



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



OFFICE OF EVALUATION

Country programme evaluation series

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the

Myanmar Country Programme

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

April 2018

COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION SERIES

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Myanmar Country Programme

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
OFFICE OF EVALUATION
April 2018**

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>

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 the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (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. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2017

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, Office of Evaluation (OED)
Food and Agriculture Organization
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153 Rome
Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

Introduction

1. Evaluation contributes to accountability and lessons learning and should lead to improved management decision-making and performance. For evaluation to play its roles, among other measures and procedures, there needs to be careful consideration of evaluation recommendations as a basis for management decisions.
2. Since 2006, FAO evaluation policy establishes that all evaluations in FAO must receive a Management Response (MR) and a Follow-up report (FR). Standardized and assured quality in the Organization's responses and follow-up reports on evaluations enhances the transparency of the evaluation process and enables drawing lessons on the effectiveness of, and compliance with the corporate evaluation policy. This guidance note outlines the roles and responsibilities for the preparation of these reports.
3. FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) is also aware that the evaluation reports themselves need to facilitate decision by management on recommendations and follow-up. Thus OED, in fulfilling its quality assurance function, will endeavour to ensure that evaluation recommendations are expressed clearly and unambiguously.
4. All queries on these procedures should be addressed to the Director, Office of Evaluation.

The Management Response

5. The Management Response is the document in which FAO management, at project, country, regional, division or corporate level:
 - i. expresses its overall opinion about the evaluation and its report, conclusions and usefulness;
 - ii. responds to individual recommendations, either by accepting them fully or partially, or by rejecting them; and
 - iii. describes how it will implement the recommendations that were fully or partially accepted.
6. The unit which has the main responsibility in implementing the work being evaluated (henceforth the Main Unit) takes the lead in preparing the MR, as identified in the Terms of Reference of the evaluation itself. In doing so, the Main Unit must consult those who have a stake in the work being evaluated and obtain the response by those who will have the implementation responsibility for each recommendation. The response to each recommendation will have to be cleared at the level formally responsible for making decisions on the issues at stake. In case of recommendations addressed to the corporate level, the Chair of the Evaluation Committee (Internal) will be responsible for final clearance, in consultation with the members of the Committee as appropriate.
7. The Management Response should be prepared using the format below.

Overall response to the evaluation

In this section, Management presents its overall views on the evaluation, the report and its conclusions.

Response by recommendation

In this section, Management should address each recommendation, discussing them in the order presented in the executive summary of the evaluation report. This should be done in the format of the Management Response matrix below (see Box 1) and include:

- a. The recommendation number and text copied from the evaluation report;
- b. Indication of whether the recommendation is accepted fully, partially, or rejected;
- c. Description of the actions to be taken, with comments as required on the conditions to be met during implementation, or on reasons leading to a partial acceptance or rejection of a recommendation;
- d. The responsible party or FAO unit for implementing the action/s;
- e. The time-frame for implementation and/or an implementation schedule, if required;
- f. Indication if further funding from FAO or a resource partner is required for implementing the recommendation.

Box 1: Management response matrix¹

Management response to the (FAO Myanmar Country Programme Evaluation Report 2011-2016)					Date
Evaluation Recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted, partially accepted or rejected	Management plan Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
Insert title of section, if any					
Recommendation 1: Alignment and coherence	Accepted	The following actions are undertaken in preparing new CPF to ensure programmatic approach for alignment and coherence;	FAOMM, RAP, HQ	December 2017	N

