

**PROJECT EVALUATIONS SERIES**

# **Final Evaluation of the FAO-Turkey Partnership Programme (FTPP)**

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE**

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

*January 2017*

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](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto: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](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Management Response.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The Follow-up Report.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Responsibilities and procedures for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report ...</b>	<b>8</b>



## **1 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, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (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.

## **2 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 (TOR) 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.

**Management response to the  
Final Evaluation of the FAO-Turkey Partnership Programme – FTPP  
March 2016 – 12 May 2016 version**

**Overall response to the evaluation**

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

8. The Evaluation of the FAO-Turkey Partnership Programme (FTPP) was conducted at the recommendation of the FAO SEC and the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock of Turkey. The Evaluation was timely at the outset of the starting the second phase of the FAO-Turkey Partnership Programme (FTPP second phase) that has been signed in June 2014. The general quality, timeliness and structure of the Evaluation were well appreciated by the donor and the recipient countries. The Evaluation findings reflect the achievements of the FTPP and areas for improvement and the recommendations are helpful for the planning of the second phase of the FTPP.

**Response by recommendation**

9. 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.

**Management response matrix<sup>1</sup>**

Management response to the (Final Evaluation of the FAO-Turkey Partnership Programme -FTPP)					Date
Evaluation Recommendation (a)	Management response (b) <b>Accepted</b> , Partially Accepted or <b>Rejected</b>	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)
<b>Programme Approach</b>					
<b>Recommendation 1. To FAO and the donor</b> Based on the lessons learned from the first phase of the FTPP, the ET strongly recommends that a much more programmatic and regional approach is applied, in order to consolidate the efforts toward improved livelihoods and sustainable natural resource management in the Central Asia and the Caucasus Region. The evaluation recommends that the overall programme goals are aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and therefore emphasize sustainable development and climate resilience.	<b>Accepted</b>	Short narrative: 1.1 FAO SEC and the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MFAL) have agreed on a Programmatic Approach in the preparation of the second phase of the FTPP that will link to national priorities, FAO strategic programmes and regional priorities. A comprehensive results matrix has been developed as a tool to incorporate priorities of various levels and ensure alignment.  1.2 FAO SEC has organized three stakeholder consultation meetings (November, December 2015 and May 2016) to build a programme and involve the participating countries' and the donor governments in the programme identification. Overall priorities, goals and objectives of the FTPP were discussed.  1.3 FAO SEC is coordinating with the FAO Country Offices to ensure FTPP priorities are in alignment with country priorities and SDGs.	FAO SEC FAOR MFAL	2016-2017	N
<b>Results-based design</b>					
<b>Recommendation 2. To FAO</b> The evaluation recommends that the programme approach be further strengthened by employing a consistent design, with clear goals and objectives that reach well beyond the	<b>Accepted</b>	Short narrative: 2.1 FAO SEC has employed a common result framework in the design of the second phase of the FTPP. As a following step, results chain and indicators will be established to	FAO SEC FAOR	2016-2017	Y

<sup>1</sup> Each column is cross-referenced to the bullet letters above.

