technical departments	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N
<b>4. National Priorities and Country Ownership</b>					
<b>REC 8:</b> In those cases in which a country does not have a functional planning and programming system, FAO should proactively offer to provide the necessary technical assistance for the development of a national framework of development priorities in the agricultural sector and related areas within FAO's mandate	<b>Accepted</b>  Scope and magnitude of the required support is to be assessed. Availability of resources will condition FAO's ability to respond to Members' needs.	8.1 Develop guidelines for FAO's contribution to national priority setting as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.	TC	June 2011	Y
<b>5. The NMTPF and the Country Workplan: Nature, Content and Time Cycle</b>					
<b>REC 9:</b> All the country technical assistance projects and activities included in the Country Workplan must be aligned with the priority areas that have been selected in the NMTPF.	<b>Accepted</b>  Management welcomes the approach to allow flexibility. This will enable the Organization to discharge its global mandate at country-level while	9.1 Reflect NMTPF/CPF-CWP programmatic relationships in the corporate Country Programming Guidelines.	FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
However the Country Workplan may include a "window" to accommodate activities that satisfy the following criteria: a) emerging priorities in areas in which FAO has a strong advocacy role, b) activities that contribute to corporate products that are part of the MTP (e.g., statistics), and c) activities for the implementation of FAO's global mandate (e.g., monitoring of treaties and conventions). All activities in the Country Workplan, including those derived from Unit Results of the Country Office, RO/SRO and Headquarters, as well as those in the 'window,' should be discussed with and approved by the FAOR, and implementation should be under his/her coordinating responsibility	aligning with national priorities.  Changes in the national context would be addressed in periodic country work plan reviews coordinated by the FAO Representative.		technical departments		
<b>REC 10:</b> The FAOR should be encouraged to seek the highest possible level in government as counterpart for signing the NMTPF, but should be given the maximum flexibility to make the final choice. The Evaluation Team considers that this situation should be analysed in each particular case. In all cases of course, all the ministries whose mandates relate to FAO's areas of work should be included in the consultation. This particular aspect of the process should be clearly defined in the NMTPF section of the new Country Programming Guidelines	<b>Accepted</b>  The FAO Representative should determine, in consultation with competent national authorities, how and by whom government endorsement should be obtained. When necessary, the FAO Representative should obtain guidance from the Subregional Coordinator or the Regional Representative.	10.1 Reflect this recommendation in the NMTPF/CPF component of the Country Programming Guidelines.	TC	October 2010-June 2011	N

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<b>REC 11:</b> The NMTPF should include expected outcomes at the greatest level of detail possible. It should not include outputs. It should include a convincing description of the strategy that FAO will use for the delivery of its cooperation, taking into consideration the Core Functions and the Primary Tools defined in the MTP for each Organizational Result of the Organization	<b>Accepted</b>  Accepted on the understanding that the content of NMTPF/CPF is not only limited to an identification of priority areas and expected outcomes (para 154) and that the most appropriate level of detail reflects the consensus among government, UN Country Team, other partners and FAO.  The CWP will include the unit results planned under the NMTPF/CPF, as well as unit results reflecting global/regional contributions programmed under the "window" (Rec. 10).	11.1 Reflect this recommendation in the CWP pilot and the NMTPF/CPF's component of the Country Programming Guidelines.	TC/OSP	June 2010- June 2011	N
<b>REC 12:</b> NMTPFs should, in the future, include indicative figures on resource requirements to meet the expected outcomes, and should include the specific budgetary commitments that FAO and the host country are willing to make for the development of activities in the selected priority areas for the following two years. However given the limited capacities that are available in FAO at this time it is recommended that these requirements be waived in the first programming cycle to include Country Workplans (2012-13) except in a small number of pilot cases to be developed for learning and testing. A final decision on the detailed content of the NMTPFs should be made taking into consideration the results and lessons learned from these pilot case studies.	<b>Partially accepted</b>  Management supports the inclusion of resource requirements in the NMTPF/CPF that express only the financial needs, but do not represent a commitment.  As the Evaluation points out in paragraph 201: "until now the funding available to FAORs for the development of country programming activities has been an undecided issue". Therefore, FAO cannot yet engage in longer-term commitments. Only the government can decide if it wants to commit its financial resources and, if so, on the most appropriate way to do it. Government, FAO and their partners need to agree on the most practical modalities to mobilize resources in support of NMTPF/CPF.	12.1 Allow inclusion of estimates of resources requirements in NMTPF/CPF and relevant guidelines.	TC	June 2011	N
		12.2 IPA 4 on resources mobilization to continue to address the issue of predictable and unearmarked programmable resources for FAO at country level.	TC/OSP	October 2010- June 2011	N

