

September 2012



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  
Alimentación y la  
Agricultura

## PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

**Hundred and Twelfth session**

**Rome, 5 - 9 November 2012**

**FOLLOW-UP TO THE STRATEGIC EVALUATION OF FAO  
COUNTRY PROGRAMMING**

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

**Mr Daniel J. Gustafson**  
**Director, Office of Support to Decentralisation**  
**Tel (06) 570-56320**

**Mr Boyd A. Haight**  
**Director, Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management**  
**Tel. (06) 570-55324**

## Executive Summary

1. At its 104<sup>th</sup> session in 2010, the Programme Committee appreciated the Strategic Evaluation of FAO country programming and Management's full or partial acceptance of seventeen of the twenty recommendations, as well as Management's Plan of Action for rolling out a revised approach to country programming.

2. In line with the FAO's policy on evaluations, this report provides an update on the status of implementation of the actions set out in the Management Response. In particular it:

- a) describes the progress made over the last two years in establishing a strategic approach to country programming, while also recognizing that expected benefits are not yet fully visible and that additional time and efforts are required;
- b) informs on the synergies that are being generated between country programming and other related reform initiatives such as the review of the structure and functioning of the decentralized offices (DOs) network, the decentralization of the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) and the transformational changes, which have a direct impact on decentralized offices capacity and the governance of country programming processes;
- c) presents the actions undertaken to develop integrated, coherent and comprehensive programmes at country level, aligned with both national development priorities and FAO Strategic Objectives. These actions emphasize the mechanisms in place to ensure coherence among CPFs, resource mobilization strategies, projects and country work plans (CWPs). It also describes the streamlined approach to monitoring and reporting and harmonization with the UNDAF; and
- d) provides an assessment of the adoption rate of the recommendations (Annex 1) using a rating system (High, Substantial, Moderate, Negligible) based on the combined result of three criteria: i) progress made against the baseline set in 2010 (year of the evaluation); ii) rate of implementation of the actions; and iii) expected results.

## Guidance sought from the Programme Committee

➤ The Programme Committee may wish to note progress in the implementation of the Evaluation Recommendations and provide its views on the follow-up report.

## Introduction

3. At its 104<sup>th</sup> session in 2010, the Programme Committee appreciated the Strategic Evaluation of FAO country programming and Management's<sup>1</sup> full or partial acceptance of seventeen of the twenty recommendations, as well as Management's Plan of Action for rolling out a revised approach to country programming.

4. In June 2012, at its 144<sup>th</sup> session, the Council<sup>2</sup> considered that, "*through the preparation of Country Programming Frameworks (CPFs), FAO could improve the effectiveness of its assistance and could contribute more strategically to the strengthening of national capacities.*" The Council agreed that CPFs should prioritize areas of collaboration between governments and FAO, with FAO's Strategic Objectives serving as a foundation and the indicators and targets of the Action Plans aligning FAO's standard-setting and normative work with the priorities defined in the CPF. It also emphasized the importance of integrating and including in the CPFs emergency and development activities, including FAO's policy work. The Council noted that CPFs would be finalized to the extent possible by December 2012 as inputs to the PWB 2014-15 and Management further specified that all countries that have not engaged in CPF formulation so far are urged to prepare, by the end of 2012, at least a preliminary CPF outline.

<sup>1</sup> PC 108/2 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/023/mc218e.pdf>; CL 140/8 paras. 15-16 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/020/k9398e.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> CL 144/REP <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/025/me323e.pdf>

5. In line with the FAO's policy on evaluations, this report provides an update on the status of implementation of the actions set out in the Management Response in terms of achievements, challenges and opportunities, and the way forward. It provides an assessment of the adoption rate of the recommendations (Annex 1) using a rating system (High, Substantial, Moderate, Negligible)<sup>3</sup> based on the combined result of three criteria: i) progress made against the baseline set in 2010 (year of the evaluation); ii) rate of implementation of the actions; and iii) expected results.