¹ Each column is cross-referenced to the bullet letters above.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Analyzed areas of work in national food and nutrition security to identify preferred and strategic pathways; ➤ New CPF aligns with country priorities, FAO five strategic objectives, UNDAF, SDGs ➤ Linkage between CPF and RAP priorities (i.e. Climate Change, One Health, Food security and nutrition) in improving effectiveness of country programme; ➤ The need of involving all relevant government partners in the formulation process of CPF to ensure FAO intervention fits well into the programmatic framework; ➤ Mainstreaming of cross cutting issues like social protection, capacity needs assessment, gender and other equity issue to support the promotion of inclusive and sustainable agricultural development and poverty alleviation. 			
Recommendation 2: One Health	Accepted	<p>Country office will continue its support for the area where FAO has its comparative advantage in leading the development of Myanmar One Health through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Activities of ECTAD; ➤ Zoonotic emerging infectious diseases (EID) and anti-microbial resistance (AMR); ➤ Food safety, nutrition and integrated pest and disease management. 	FAOMM, RAP, HQ	December 2022	Y
Recommendation 3: Under this framework, FAO should continue	Accepted	<p>Country office has started its support in Food Safety areas and will continue support through:</p>	FAOMM,RAP, HQ	December 2022	Y

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Myanmar Country Programme – Management Response

<p>its policy support to further develop food control systems and formulate a comprehensive food safety policy and strategy. The food safety policy should define the roles, responsibilities and coordination of standard regulations among ministries and regulation bodies.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Food safety policy under preparation in collaboration with MoHS; ➤ Compliance with CODEX standards; ➤ FAO's advance of technical support in developing policy, legislation and practices that increase adherence to sanitary and phytosanitary standards (SPS) 			
<p>Recommendation 4 : FAO should prioritize integration of gender considerations in its country programme, based on sound gender analysis and development of systematic approaches to integrating gender equality and women's empowerment</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>This is a cross cutting issue that we will address in all FAO projects and interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Recent completed country level gender assessment study is a good start for further work on gender and social equity in the country. (a publication was launched in last December) <p>iv.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As one immediate follow-up action, FAO and UNWOMEN are working together to formulate a joint FAO-UN Women (UNW) programme on Enhancing gender-equitable access to land for rural women's economic empowerment and poverty reduction under the framework of integrated UN joint approach for promoting Rural Women's Economic Empowerment. 	<p>FAOMM, RAP, HQ</p>	<p>December 2022</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: Climate change</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>This is another cross cutting issue and it has been fully addressed throughout the new CPF: FAO's positive tracked records in supporting the country in combating Climate Change through field projects;</p>	<p>FAOMM, RAP, HQ</p>	<p>December 2022</p>	<p>Y</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ We will continue to build and strengthen national capacity and promote natural resource management and climate-smart agrarian systems; ➤ We will work closely with community-based organizations for the co-management of natural resources that will an effective means to achieve climate change adaptation and mitigation results, as well as the conservation of biodiversity; ➤ With FAO's comparative advantage, we will assist the government in preparation of Myanmar Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (MAPDRR) and its annual planning. 			
Recommendation 6: Land Use and Tenure	Accepted	<p>Country office is undertaking the following interventions in Land use and tenure areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ FAO's advisory role to the government on strengthening land policy and institutional framework (Land Policy Adviser in MOALI); ➤ Implementing pilot access to land programme in Dry Zone through GASFP Project; ➤ Potential to scaling-up pilot land access initiatives from Dry Zone to other areas; ➤ On-going project on forest monitoring and inventory, FIRST and VGGT provide FAO unique advantage in supporting the country to strengthen data and information system on land use and management in forest and natural habitat areas. 	FAOMM, RAP, HQ	December 2022	Y
Recommendation 7: Resilience	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ FAO has started engagement with MOALI, MONREC and Ministry of Social Welfare 	FAOMM, RAP, HQ	December 2022	Y

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Myanmar Country Programme – Management Response

