



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

منظمة
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Hundred and Twenty-fourth Session

Rome, 21-25 May 2018

Synthesis of lessons learnt in application of the Country Programming Framework

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

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

Ms Beth Crawford
Officer-in-Charge
Office of Strategy, Planning and Resources Management (OSP)
Tel. +39 06570-52298

*This document can be accessed using the Quick Response Code on this page;
an FAO initiative to minimize its environmental impact and promote greener communications.*

Other documents can be consulted at www.fao.org

MW697e



PC124

1. FAO Management appreciates the work and the approach of the Synthesis Report on the lessons learned in the application of the Country Programming Framework. Management recognizes the challenge faced during the preparation of this report as it covered a period where a major change in the approach to CPF formulation was introduced through the post-2015 CPF guidelines.
2. Management welcomes the recommendations presented in the Report. OED notes that “the CPF has not yet received the full support it merits from the whole of FAO”, and recommends that “FAO should enhance the CPF process by increasing attention to context analysis, stakeholder engagement and governance arrangements.” Management agrees with the spirit of this recommendation. In fact, the CPF guidelines call for corporate engagement throughout the entire CPF formulation process, as needed and requested by the FAOR, through the Country Support Team. While management acknowledges that there is room to strengthen the role of Country Support Teams, it is important to maintain pragmatism particularly in the context of formalizing such teams.
3. OED proposed that the Country Support Teams “should assist with context analysis, need assessments, or national-led studies of strategic nature with a view to providing a solid basis for strategic prioritization and programme design”. Management agrees that the Country Support Team can assist with the proposed actions, however, to avoid duplication of efforts, and, as indicated in the CPF Guidelines, the CPF formulation team is advised to make use of all available country context analysis (including studies prepared by government, World Bank and other financial institutions, universities, NGOs, UN agencies, and UN common country analysis).
4. Management welcomes the recommendation to have a CPF steering committee comprised of representatives from the government, FAO and other key partners. The CPF guidelines call for the establishment of institutional arrangements for implementation monitoring and reporting of the CPF. Management believes it is at the discretion of the government together with the FAOR to decide how they wish to set up such arrangements.
5. Management appreciates the finding that the process of setting indicative resource requirements has improved over time, and agrees that there is still room for improving resource estimations for CPF implementation. OED proposed that FAO enhances “capacities and tools for estimation of resource mobilization, monitoring and evaluation”. Management agrees on the need to build capacities to improve resource mobilization targets, and on the enhancement of tools for CPF monitoring.
6. OED noted the improved alignment of CPFs with the Strategic Framework. The Report recommended to “specify attainable country level outcomes in CPFs, based on well-defined theories of change, linking the field programme to national objectives”. Management welcomes the need to improve the theories of change at country level, but does not agree with the recommendation to include additional outcomes on top of those defined by the government and UNDAF, and those in the FAO results framework.
7. The Report recommends to “use outcomes rather than outputs as the main point of reference in measuring performance and setting targets for the CPFs.” Management does not agree with this recommendation as FAO is not fully accountable for the achievement of outcomes.
8. The Report recommends to “ensure timely production and use of Country Gender Assessment in the CPFs”. Management agrees with the recommendation, and it has been stressed in the CPF guidelines and in the CPF tool on gender mainstreaming in CPF formulation.

Management response matrix

Management response to the Synthesis of lessons learned in the application of the Country Programming Framework

Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted , Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
(a)	(b)	€	(d)	€	(f)
<p>Recommendation 1: FAO should enhance the CPF process by increasing attention to context analysis, stakeholder engagement and governance arrangements.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Management agrees on the importance of conducting/collecting the relevant context analysis during the CPF formulation process which is indeed a requirement under step 2 of the CPF guidelines.</p> <p>Management agrees on the need to strengthen the role of the Country Support Teams throughout the whole CPF formulation process but stresses that it is important to maintain pragmatism in putting together a formalized country support team. Management believes the final composition of country support teams should remain at the discretion of the FAORs, according to country priorities and in line with the CPF guidance, and supported by the Regional Programme Leader.</p> <p>Management confirms that the CPF guidelines encourage FAORs to be part of a steering committee if requested by the Government. Management believes this should remain at the discretion of the host government and the FAOR.</p>	<p>OSP</p>	<p>June 2018</p>	<p>N</p>

Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
(a)	(b)	€	(d)	€	(f)
Recommendation 2: FAO should enhance capacities and tools for estimation of resource mobilization, monitoring and evaluation.	Accepted	<p>Management agrees that further guidance and capacity building is needed to improve estimation of resource mobilization targets. Management also notes from the evaluation that the larger country offices seem able to more closely calibrate the targets, perhaps pointing to the need for more support to those countries where capacity is limited.</p> <p>Management agrees that all relevant partners, including resource partners and financial institutions, should be included during the formulation process, which would contribute to closing the gap between expectations and achievements. This is reinforced in the current CPF guidelines.</p> <p>Management recommends that a resource mobilization action plan be required for each of the country offices, to be updated annually, and will adjust the CPF guidelines accordingly.</p>	TCR	June 2018	N
Recommendation 3: FAO should strengthen the CPFs as an effective instrument for the results-based management at the country level.	Partially Accepted ¹	Management agrees on the need to continuously strengthen results-based management at country level. Management also believes that developing theories of change at country level can be improved, and in fact	ESP, ROs	n/a	

¹ Recommended action related to gender accepted.

Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
(a)	(b)	€	(d)	€	(f)
		<p>workshops have been conducted in RNE and RLC with participation of FAORs and AFAORs.</p> <p>Management does not agree that additional CPF outcome targets should be introduced. FAO’s direct contribution at country level is measured through outputs, which link to corporate outputs and to corporate outcomes. Outcomes at country level are assessed every two years through the Corporate Outcome Assessment.</p> <p>Management does not agree with the recommendation of solely using outcomes as the main point of reference for measuring performance and setting targets. This is because FAO is not directly accountable for the achievement of outcomes, whereas FAO is responsible and accountable for the concrete results delivered at country level (outputs).</p> <p>Management would like to recognize the importance of Country Gender Assessments as a useful tool in the preparation of the CPF. In fact, the CPF tool on Gender requires that a Country Gender Assessment is carried out during the phase of collecting country intelligence.</p>			