## I. Achievements

6. Country programming focuses FAO's work at country level on those areas where it can add most value to the government's development objectives, helps integrate FAO's work with that of other United Nations agencies and development partners and serves as catalyst for resource mobilization. The development of the Country Programming Frameworks reflects the heightened emphasis and importance given to effective planning and priority setting at the country level and the full integration of these process within FAO's planning, budgeting and programming architecture and corporate results frameworks. The CPF is a critical element in establishing a "clear line of sight" between the work of country offices and FAO's Strategic Objectives, as well incorporating country and regional priorities in the design of the Organization's global programmes.

7. All accepted Evaluation recommendations have been addressed and most of the actions have been completed or are close to completion. In addition, new initiatives are being developed to further support implementation of the Action Plan. This process has benefited from close collaboration between headquarters and decentralized offices with the support of a number of communication tools, such as Intranets, discussion fora, newsletters, learning initiatives, and peer support networks.

8. The Programme Committee at its 108<sup>th</sup> session (October 2011)<sup>4</sup> supported the "Country Programming Guidelines – Policies and Principles", endorsed at the 143<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Council (November 2011).<sup>5</sup> In 2011 and 2012, institutional roles and responsibilities were reviewed in line with the decentralization policy endorsed by the 144<sup>th</sup> session of the Council. As a result, country offices are now responsible for country programming, while subregional, regional and headquarters units are charged with ensuring coherence between country, (sub)regional and corporate programming processes, providing technical backstopping, and assuring quality. Capacity for providing support to country offices is expected to be further strengthened following the critical review of staffing in decentralized offices, while support to country offices has now been included as part of the job description of all decentralized technical officers.

9. Throughout 2010-11 a Country Office Work Planning pilot allowed testing a mechanism for integrating the work of country offices into the corporate programming framework. The pilot was conducted in six countries across five regions and generated lessons regarding the integration of emergencies and development work, the mutual dependency of project and non-project activities, the potential mechanisms for enhancing collaboration across the Organization, and the most appropriate level of detail for operational planning.

10. In January 2012, the Guide for the Formulation of the Country Programming Framework<sup>6</sup> (CPF) was issued. It is in use by all countries undergoing a CPF process in 2012 and, as a result, CPFs are beginning to demonstrate improved quality and harmonization. The Guide is a living document and will be updated based on experience and lessons learned. In addition, guidance notes for addressing specific technical issues have been prepared and a quality assurance mechanism for CPFs has been put in place.

---

<sup>3</sup> (a) High - Fully adopted; (b) Substantial - Largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet; (c) Moderate - Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas; and (d) Negligible - No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage.

<sup>4</sup> CL 143/7 paras. 5-7 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/023/mc358e.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> CL 143/REP para. 23 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/024/mc783e.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> <ftp://ftp.fao.org/TC/CPF/Guidelines/CPFGuidelines.pdf>

11. Since March 2012, the Effective Country Programming Learning Programme (ECP-LP) is being used to increase staff awareness of the integrated and unified approach to country programming. To this end, care has been taken to develop guidance and tools that will enable country offices to effectively coordinate all programming processes taking place in the country, including the three core components identified in the Evaluation (namely, identification of national development priorities, CPF, country work plans), resource mobilization and project cycle management. The programming process is based on results-based management principles, and significant efforts have been made to streamline components and harmonize with requirements related to the UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF), capacity development and disaster risk reduction and management (DRR/M). Seven training workshops have been conducted across three regions, and a peer support network is being formed.

12. In April 2012, the Council endorsed the corporate Resource Mobilization and Management Strategy,<sup>7</sup> which promotes a programming approach to resource mobilization, based on priorities identified in CPFs and FAO's Strategic Framework. Business processes have been redesigned to enable decentralized offices to develop subsidiary resource mobilization strategies and action plans. Regional and subregional resource mobilization strategies have been developed and a resource mobilization strategy and action plan is now requested as an integral element to the CPF. This is expected to encourage country offices and national counterparts to realistically consider the potential to mobilize and manage the required resources, prior to defining commitments in the CPF.

13. In July 2012, the first part of FAO's new Guide to the Project Cycle covering the identification, formulation, and appraisal and approval phases was launched. The Guide improves the strategic orientation, quality and accountability of projects, ensuring that each proposal, from the early identification, is conducive to results supporting national development goals and frameworks and fully aligned with UNDAFs, CPFs, and FAO's Strategic Framework. The five UN Country Programming Principles have been mainstreamed as defining factors of sustainability, together with simplification of procedures and standardization of formats to better guide project formulators.