		<p>and Relief to ensure that resilience, CCA and DRR are integrated into Ministry policy, planning and implementation frameworks – operational plans being developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CPF includes distinct programmes for immediate response and for long term development, including capacity building ➤ FAO assisting in preparation of Myanmar Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (MAPDRR). And will be involved in annual planning of MAPDRR 			
Recommendation 8: Monitoring	Accepted	<p>Country office will use the following tools to monitor programme and projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Monitoring Plan ➤ Systems: FPMIS – Field Programme Management Information System, iMIS – Integrated Management Information System, PIREs – Programme Planning, Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Support System ➤ Situation analysis, engagement with GoUM and other staff, review PF will include suggestions for M&E 	FAOMM	December 2022	Y
Recommendation 9: FAO Country Office Capacity	Accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Office opened in NPT – greater facilitation for Yangon-based officers to work in NPT ➤ Recruitment of senior national programme officer for stationing in NPT 	FAOMM	January 2017	N
Recommendation 10: Capacity development	Accepted	<p>Three dimensions of capacity development by targeting communities and organizations, and by creating the enabling environment for long-term change. In the emerging context of Myanmar, people are being asked for the first time to make decisions concerning how their life and livelihoods should be shaped. As such, they do not always have</p>	FAOMM, RAP, HQ	December 2022	Y

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Myanmar Country Programme – Management Response

		<p>the ability to respond as individuals or communities. Future needs assessments should consider this, and adopt approaches that support beneficiaries in formulating their needs and aspirations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Capacity development underpins all programmes to assist GoM and stakeholders; ➤ Strengthened targeted capacity building of: Forestry Research Institute, extension and research staff, planning and policy staff, State/Region and Township staff, and farmers' organisations and community groups; 			
Recommendation 11: Knowledge Management and Communication	Accepted	<p>The following actions are being taken to support greater application of FAO's global knowledge and experience at the programme and project levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Communication Strategy and Action Plan is being drafted to further increase FAO visibility in the country; ➤ Create synergetic partnership with a range of stakeholders, promote innovations, maximize results and attract resources; ➤ Create synergetic partnership with the Government FAO Myanmar. 	FAOMM	December 2022	N

The Follow-up Report

After one year in the case of project and country evaluations, and two years in the case of thematic and strategy evaluations, the same Main Unit that prepared the MR, should coordinate inputs and prepare a Follow-up Report (FR) on the implementation of the accepted recommendations. The purpose of the Follow-up report is to enhance accountability and lessons learning by informing stakeholders about the outcomes achieved and impact originated through the implementation of the evaluation recommendations. The FR also informs about any variation between actions decided in the Management Response and those actually implemented. The Office of Evaluation contacts the Main Unit for the preparation of the Follow-up Report in due time.

In order to standardize reporting, based on the experience of other agencies and a test conducted in 2013-14 by OED, the tool called Management Action Record (MAR) was introduced in the Follow-up Report template. The MAR is the quantitative self-assessment by responsible units **of the progress made in the implementation** of each fully and partially accepted recommendation, through a six-point scoring scale, following the qualifiers in Box 2 below.

Qualifiers for the Management Action Record scoring

- 1 - None: no action was taken to implement the recommendation;
- 2 - Poor: plan and actions for implementation of the recommendation are at a very preliminary stage;
- 3 - Inadequate: implementation of the recommendation is uneven and partial;
- 4 - Adequate: implementation of the recommendation has progressed; there is no evidence yet of its results on the intended target;
- 5 - Good: the recommendation has been fully implemented and there is some initial evidence of its impact on the intended target;
- 6 – Excellent: there is solid evidence that the recommendation has had a positive impact on its intended target.

The MAR allows OED and FAO to gain a better understanding of good practices and obstacles in the implementation of evaluation recommendations, through the consolidation of quantitative information from all FRs. When OED carries out a validation process of a Follow-up Report, it will enter its own rating of progress made in the implementation of the recommendations. The MAR will also contribute to the tracking system of all recommendations and their implementation, for both accountability and learning purposes, that was established by OED in response to the 2012 External Audit recommendations.

The MAR score complements the narrative description and the evidence available about the progress made in implementing each recommendation, and their impact.

