



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

Impact Evaluation of FAO's programme under the Common Humanitarian Fund

Management response to the evaluation report

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

Permission to make copy, download or print copies of part or all of this work for private study and limited classroom use is hereby granted, free of charge, provided that an accurate citation and suitable acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright owner is given. Where copyright holders other than FAO are indicated, please refer to the original copyright holder for terms and conditions of reuse. All requests for systematic copying and electronic distribution, including to list servers, translation rights and commercial reuse should be addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of FAO concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

Evaluation of FAO's work under the Common Humanitarian Fund
Management Response
January 2013

Overall management response to the evaluation

The evaluation report was found to be comprehensive, well documented and well presented (graphs, diagrams etc.). It is a valuable source of information and gives a useful retrospective overview and analysis of CHF funding of food security and livelihood emergencies in Sudan, and in particular on CHF funding of FAO activities.

For FAO Sudan the report is an appreciated tool for:

- 1) Discussion with OCHA, CHF management and donors in Sudan. The report further demonstrates that FAO has achieved tangible results on the ground together with its implementing partners, and that FAO addresses in an objective manner strengths and weaknesses of its operations in the concerned states. It also allows demonstrating that FAO is a learning institution and willing to improve its strategic choices and modes of operation for more durable results; and that FAO is doing this on the grounds of thorough analysis of its achievements and weaknesses, as well as of the existing limits set by the humanitarian aid system.
- 2) Discussion with the Food Security and Livelihoods (FSL) sector members and implementing partners. The report raises certain key issues which have to be discussed within the FSL sector and the line ministries which are members of the FSL sector. Furthermore, it provides FAO with an “outside view” through facts collected in the field which corroborate certain issues that have been raised before the evaluation and which need to be further developed within the sector to agree on common action.
- 3) Improvement of design and implementation of projects and operations in the field. The report provides a variety of interesting and informative insights on stakeholder views and perceptions in the field (beneficiaries above all). Again it provides FAO with an “outside view” which corresponds with issues regarding improvement of project design and implementation that have already been raised before the evaluation. This “outside view” is useful and furthermore demonstrates that the subjects raised are issues of larger concern that have to be addressed with priority.

The report also provides valuable analysis and suggestions concerning possible enhancement of FAO's positioning and role in Sudan which FAO Sudan will need to take up during the forthcoming decentralization process.

Management response matrix

Evaluation Recommendation	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
Recommendation 1: FAO prioritizes its action on sectors where it has a comparative advantage over others, based on its technical expertise or its strategic positioning, possibly giving up some areas of work.	Partially accepted. It is possible for FAO to do so 1) if other UN agencies (WFP, UNDP etc.) are willing to focus on their respective comparative advantages in a spirit of complementarily rather than competing with FAO; 2) if donors do agree on funding areas of work such as technical advice, policy and strategic support and related capacity building, strengthening of local implementation capacities etc. This is only partially the case for humanitarian funding on which the emergency and rehabilitation programme depends, and on which the evaluation has been centered. It is to be noted that many of the areas of Sudan where FAO operates require emergency and rehabilitation as the basis for recovery and development.	1) Further exploit the scope for improving FAO's technical advice and backstopping within the frame of humanitarian funding	ERCU/FAOR	Ongoing	Y
		2) Further exploit the scope of FAO's technical and strategic leadership within the FSL cluster	ERCU/FAOR	Ongoing	Y
		3) Improve FAO's positioning on key strategic rural development issues at national and cross border levels	FAOR	As soon as FAOR is in place	Y
		4) Improve FAO's presence in advocacy and policy dialogue and support, as well as policy/strategy advice to government	FAOR	As soon as FAOR is in place	Y
		5) Seek technical support from RNE and HQ where and when required	FAOR	According to needs	Y