## II. Main challenges and opportunities

14. **Improve the quality, harmonization and standardization of CPFs.** The launch of the CPF Guide and the rollout of the ECP-LP provide the basis and capacity for improving the quality and consistency of CPF documents. A Quality Assurance mechanism has been developed and is being rolled-out, to ensure the relevance (strategic focus and priorities), feasibility (financial and technical) and sustainability of CPFs. Further efforts are also required to improve Organization-wide coordination of CPF processes and strengthen capacity to ensure compliance with the minimum quality standards.

15. **Ensure country ownership of CPFs.** The approach to country programming has been well received in the majority of countries, although in limited number of cases, some national governments still appear reluctant to engage in the CPF formulation. This stems from a number of factors, ranging from political circumstances, perceived high transaction costs involved in the CPF process, or lack of information regarding the purposes and advantages of the exercise. Increasing efforts are being made to develop tailored strategies to overcome these problems, focussing on advocacy and awareness raising.

16. **Boost country office ownership of, and accountability for, FAO planning.** The strengthening of decentralization and strategic planning are helping to boost the contribution of bottom-up planning of FAO's work, in which priorities and outcomes identified through CPFs provide building blocks for regional priorities. It will also enable country offices to hold themselves accountable for implementing, monitoring and reporting on corporate commitments at country level. Growing requests for follow-up support to CPF formulation is evidence of the country offices' commitment to adopt the new approaches to country programming.

---

<sup>7</sup> JM 2011.2/4 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/024/mc062e.pdf>

17. **Adapt the country programming approach and business processes to an evolving context.** FAO country programming is closely aligned to UN programming processes. In 2012 the UN General Assembly may adopt new approaches regarding the UN's Operational Activities for Development in the context of its Quadrennial Review. This will set the stage for the UN System's country-level work, including Delivering as One, the Resident Coordinator System and the UNDAF process. The resulting implications for FAO's country programming process will need to be monitored and assessed. Particular attention needs to be paid to the alignment of FAO programming timeline with the UN system programming cycle. In addition, FAO's transformational change initiatives could help to improve the implementation of country programming. These changes will provide an opportunity to further enhance the integration of country programming in FAO's new business model and strengthen the Organization's performance, results and impact at regional, subregional and country levels.

18. **Continue developing capacity to provide corporate support for country programming processes.** Country programming is a corporate effort following the subsidiarity principle. FAORs lead the formulation of CPFs, resource mobilization strategies, national project documents and country work plans. They are supported in these processes by the subregional multidisciplinary team (MDT) or, in its absence, by the relevant regional office. Subregional and regional offices are responsible for planning and coordinating the support and technical inputs required from relevant units across the Organization, thereby ensuring that all programme components meet minimum quality standards. In this setting, enhanced knowledge networking, coordination mechanisms and engagement of Strategy Teams and technical offices will be essential to ensure unity of purpose and to effectively leverage the Organization's global knowledge, products and services in support of country priorities.

19. **Leveraging further resources at country level.** Improved country programming will enhance the Organization's capacity to leverage resources at country level and to mobilize technical support in a timely manner. Three key conditions are necessary to meaningfully engage resource partners: i) clarity of priority areas for FAO assistance and achievement of results; ii) commitment to the implementation of the CPFs; and iii) quality of dialogue between FAO, national counterparts and partners at country level around FAO core thematic areas.

### III. The way forward

20. Noting the challenges and opportunities raised above, the following issues are to be considered for the way forward.

21. **Moving from formulation to the implementation of effective country programmes.** Most of the efforts made so far have focused on the formulation of country programmes, i.e. the preparation of CPF documents and resource mobilization strategies. As recommended by the Evaluation, the formulation of country programmes does not stand in isolation. A synergetic approach has been adopted along with other FAO business processes, such as resource mobilization and project operations. Throughout 2012-14, attention will be focused on those processes, which represent the implementation, monitoring and reporting phases of country programming and will be critical in determining the effect of the improved CPF documents on the effectiveness of FAO's country programmes.