<p>outputs. It is recommended to use a results-based management approach for the design, which is well suited to accommodate any necessary changes or modifications (which are to be expected in a programme focused primarily on capacity development).</p>		<p>incorporate a monitoring tool at the Subregional level as well as at countries.</p> <p>2.2 A socio-economic analysis in the Subregion has been prepared in the preparation of the second phase of the FТПP, as a basis for a Subregional strategy, as well as formulation of specific baseline.</p> <p>2.3 It is proposed in the Operational Framework of FТПP II that the beneficiary country to nominate high level officials as Senior Focal Point to ensure effective participation from the design of the programme.</p>			
<p><b>Recommendation 3. To FAO</b> Gender equity should be mainstreamed in the design of the future programme. The ET also recommends that gender analyses are undertaken as part of the baseline surveys, and that the activities are planned in such a way as to address the issues identified. It is moreover recommended that extensive capacity development will be undertaken among the implementing partners in terms of gender equality perspectives.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p>	<p>Short narrative:</p> <p>3.1 FAO SEC, with support from FAOREU has drafted a programming guideline on Gender Mainstreaming and Human-Right-Based Approach to be used in FТПP II and FТПP. Discussion to brainstorm on gender mainstreaming and HRBA, and SWOT analysis has been conducted both in stakeholder workshops, and at SEC. A consultancy was initiated to formulate various proposals for SEC and in Turkey on gender mainstreaming.</p> <p>3.2 Gender mainstreaming and HRBA principles will be integrated at all levels of the project cycle (design, implementation, conclusion, monitoring and evaluation), and into all activities and documents of the respective projects.</p> <p>3.3 FAO SEC is in consultation with the donor and beneficiary countries in developing a Subregional project on gender mainstreaming in the SEC countries with a focus on gender empowerment, gender analysis and capacity development of gender policies and activities.</p>	<p>FAOSEC FAOR</p>	<p>2017</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p><b>Programme Implementation</b></p>					



<p><b>Recommendation 4. To FAO</b> It is recommended that non-state actors, such as NGOs, CBOs and private actors, are included in programme implementation in order to enhance internal capacity to act effectively at field level.</p>	<p><b>Accepted (with notes)</b></p>	<p>Short narrative:</p> <p>4.1 FAO SEC agrees with this recommendation, however, employs a step-by-step approach, to ensure buy in from stakeholders and counterparts, and recommends aiming the context of political and internal preparedness in the beneficiary countries.</p> <p>4.2. Possible pilot activities are considered in 2 countries with progressive CSO environment: Turkey and Kyrgyzstan, and a pilot project in agriculture extension employing stakeholder participation is envisaged in Kazakhstan.</p> <p>4.2 FAO country offices will be able to facilitate this process to coordinate with the government in order to engage and develop partnership with the CBOs, NGOs and other private sector, as appropriate in the implementation of the FTPP second phase and develop capacity of different actors.</p>	<p>FAOSEC FAOR MFAL</p>	<p>2018</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 5. To FAO</b> During the programme implementation, it is recommended that beneficiary representatives (i.e. farmers, fishers, livestock keepers, and value chain and agribusiness actors) are included in governing and collaboration bodies, both at national and regional levels (e.g. CACFish) in order to ensure that the activities are relevant to the needs of the agricultural/forestry/fisheries sectors.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p>	<p>Short narrative:</p> <p>5.1 FAO SEC in collaboration with the FAO Country Offices will facilitate in developing effective partnership with the beneficiaries/actors and support in participating in the regional and national level governing bodies of the programme. FAO will provide advocacy support in promoting partnership.</p> <p>5.2 All FTPP support programmes will focus on developing institutional capacity in the beneficiary countries including integrating gender equality and human rights-based work.</p> <p>5.3 FAO has proposed to the donor to increase the visibility of FTPP and allocation of funds for visibility activities and communicating programme results to stakeholders in the participating countries.</p>	<p>FAOSEC FAOR</p>	<p>2017-2018  2018-19</p>	<p>Y</p>

### 3 The Follow-up Report

1. 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.
2. 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.

3. 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.
4. The MAR score complements the narrative description and the evidence available about the progress made in implementing each recommendation, and their impact.
5. Furthermore, following a request by the Programme Committee at its 103<sup>rd</sup> 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.
6. 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

7. 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

8. 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 matrix<sup>2</sup>

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)
<b>Recommendation 1</b>	Summary of actions agreed	Short narrative		Short narrative
<b>Recommendation 2</b>	Summary of actions agreed	Short narrative		Short narrative
<b>Recommendation 3</b>	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

<sup>2</sup> Each column is cross-referenced to the bullet letters above.

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

9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsibility for action</b>	<b>Deadline before PC meeting</b>
Final report of the evaluation and request for the management response will be sent to the appointed senior officer.	Office of Evaluation (OED)	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 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 Director	6 weeks