Evaluation Recommendation	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
Recommendation 2: FAO keeps supporting the livelihoods and food security of rural households whose vulnerabilities are still extreme, building on identified areas of strengths and weaknesses. When relevant, FAO should seek to define gradual strategies to transition out of emergency support and explore ways to devise multi-level programmes with short and longer-term objectives, possibly mixing funding sources, thus promoting continuity from emergency into development.	Partially accepted. Most of the relatively few donors still active in Sudan have separate portfolios, a bigger one for emergency and a smaller one for development. They fund programmes from either one of the two portfolios. Similarly, FAO's programme in Sudan consists of an emergency and a development programme. Whenever possible, ERCU designs transition oriented programmes and uses emergency funding to engage in recovery and development oriented activities. DFID is preparing a fund with a mid-term prospect aimed at strengthening resilience. FAO is formulating a programme to tap these funds.	1) Keep in touch with donor(s) who accept funding transition from emergency to development; submit fundable proposals 2) Try to diversify funding base 3) Develop mid-term operational strategies and programme frameworks in areas which are in a recovery/protracted crises situation (e.g. parts of Darfur, eastern Sudan) 3) Develop general guidelines for FAO's mid-term prospects in this area of work, based on the CPF and other relevant documents 4) Seek technical support from RNE and HQ where and when required	ERCU/FAOR	Ongoing	N
			FAOR ERCU/FAOR	Ongoing Ongoing	N N
			ERCRC/FAOR	By July 13	Y
				According to needs	Y
Recommendation 3: FAO, by way of its Representation, should be more active on strategic issues related to rural development as advisor to the Government and by way of policy support, and better balance its sources of funding in order to avoid leaning excessively on emergency-stamped sources.	Accepted. The scope for raising funds for development-oriented programmes is limited, but more effort should indeed be put into it. In order to enable FAO-Sudan to provide government with a policy support that provides leverage for rural development in the interest of Sudan's poor rural majority, strong links and flows of sound information and analysis have to be created between what happens on the ground and at the top. FAO has developed its Country Programming Framework (CPF) which will assist the GoS and FAO to prepare and implement medium to long-term development programmes in Sudan	In addition to actions No. 3), 4) and 5) under Recommendation 1: 1) Strengthen fund raising for longer-term and development-oriented programmes 2) Build a sound and active system of collection and analysis of data and information about relevant developments on the ground and ensure feedback to Khartoum (and vice-versa).	FAOR	As soon as FAOR is in place	N
			ERCU/FAOR	Ongoing	Y

Evaluation Recommendation	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
Recommendation 4: FAO seeks to implement integrated interventions whereby inputs or services that can cross-fertilize one another and are distributed simultaneously and result in higher impact.	Accepted. Measures in this direction have been undertaken since the beginning of 2012 (e.g. focus on seeds of multi-purpose crops which allow tackling different problems at once; seedling and seeds distribution coupled with promotion of soil and water conservation practices; strengthening links between animal health, feeding and drinking water; restocking with small ruminants coupled with training in improved animal husbandry practices etc). There is still considerable space for improvement.	1) Pursue and extend measures of improvement; streamline them	ERCU/FAOR ERCU/FAOR	Ongoing Ongoing	N Y
		2) Build capacities of staff in FAO-field offices and of certain service providers in this approach	ERCU/FAOR	Ongoing	N
		3) Sensitize donors about the necessity of this approach for better impact and value for money 4) Seek support from external consultants and HQ where and when required	ERCU/FAOR	According to availability	Y
Recommendation 5: Consider its responsibility to promote a strategic sector approach as a priority and support for that matter sector needs assessment, knowledge sharing and monitoring.	Accepted. Much is being done in sector coordination but there is considerable room for improvement. The sector's potential of leverage should be actively used e.g. for identification of and developing shared views of sector members, with the government, donors and beneficiaries on key issues in affected areas; elaboration and implementation of common approaches; complementarities according to comparative advantages of sector members	1) Strengthen strategic aspects of FAO FSL sector co-lead (additional staff)	ERCU/FAOR/HQ	From January 2013 onwards	Y
		2) Strengthen FAO's role in backstopping and as technical lead agency regarding the sector's programmes	ERCU/FAOR		Y
		3) Improve methodological capacities and knowhow (assessments, monitoring) of the FSL sector coordination at national and state levels	ERCU/FAOR/OCHA		Y
Recommendation 6: Keep attentive to the importance of managing its staff resources, to avoid that staff be diverted of real priorities focus	Partially accepted. Firstly, given the numerous and diverse expectations, challenges and constraints it is inevitable that staff get involved with a range of occupations, although their core role remains focused on the priorities	1) Further explore possibilities to offer more attractive contractual conditions to well performing key staff (decentralization etc.)	HQ/FAOR	By March 2013	N
		2) Review ToR of all ERCU and RP	HR-Budapest	By	Y

Evaluation Recommendation	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
and encourage them to remain within the programme by offering reasonable contractual conditions.	of their mandate. Secondly, contractual conditions are related to the funding structure, as long as there is only short-term funding available it will hardly be possible to offer reasonable contractual conditions. This limits ERCU's capacity to develop.	staff and identify measures of improvement 3) Identify measures for appropriate training and seek funding 4) Follow up effective practising of new skills acquired by trained staff 5) implement and consolidate already reached agreement with CHF to share monitoring and reporting tasks	ERCU/FAOR/HQ ERCU/FAOR	February 2013 According to needs Regularly	N N
Recommendation 7: FAO uses in-house technical expertise to transfer knowledge to Governmental and NGO staff through training and dissemination of normative work it produces or has access to.	Accepted. This has been done and is going to be done. However, in addition to normative work, concrete applied skills and capacities to adopt more holistic approaches should be developed and promoted.	1) Training workshops on e.g. LEGS, improved animal husbandry, water and soil conservation etc. 2) Training workshop on gender mainstreaming is planned. 3) Trainings through FSL sector on areas such as Disaster Risk Management, etc	ERCU/FAOR HQ ERCU/FAOR	From January 2013 onwards March 2013 From January 2013 onwards	Y Y Y
Recommendation 8: FAO ERCU establishes more strategic partnerships with NGOs, seeking to build a long-term collaboration which would infer more efficient use of capacity building investments.	Accepted This requires shared views and interests in key issues in the longer term, as well as clear ideas about the partners' roles, and possibly a longer term funding mechanism.	1) Identify NGO partners and areas of interest, and discuss the issue with them	ERCU/FAOR	By June 2013	Y
Recommendation 9: FAO should keep very attentive to promoting peaceful livelihood considering the latent conflict over land between	Accepted. Since 2010, ERCU is collecting field experience on this issue in parts of Darfur with funding of a multi-donor peace building fund (DCPSF). This is being pursued. In addition, FAO is developing a Darfur Natural	1) capitalize on acquired field experience; organize assessment and workshop 2) support scaling up of lessons learnt at state level	ERCU/FAOR ERCU/FAOR	By December 2013	Y N