22. **Decentralizing country programming responsibilities.** As an increasing range of country programming functions are transferred to the regions, the role of headquarters units will primarily focus on refining common principles, developing guidelines and tools, and ensuring overall compliance with corporate policy, standards and procedures. This will require organizational learning, thorough consultations and continuous networking. The direct support to implementation of these principles and guidelines will be progressively provided by regional offices. Rebalancing of capacities and institutional knowledge between headquarters and decentralized offices will be required. This calls for a new business model which:

- further enhances the role, capacities, and support available to FAO Representatives in leading the country programming process, striving for improved impact and performance;
- leverages the strengthened capacity of regional offices to provide technical and operational support to country programming;
- further strengthens the capacity of headquarters units to set the global framework for country programming and to develop global support tools, monitor implementation and manage change; and
- pro-actively contributes and adapts to the common UN programming practices agreed by the UNDG.

23. **Progressive integration of the Technical Cooperation Programme and capacity development concerns into the country programming process.** As recommended by the Evaluation, approvals and utilization of TCP resources could better support the preparation of CPFs and the priorities emerging from them. Proposals for overall enhancement of the TCP, are submitted for consideration of the Council in document CL 145/8.

24. **Develop IT supporting tools.** In order to fully roll out this holistic approach to country programming, a corporate tool supporting and streamlining the formulation, implementation, monitoring and reporting processes of the country programme must be developed. Some elements of this system already exist, which facilitate the management of projects, country offices and work in countries managed by regional, subregional and headquarters offices. CPF and CWP preparation and monitoring systems are under development and will be closely integrated with existing systems. They will facilitate an overview of country programmes, streamline monitoring processes, and support staff in ensuring that all work in the country is fully aligned with agreed priorities.

#### *Guidance sought from the Programme Committee*

25. The Programme Committee may wish to note progress in the implementation of the Recommendations and provide its views on the follow-up report.

**Annex 1: Achievements of the implementation of the country programming Action Plan**

<b>Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)</b>	<b>Date</b>			<b>Adoption Rating Scale</b>
<b>Evaluation Recommendation</b>	<b>Action Agreed</b>	<b>Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken</b>	<b>Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures</b>	<b>High Substantial Moderate Negligible</b>
<p>REC 1: 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Country Programming (CP) to describe the whole process;</li> <li>2. National Priorities to identify the issues and areas of work that the government has identified as its main priorities;</li> <li>3. Country Programming Framework (CPF) to substitute for “NMTPF”;</li> <li>4. Country Workplan (CWP), for the two-year workplan (no change in this case)</li> </ol>	<p>1.1 Include a Glossary of country programming terminology in the corporate country programming guidelines.</p>	<p>The proposed terminology has been adopted and is in use in country programming. It is reflected in the Policies and Principles for country programming endorsed by the Programme Committee in November 2011 and in the CPF guide endorsed by Management in January 2012, as well as in the integrated Effective Country Programming (ECP) learning programme.</p>	<p>All CPFs currently being formulated reflect the policies, principles and processes recommended by the Evaluation.</p>	<p>HIGH</p>
<p>REC 2. 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</p>	<p>2.1 Prepare and introduce corporate country programming guidelines, including principles and policies to ensure programmatic links</p>	<p>2.1 The Country Programming Guidelines – Policies and Principles and the CPF Guide have been prepared. Detailed country work planning guidelines are under preparation and</p>	<p>The guidelines for individual country programming components are currently being tested and refined in association with one another.</p>	<p>HIGH</p>