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or rejected</b> and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p><b>REC 13:</b> There should be a joint corporate review with TCE, TCS/TCD and OSP regarding the policies governing the incorporation of Emergency Activities into the NMTPF and the Country Workplan. The Evaluation Team was not able to see any justification for maintaining, as a general rule, a separate programming system to accomplish the same task for emergency work. The joint review should also analyse the need to specify criteria and special conditions under which exceptions should be made. FAO should use this joint corporate review to analyse the relationship and articulation of emergency planning and activities with the RBM system and in particular how emergency activities should define their contributions to Unit Results, at all levels but in particular in the case of Country Unit Results.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>FAO's co-leadership of the UN Inter-Agency Global Food Security and Agriculture cluster will represent an important input to the CPF and CWP process.</p> <p>As part of its mandate in the framework of the Global Cluster on Food Security and Agriculture, FAO will continue to also produce specific humanitarian planning documents that will feed into and be based on the CPF.</p>	<p>13.1 A joint corporate review will take place, coordinated by FO X1 Strategy Team.</p>	<p>FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and technical departments</p>	<p>2010-2011</p>	<p>N</p>
		<p>13.2 Based on the result of the corporate review, ensure that related unit results are defined at country level.</p>	<p>Strategic Objective I, Strategy Team</p>	<p>2011-2012</p>	<p>N</p>
<p><b>REC 14:</b> The cycle for preparing NMTPFs should be aligned with the planning cycle of the host country, and therefore also of the new UNDAF cycle. The document should undergo a mid-term review and be adjusted if necessary. When there are major changes in the international context, in FAO's Strategic Framework or in the national policies and strategic directions, an interim review of the NMTPF should also be considered.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>The opportunity to align as much as possible with the UNDAF formulation process should also be considered, since some governments are concerned about having to engage in many UN planning processes launched at different times. The FAO Representative should decide on how best country programming can be: i) aligned to host country planning cycle; and ii) coherent with UNDAF cycle while adhering to FAO's corporate cycle. The FAOR should agree on the timing of interim reviews jointly with host country authorities, with guidance from the Subregional Coordinator or Regional Representative, as needed.</p>	<p>14.1 Reflect this recommendation in the new NMTPF/CPF guidelines as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.</p>	<p>TC</p>	<p>October 2010- June 2011</p>	<p>N</p>

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  <b>Accepted, partially accepted or rejected</b> and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
<b>6. Country Programming: Organization and Institutional Responsibilities</b>					
<b>REC 15:</b> The Regional Offices (including their Sub-regional Offices) should have the main responsibility for organizing the backstopping, monitoring and quality assurance of Country Programming activities. This includes responsibility for ensuring that the NMTPFs are completed on time according to the agreed cycle and respect the approved procedures. FAO should formally assign these responsibilities to the ROs and make the necessary allocation of human and financial resources to ensure that these responsibilities can be adequately discharged by the RO or its delegated SRO.	<b>Accepted</b> Management supports this recommendation subject to the provision or reallocation of resources.	15.1 Redesign country programming business processes.	TC/OSD	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N
		15.2 Include relevant budgetary proposal in PWB 2012-13.	OSP	March 2011	Y (\$\$)
<b>7. Funding for Country and Regional Programming Process</b>					
<b>REC 16:</b> FAO should assign each Regional Office a lump sum from the Regular Programme to cover the estimated costs of the country and regional programming activities that will take place during that budget cycle.	<b>Accepted</b> Management supports this recommendation subject to the provision or reallocation of resources.	16.1 Include relevant budgetary proposal in PWB 2012-13.	OSP	March 2011	Y (\$\$)
<b>REC 17:</b> FAO should allocate funds available from its Regular Programme budget for field activities to the Regional Offices, to support the selected priority areas of work under the NMTPF in each country. In the new institutional context of corporate programming, the system of special rules utilised in the TCP	<b>Rejected</b> Management does not accept the recommendation for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council in 2005 agreed a modified set of criteria ("special rules" referred to in recommendation 17) for the appraisal of requests for TCP assistance, while ensuring continued conformity with FAO's</li> </ul>				