Evaluation Recommendation	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible unit	Timeframe	Further funding required (Y or N)
farmers seeking to expand their agricultural production and pastoralists seeking pasture.	Resources Management (NRM) strategic framework together with UNEP into a programme promoting sustainable livelihood strategies for both farmers and pastoralists; community involvement in conflict and NRM; strengthening state and national capacity in NRM and related policies.	3) organize workshop with UNEP, Darfur state ministries and possibly interested donors	ERCU/FAOR/UNEP	By June 2013	Y
		4) fund raising	FAOR/UNEP	By November 2013	Y

Format of the Follow-up Report

1. A follow-up report must be prepared on the implementation of agreed recommendations, normally by the unit responsible for the original management response. Its purpose is to inform about the outcome and impact of the evaluation's recommendations and, if necessary, account for any variation between actions decided in the Management Response and those actually implemented. The Office of Evaluation has put in-place a monitoring system for requesting the preparation of Follow-up Reports and contacts responsible units in due time.

2. The PC at its 103rd session in April 2010 requested that follow up reports to evaluations include "the programme and policy impact stemming from the implementation of the recommendations of evaluation". This additional information will contribute to enhance the feed-back loop between policy and programme implementation and evaluation and improve the quality of evaluations.

3. The Follow-up Report should follow the format below and may be supplemented with additional text as required.

Follow-up report matrix

Follow-up report of the Management response to the (Evaluation title)			Date
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
Recommendation 1.	Describe Action(s)	Insert	Insert

Responsibilities and procedures for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report

4. The Office of Evaluation coordinates the preparation of Management Responses and Follow-up Reports. It will formally request that these documents be prepared and will check that they meet required standards of comprehensiveness and clarity. OED will upload both Management Responses and Follow-up Reports on its Web site and in FPMIS.

5. In preparing Management Responses and Follow-up Reports, consultations should take place with and inputs sought as necessary from parties within and outside FAO to whom the evaluation recommendations were addressed.

6. Operational responsibilities are as follows:

- a) **Evaluation reports for the Programme Committee:** The Evaluation Committee will designate the senior officer who will have overall responsibility for coordinating the preparation of the Management Response and Follow-up Report. The Management Response and Follow-up Report should be completed within **four weeks** of the request and be sent to OED (see Annex 1). The Follow-up Report will be submitted to the Programme Committee **two years** after the Evaluation report and its Management Response have been discussed by the Committee itself.
- b) **Project Evaluations:** The project Budget Holder will normally be responsible for coordinating the preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation. The Management Response and Follow-up Report should be completed within **four weeks** of the request and be sent to OED. The Follow-up Report will be prepared **one year** after the Management Response.

- c) **Country Evaluations:** The FAO Representative will normally be responsible for coordinating the preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation. The Management Response and Follow-up Report should be completed within **four weeks** of the request and sent to OED. The Follow-up Report will be prepared **one year** after the Management Response. Governments should be encouraged to provide their own response to the evaluation.
- d) **Evaluations of Emergency and Rehabilitation Programmes and Projects:** The Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division will normally be responsible for coordinating the preparation of the Management response and Follow-up Report. The Management Response and Follow-up Report should be completed within **four weeks** of the request and sent to OED. The Follow-up Report will be prepared **one year** after the Management Response.

Annex 1: Schedule for the evaluation management responses and follow-up reports to be submitted to the Programme Committee

Action	Responsibility for action	Deadline before PC meeting
The Evaluation Committee will designate the senior officer who will have overall responsibility for preparing the management response or follow-up report.	Secretary of Evaluation Committee (Director, OED)	14 weeks
Final report of the evaluation and request for the management response or the follow-up report will be sent to the senior officer appointed by the Evaluation Committee.	Office of Evaluation	12 weeks
Draft management response/follow-up report will be provided by the responsible senior officer to the Evaluation Committee through the Director, Office of Evaluation. Attention will be drawn to any aspects of the response/report which are controversial.	Designated officer	8 weeks
Comments by the Evaluation Committee to the responsible senior officer.	Evaluation Committee	7 weeks
Forwarding of the management response/follow-up report through the PC Secretariat to ODG for clearance before posting	Designated officer/OED	6 weeks