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
<p>Programming document should have clear statements regarding: 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>between the three components.</p> <p>2.2 Implement the Country Office Work Planning Pilot and produce the resulting guidelines (IPA Project 3) as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.</p> <p>2.3 Produce the new NMTPF/CPF guidelines as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.</p> <p>2.4 Develop guidelines for FAO's contribution to national priority setting as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.</p>	<p>expected to be completed by the end of 2012.</p> <p>A streamlined programming, monitoring and reporting system is being developed to facilitate clarification of programmatic linkages and accountability. The system will include information on work undertaken by all FAO units and allow both generating evidence-based annual, mid-term and final CPF reports, and feeding into corporate reports such as the Mid-term Review and the Programme Implementation Report.</p> <p>2.2 Country office work planning (COWP) was piloted in six countries across all five regions during 2010-11.</p> <p>2.3 The new CPF Guide was completed and published in January 2012.</p> <p>2.4 The CPF Guide describes FAO's role in national priority setting.</p>	<p>FAO Representations are increasingly following the new CPF guide and applying the CP policies and principles, thus adopting a holistic approach to country programming.</p> <p>Lessons learned from the COWP pilot were incorporated in the corporate work planning guidelines for 2012-13, the CPF guide, and the revised roles and responsibilities for country programming. They are also key to the development of the country work planning Guidelines.</p>	



Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
<p>REC 3. 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.</p>	<p>3.1 Recommendation to be reflected in the corporate Country Programming Guidelines.</p>	<p>Flexibility and strategic focus are among the 8 principles identified for CP. The CPF, CWP and project cycle guidelines establish minimum quality requirements, but are conceived as "living documents" which may be revised, as and when needed to reflect and adapt to changing contexts.</p>	<p>Countries that have started the formulation of the CPF in 2012 and have gone through the ECP trainings are increasingly following the guidelines in order to meet the minimum requirements, while flexibly adjusting to the specific country context.</p>	<p>SUBSTANTIAL</p>
<p>REC 4: 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</p>	<p>4.1 Prepare a document on general principles for country programming for consideration by the Programme Committee at its October 2011 session.</p> <p>4.2 Include in the NMTPF/CPF component of the corporate Country Programming Guidelines a mechanism to ensure FAO staff and concerned Permanent</p>	<p>4.1 The Programme Committee considered and endorsed a document on general principles and policies for country programming.</p> <p>4.2 A communication strategy aimed at informing FAO staff at all levels, including Permanent Representatives, on the status of implementation of CPFs has been developed.</p>	<p>At the time of planning any type of activity in a country, all FAO staff will be aware of the priorities for FAO's collaboration and specify how their contribution is relevant.</p>	<p>SUBSTANTIAL</p>

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
	Representatives are duly informed of the finalization of country NMTPF/CPFs. Ensure relevant documents are available in the FPMIS.	Associating planned activities to the country programme and obtaining FAOR clearance will be a mandatory requirement prior to starting implementation.		
REC 5: 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	Deferred.	In 2012 all Regional Conferences have been held in the first six months of non-Conference years. As noted in the Management Response, any further changes can only be considered after the evaluation of FAO's Governance foreseen under the IPA.	The timing has allowed all regional conferences to play their advisory roles <i>vis-à-vis</i> the Council and Conference.	SUBSTANTIAL
REC 6: 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.	6.1 Reflect this recommendation in the corporate Country Programming Guidelines. 6.2 Prepare in close collaboration with WFP and IFAD a guidance note on integration of food security in the UNDAF guidelines. 6.3 Ensure mechanisms	6.1 Alignment of CPF process with UNDAF is one of the 8 CPF principles. The description of the integration of the two processes is provided in the CPF Guide. 6.2 A guidance note on food and nutrition security was developed under the leadership of FAO with the collaboration of ILO and WFP. It was endorsed by the UNDG in October 2011.	6.1 Consistency and integration of CPF priorities and results with UNDAF priorities and outcomes is systematically ensured in the new CPFs. 6.2 The guidance note is available as a component of the UNDG Programming Reference Guide and the FAO companion Toolkit for CPF formulation	MODERATE