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
appear unnecessary. Rather, the funds now in the TCP and any other RP funds available for country level activities should be managed through the rules and procedures established in the corporate programming system. The TCP funds are already under the responsibility of the ROs since January 2010. The allocation of these resources at country level would be formalised through the Country Workplans. The FAO Secretariat should seek the appropriate resolution from its Governing Bodies	<p>mandate, including that country-level priority setting for the use of TCP resources should be fully integrated into NMTPFs. Thus the provision of Regular Programme support to selected priority areas of work under the NMTPF is addressed under the existing TCP criteria, which were reaffirmed during the review of the TCP project cycle and TCP approval guidelines in accordance with the IPA by the Programme Committee and Council in 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the key role of the NMTPF in the country programming process will ensure that TCP projects support national priorities and, through the country work plans, contribute to FAO's corporate objectives and results, as foreseen in the TCP criteria</li> <li>the abolition of the TCP criteria and the aggregation of TCP resources with other funds to be managed through the overall corporate programming system would in essence compromise the nature and purpose of the TCP, as it would transform the TCP into a source of financial rather than technical support. This would significantly reduce the ability of the Organization to respond to the governments' requests for technical assistance as foreseen in the Basic Texts.</li> </ul>				
<b>8. Country Programming and Resource Mobilization</b>					
<b>REC 18:</b> The process by which NMTPFs are developed should not be excessively influenced by the potential interest and priorities of donors in each individual country. The main objective of Country Programming is to establish an intelligent dialogue with government	<b>Accepted</b>	18.1 Articulate this concept in CPF and CWP components of the Country Programming Guidelines as well as in the corporate resource mobilization strategy.	FO X1 coordination involving OSD, OSP, TC, ROs and technical	3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2011	N

Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
authorities and jointly select from the government's priority areas the ones where FAO can best contribute (within its own Strategic Frame-work) through high level technical assistance and capacity development activities			departments		
<b>REC 19:</b> FAO should delegate the authority and provide the necessary resources to the Regional Offices in order for them to develop an aggressive strategy of resource mobilization for regional activities. These activities should be identified on the basis of the most relevant common problems with a regional dimension, identified in turn through the priorities and themes that emerge from Country Programming activities in the countries of the region.	<b>Accepted</b>  Management supports this recommendation subject to the provision or reallocation of resources	19.1 Reflect recommendation in finalization of corporate resource mobilization strategy (IPA 4).	TC/OSP	June 2011	N
		19.2 Redesign business processes related to resource mobilization.	TC	June 2011	N
		19.3 Include relevant budgetary proposal in PWB 2012-13.	OSP	March 2011	Y (\$\$)
<b>REC 20:</b> FAO should develop a comprehensive Corporate Strategy for Resource Mobilization, and should integrate into it the regional and global initiatives that emerge from the Country Programming process. Furthermore, FAO management should rationalise and streamline responsibilities in this area and strengthen the capacity of the appropriate units in HQ to define and implement the Corporate Strategy. The main thrust of this strategy should be to obtain funds for the implementation of programmes that focus on "country-led normative work," i.e., the normative work that responds to priorities emerging from Country Programming. This is especially important in relation FAO's recent efforts to obtain unearmarked voluntary	<b>Accepted</b>  Falls under IPA project 4 on resource mobilization.  Management agrees that FAO's CPF should focus on national priorities within the FAO Strategic Framework, including the Impact Focus Areas (IFAs).	20.1 Reflect recommendation in finalization of corporate resource mobilization strategy (IPA 4).	TC/OSP	June 2011	Y (\$)



Evaluation Recommendations	Management  Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and COMMENT on the Recommendation	Management - Action to be taken			
		Action	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
contributions, a source of funding that are likely to increase because of the changing international aid environment and the development of a stronger planning and programming system in FAO.					