Furthermore, following a request by the Programme Committee at its 103rd session in April 2010 that Follow-up Reports to evaluations include *"the programme and policy impact stemming from the implementation of the recommendations of evaluation"*, the Impact column was added to the Follow-up matrix. Impact is here defined as the long lasting change directly generated by the actions carried out to implement the specific recommendation.

The Follow-up Report should be prepared using the format below.

Follow-up report of the Management response to the Evaluation (Title and date)

Overall progress in the implementation of all accepted recommendations

This section will provide a concise description of main achievements in the implementation of all accepted recommendations, fully and partially, as well as of the obstacles met in the process.

Detailed progress in in the implementation of each accepted recommendations

In this section, Management should inform on the progress made in the implementation of each accepted recommendations, fully or partially, as well as on obstacles met in the process. This should be done in the format of the Follow-up report matrix below (see Box 3) and include:

- a. The recommendation number and text, copied from the Management Response;
- b. The actions agreed in the Management Response, in a summary version as required;
- c. Description of actions actually taken and any comment or information considered useful as supporting evidence to the self-assessment;
- d. MAR score; and
- e. The impact of those actions: impacts can occur at any level, including changes in policies, procedures, technical knowledge, livelihoods, state of natural resources, etc.

Follow-up report matrix²

Accepted evaluation recommendations (a)	Action Agreed in the Management Response (b)	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c)	MAR score (d) *	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e)
Recommendation 1	Summary of actions agreed	Short narrative		Short narrative
Recommendation 2	Summary of actions agreed	Short narrative		Short narrative
Recommendation 3	Summary of actions agreed	Short narrative		Short narrative

*: **1 - None:** no action was taken to implement the recommendation; **2 - Poor:** plan and actions for implementation of the recommendation are at a very preliminary stage; **3 - Inadequate:** implementation of the recommendation is uneven and partial; **4 - Adequate:** implementation of the recommendation has progressed; there is no evidence yet of its results on the intended target; **5 - Good:** the recommendation has been fully implemented and there is some initial evidence of its impact on the intended target; **6 – Excellent:** there is solid evidence that the recommendation has had a positive impact on its intended target.

² Each column is cross-referenced to the bullet letters above.

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

OED monitors and facilitates the preparation of the Management Responses and Follow-up Reports. It will notify the Main Unit in due time for the preparation of these reports and will check that required standards of comprehensiveness and clarity are met. It will upload both the MRs and the FRs on its Web site; in the case of evaluations of extra-budgetary funded initiatives, the MRs and the FRs will also be uploaded in FPMIS.

In preparing the MRs and the FRs, the Main Unit must consult with and seek inputs as necessary from parties within and outside FAO to whom the evaluation recommendations were addressed. Nevertheless, FAO management takes the full responsibility for the contents of both MR and FRs and for the implementation of agreed actions within its mandate.

Operational responsibilities are as follows:

- a. **Evaluation reports for the Programme Committee:** The Chair of the Evaluation Committee (Internal) designates, in consultation with OED, a senior officer who will have overall responsibility for coordinating the preparation of the Management Response and Follow-up Report. This will be done at the inception stage of the evaluation and indicated in the Roles and Responsibilities section of the evaluation Terms of References. This will enable the designated person to be part of the evaluation Reference Group. The MR should be completed within **four weeks** from the notification by OED and sent to OED Director (see Box 4). The FR should be submitted to the Programme Committee **two years** after the evaluation report and its MR have been discussed by the Programme Committee, unless otherwise decided by the PC itself. Six (6) months prior to the Programme Committee session for which it is due, OED informs the senior officer who coordinated the preparation of the MR about the schedule for the FR preparation and discussion.
- b. **Project Evaluations:** The project Budget Holder will normally be responsible for leading 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 notification by OED and 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 leading 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 either separately or as part of the MR. In the case of the latter, it should be explained in the MR which actions were agreed by the Government to undertake.

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
Final report of the evaluation and request for the	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.	Designated officer/OED	8 weeks
Comments by the Evaluation Committee to the	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 Director	6 weeks