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
	and resources are in place to enable FAO's country offices to simultaneously: (i) align with national priorities and planning processes; (ii) integrate with corporate planning process; (iii) integrate UN country programming process; and (iv) integrate disaster risk management challenges.	6.3 Guidance notes support mainstreaming UN common programming principles, and work is on-going to mainstream DRM concerns.  IT tools supporting the formulation and monitoring of CPFs and CWPs are currently under development. Guidance notes have been prepared to support the mainstreaming of the UN common programming principles in the country programming process. Those specifically related to integrating capacity development, gender issues, rural employment and decent work, and food and nutrition security concerns into country programming processes. Other notes on DRM mainstreaming and civil society involvement in CPF process are under preparation.	6.3 Integration between FAO and UN country programming processes has been enhanced.  The IT tools will allow associating all work undertaken in the country to national priorities, objectives emerging from UN programming processes, and corporate objectives in a holistic programme. This will simplify the reporting line by streamlining them into a single planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting process.  Guidance notes will enhance the quality of the CPF document and formulation process.	
REC 7: Because the NMTPF component of Country Programming fulfills several key purposes for FAO that go beyond country level work, the Evaluation	7.1 Reflect this recommendation in the corporate Country	There is renewed corporate commitment to formulation of CPFs and integrated country	Newly formulated CPFs suggest that efforts have increased to reflect these	SUBSTANTIAL

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
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.	Programming Guidelines.	programming approach as a tool to improve the focus and effectiveness of FAO's assistance.	expectations. However the General Assembly's Quadrennial Review may result in the adoption of new approaches for UN operations at country level and the implications for FAO's programming process will need to be assessed.	
REC 8: 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	8.1 Develop guidelines for FAO's contribution to national priority setting as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.	8.1. The recommendation is reflected in both the Country Programming Guidelines – Policies and Principles, and the CPF Guide in the section “CPF and country programming.”	Since the publication of the new guidelines, FAO has provided or is envisaging to provide support to several countries for the identification of national sector priorities by assisting in the formulation of the national sector strategies and investment plans. CPFs have or will be subsequently formulated in those countries.	HIGH
REC 9: 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.	9.1 Reflect NMTPF/CPF-CWP programmatic relationships in the corporate Country	Reflected in the Country Programming Guidelines, CPF Guide and country work planning guidelines currently under	In 2014-15, with the support tools in place and the start of a new programming cycle where	MODERATE

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
<p>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</p>	<p>Programming Guidelines.</p>	<p>development. The CPF is the starting point for programming at country level. It defines the outcomes and approaches/type of the interventions to which the Organization commits in the country in support in achieving national sector objectives.</p> <p>Through the CPF and country work plans support tools, FAORs will be able to review and clear all activities planned for their country(ies) of accreditation, on the basis of the priorities for collaboration agreed with the government in the CPF, and the opportunity of addressing additional global or emerging issues not initially foreseen (“window”).</p>	<p>all FAO offices in all locations will be planning simultaneously, country offices will be able to effectively coordinate all work undertaken in the country. They will be able to ensure relevance to national priorities and corporate goals, irrespective of source of funding and location of the unit responsible for the activities. The Organization will be able to discharge its global mandate at country level while aligning with national priorities, as recommended by the Evaluation.</p>	
<p>REC 10: 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</p>	<p>10.1 Reflect this recommendation in the NMTPF/CPF component of the Country Programming Guidelines.</p>	<p>10.1 The recommendation is reflected in the CPF guide (“Validation and endorsement of the CPF”). Depending on the institutional arrangements agreed upon with the government, the acknowledgment of the formal</p>	<p>There is increasing evidence of broad consultation process with all relevant ministry counterparts.</p> <p>Generally, countries prefer</p>	<p>HIGH</p>

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
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		endorsement can be obtained either through the signature, or an "exchange of letters" between the government and the FAO Representative.	to formally endorse the CPF with the signature.	
REC 11: 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	11.1 Reflect this recommendation in the CWP pilot and the NMTPF/CPF's component of the Country Programming Guidelines.	The CPF has been conceived as a strategic tool focusing on priorities and outcomes, along with the description of type of the interventions FAO intends to undertake in order to achieve them. The CWP, on the other hand, has been defined as an operational tool, centred around the definition of outputs and activities on biennial basis.  The most appropriate level of details of the results reflects the consensus among government, UN Country Team, other partners and FAO. The CPF allows for the articulation of outcomes into outputs.	Further work is being undertaken to ensure a coherent articulation of CPF-CWP linkages.	HIGH
REC 12: 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	12.1 Allow inclusion of estimates of resources requirements in NMTPF/CPF and relevant	12.1 Total resource requirements are expressed in the CPF only in terms of financial needs, and not commitment.	Since the introduction of the new CPF guide, all the countries engaging in its formulation are providing	HIGH

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
<p>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.</p>	<p>guidelines. 12.2 IPA 4 on resources mobilization to continue to address the issue of predictable and unearmarked programmable resources for FAO at country level.</p>	<p>Resource mobilization guidance specifically indicates that requirements identified in the CPF should be consonant to the capacity to mobilize and manage funds. They should include an assessment of resources available through ongoing projects, as well as of donor interest in the country and resource levels delivered in the country by the Organization over the recent period.</p>	<p>an assessment of the total required resources and the resource mobilization gap.</p>	
<p>REC 13: 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</p>	<p>13.1 A joint corporate review will take place, coordinated by FO X1 Strategy Team.  13.2 Based on the result of the corporate review, ensure that related unit results are defined at country level.</p>	<p>13.1. This principle is reflected in the Country Programming Guidelines – Policies and Principles and the CPF Guide. Work is ongoing to develop the mechanisms for integrating emergency activities in the CWP. In addition, the new Project Cycle rules and procedures also apply to emergency activities, with some exceptions. As such, all projects are subject to the same quality standards, including those of UN CP and the strategic alignment to CPF and corporate priorities.</p>	<p>CPFs are increasingly addressing DRR/M issues, either as a separate priority area or integrated in all relevant priority areas. DRR/M action plans are therefore no longer being prepared.</p>	<p>SUBSTANTIAL</p>

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
all levels but in particular in the case of Country Unit Results.		<p>With the decentralization of TCE, the organizational structure is being adapted to support these changes.</p> <p>A guidance note on the integration of transitional programming into the CPF is under preparation and will be ready by the end of 2012.</p> <p>13.2 CWPs, when rolled-out, will include related Organizational Outputs.</p>		
<p>REC 14: 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>14.1 Reflect this recommendation in the new NMTPF/CPF guidelines as part of the Country Programming Guidelines.</p>	<p>14.1 The Country Programming Guidelines – Policies and principles and the CPF Guide reflect this recommendation.</p>	<p>CPF programming cycles are aligned to the national planning cycles, including the UNDAF preparation process where it is ongoing.</p>	<p>HIGH</p>
<p>REC 15: 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</p>	<p>15.1 Redesign country programming business processes.</p> <p>15.2 Include relevant</p>	<p>15.1 Regional and subregional offices have been assigned a key role in coordinating and supporting the formulation and quality assurance processes of the</p>	<p>Regional and subregional offices have taken the lead in coordinating the formulation of CPFs in their regions and</p>	<p>SUBSTANTIAL</p>



Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
<p>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.</p>	<p>budgetary proposal in PWB 2012-13.</p>	<p>CPF, Project Cycle and CWP.</p> <p>15.2 In 2012-13 an estimated USD 10.4 million were reallocated to regional offices, partly to increase their functions to support FAO's work at country level. Key positions were established in regional offices to support country programming processes.</p> <p>In addition, outposted technical positions in the FAORs have been phased out and restored in regional and subregional offices to further strengthen their capacities.</p> <p>Finally, CPF and RBM focal points were formally established in each region/subregion playing a key role in supporting country programming processes.</p> <p>The ongoing review of post staffing structure in regional offices will also provide a basis for rationalizing the distribution of budgetary resources to</p>	<p>subregions, and have provided technical support to the country offices.</p> <p>Regional offices have augmented their capacity for planning, monitoring and oversight and can intensify their operational support to country offices.</p> <p>The strategic planning process now underway will have impact on how resources are applied to the work programmes. It is expected that the increased flexibility and more strategic use of resources will augment regional offices' support to country and regional programming activities.</p>	

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
		prioritized activities.		
<p>REC 16: 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.</p>	<p>16.1 Include relevant budgetary proposal in PWB 2012-13.</p>	<p>In addition to the resources indicated above, in 2012-13, significant staff time and an estimated USD 1 million funded by the IPA were allocated to supporting, assuring quality and strengthening capacity for formulating CPFs, developing resource mobilization strategies, managing projects and preparing country work plan. Resource needs will be further assessed following the critical review of the post structure in decentralized offices.</p>	<p>The capacity of regional and subregional offices to support country programming activities has been strengthened by the ECP learning initiatives, and the transfer of resources.</p>	<p>SUBSTANTIAL</p>
<p>REC 17: 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 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.</p>	<p>Recommendation rejected.</p>	<p>Proposals for overall enhancement of the Technical Cooperation Programme, consistent with the Strategic Thinking Process and country programming frameworks, will be submitted for the consideration of the Council at its next session through the Programme and Finance Committees.</p>		<p>NEGLIGIBLE</p>

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
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		The CWP country work planning will include all projects delivered in a country, including through the TCP fund. Thus, the CWP will formally reflect how TCP resources allocated to a country contribute to addressing national priorities agreed by FAO and the government through the CPF.		
REC 18: 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 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	18.1 Articulate this concept in CPF and CWP components of the Country Programming Guidelines as well as in the corporate resource mobilization strategy.	<p>The corporate Resource Mobilization and Management Strategy (RMMS) was endorsed by the Council in April 2011 and the principles contained therein make reference to this point.</p> <p>The CPF guide also provides the main elements for the prioritization process, stressing the importance of assessing FAOs comparative advantages on the basis of FAO's mandate, position and capacity to act.</p> <p>The draft country work planning guidelines stress that the CPF and the PWB define commitments which are the starting point for</p>	<p>Priorities at the country level are increasingly defined through a dialogue with main national partners, development partners and resource partners.</p> <p>Regardless of funding availability, work that does not contribute to agreed goals will not be approved as it cannot be included in the work plan.</p>	MODERATE

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
		preparing the work plan. The CWP guidelines also indicate that only activities for which the source of funding is certain should be included in the work plan.		
<p>REC 19: 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.</p>	<p>19.1 Reflect recommendation in finalization of corporate resource mobilization strategy (IPA 4).</p> <p>19.2 Redesign business processes related to resource mobilization.</p> <p>19.3 Include relevant budgetary proposal in PWB 2012-13.</p>	<p>19.1 The Resource Mobilization and Management Strategy was endorsed by the Council in April 2011 and makes reference to this point.</p> <p>19.2 Subsidiary resource mobilization strategies and action plans at the regional and subregional level have been rolled out.</p> <p>19.3 In the PWB 2012-13, IPA resources were specifically earmarked to support the development of resource mobilization strategies at regional and subregional levels. In addition, the reallocation of savings to decentralized offices provides greater capacity to fulfil this role.</p>	<p>To date, RAF, SFE, SFW, SFC, RNE, REU, RAP and SAP have drafts in place. It is expected that remaining regions/subregions will complete their strategies by the end of 2012. For instance, SFE is preparing a resource mobilization action plan in relation to the Horn of Africa strategy for resource mobilization. In the same line, SFW engaged in the formulation of the resource mobilization action plan for the Sahel crisis.</p>	<p>SUBSTANTIAL</p>

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)	Date			Adoption Rating Scale
Evaluation Recommendation	Action Agreed	Comments on actions taken, including reasons for actions not taken	Impact (changes) of actions taken in terms of programme, policies and/or procedures	High Substantial Moderate Negligible
<p>REC 20: 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</p>	<p>20.1 Reflect recommendation in finalization of corporate resource mobilization strategy (IPA 4).</p>	<p>The Resource Mobilization and Management Strategy promotes a programmatic approach to resource mobilization. FAO’s IMPACT communications campaign and the Strategic Thinking Process will further boost work in this direction, as FAO’s objectives are refocused and concentrated in the five Strategic Objectives.</p>	<p>Pooled funds have been mobilized (e.g. in support of Global Statistics) and will see FAO’s normative work translated and applied at country level.</p> <p>The five Strategic Objectives provide a mechanism for potentially attracting additional pooled funding</p>	<p>MODERATE</p>

(a) High - Fully adopted

(b) Substantial - Largely adopted but not fully incorporated into policy, strategy or operations as yet

(c) Moderate - Adopted in some operational and policy work, but not to a significant degree in key areas

(d) Negligible - No evidence or plan for adoption, or plan and actions for adoption are in a very preliminary stage