

Project Evaluation Series

**Mid-term evaluation of the project
“Mainstreaming sustainable land
development and management”**

GCP/GUY/003/GRI

Management response

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|--|---|--|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| <p>Recommendation 1.</p> <p>To FAO and GLSC.</p> <p>Adjust the project design.</p> <p>The evaluation showed that the existing project planning is obsolete: the execution of the planned activities and the achievement of set outputs and outcomes is unfeasible. Therefore, a revised workplan for the remainder of the project needs to be finalized, adopting a feasible Theory of Change and considering evaluation team's observations in Box 1. In line with this, a feasible no-cost extension should be suggested and an annual work plan should be developed according to new planning. The planning should be done in close coordination between the two agencies, under the leadership of GLSC.</p> | Accepted | A revised work plan and budget have been developed. We will do our best to incorporate recommendations into this revised work plan. Currently, the project is awaiting the donor's endorsement of the No-cost extension, which will adjust the NTE to June 2023. | PMU, FAO Guyana working in close collaboration with GLSC | 12-31-2021 | No |
| <p>Recommendation 2.</p> <p>To GRIF steering committee.</p> <p>Consider project adjustments and provide closer oversight.</p> | <p>Partially accepted</p> <p>We have already had conversations with our national counterparts, and they have expressed some concerns. This</p> | Our national counterpart has some concerns regarding the recommended role of the GRIF Steering Committee versus the GGGI. The GGGI is supporting the Governments of Guyana and Norway on the | PMU, FAO Guyana | 11-30-2021 | No |

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|--|--|--|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| As the actual highest decision-making body, the GRIF steering committee members should consider an adapted project design, planning and budget, to be submitted by GLSC/FAO. The revised design and planning should be carefully judged against feasibility. Once accepted, the GRIF steering committee and secretariat members (PMO, Norway, GGGI) should take up a closer supervision role of the project, based on more frequent, indicator-based progress reports and continuous communication with the project. | is mainly due to the fact that the Government of Guyana and Norway have already contracted the Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) to support the monitoring and facilitate the necessary actions to improve the delivery of all GRIF projects. This mechanism will be followed. Nevertheless, the recommendation will be taken to GRIF and National counterparts for their consideration. | implementation of the GRIF-funded projects. They are intended to support the monitoring of projects to speed-up implementation and achieve the planned outcomes. GGGI will facilitate a monthly meeting between Partner Entities, Implementing Entities, and members of the GRIF Steering Committee to address: issues, challenges and ensure reporting on project implementation. | | | |
| Recommendation 3. To FAO and GLSC. Establish a cooperative body for decision-making. Day-to-day decisions for the project on planning, procurement, budgets and staff are taken by the directors of both partner organizations (GLSC CEO and FAO-R). In practice, these decisions are taken individually. Building on the improved | Accepted | Discussions are already ongoing with the national counterpart to make decisions together. This has seen increased frequency of both technical level meetings as well as policy level meetings between the FAO REP and GLSC CEO, to strengthen joint implementation. PSC has also been reconvened and will continue to meet as another level of decision making. | PMU, FAO Guyana working in close collaboration with GLSC | 11-30-2021 | No |

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|---|--|---|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| communication between these two persons, regular meetings could be formalized to take these decisions in consensus. | | | | | |
| <p>Recommendation 4.</p> <p>To GRIF steering committee, FAO and GLSC.</p> <p>Clarify roles and responsibilities for all project partners.</p> <p>To improve project management, communication and effective fulfilment of roles, the roles and responsibilities of the different project partners and decision-making bodies should be harmonized and clarified in a dedicated workshop among all parties.</p> | Accepted | Workshop(s) will be held with different partners to review documentation and ensure there is clarity and consensus between project parties on the roles and responsibilities. | PMU, FAO Guyana | 1-31-2022 | No |
| <p>Recommendation 5.</p> <p>To FAO and GLSC.</p> <p>Reconstitute the Steering Committee.</p> <p>In the short-term, a Steering Committee meeting should be convened to discuss and receive</p> | Accepted | The Project Steering Committee (PSC) was re-convened starting on August 27, 2021, and the budget revision and revised work plan were agreed upon and endorsed. The PSC will continue to meet regularly, at least twice annually. The recommendation will be made at | PMU, FAO Guyana working in close collaboration with GLSC | 12-31-2021 | No |

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|---|--|--|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| recommendations for the revised project design. It should be ensured that all steering committee members are fully updated and informed about the project progress and challenges before the meeting. Also, the different planned roles and benefits of each member should be informed and endorsed by each member. The PSC should be considered as a engagement and coordination platform and, in line with its ToR, not a decision-making body. In line with the Prodoc, consider engaging non-governmental agencies and regional/local stakeholders, possibly as observer members. | | the next meeting to consider engaging NGOs. | | | |
| <p>Rrecommendation 6.</p> <p>To FAO and GLSC.</p> <p>Actively engage other governmental agencies in project execution.</p> <p>In the context of a working PSC, roles and responsibilities of other agencies related to land administration and management, as</p> | Accepted | The national counterpart has already been engaged on this recommendation. GLSC has already commenced engagement with other agencies to support the implementation of specific activities under the project. We will continue to follow up and actively promote the engagement of other agencies in the | PMU, FAO Guyana working in close collaboration with GLSC | 10-29-2021 | No |

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|---|--|---|------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| mentioned in the ProDoc, will be renewed. Based on this, the partner agencies should actively reach out to these other agencies and plan their inclusion in specific project activities to contribute to broader project ownership and sustainability. | | project. (Note: This will be ongoing throughout project life). | | | |
| <p>Recommendation 7.</p> <p>To FAO.</p> <p>Finalize an operations' manual for the project.</p> <p>The lack of clarity about FAO processes for procurement, contracting, reporting and monitoring has contributed to slow project delivery and lack of collaboration between the agencies. An operations' manual for the project has been developed but not yet finished. The ET has reviewed this manual and considers it to fulfil its role, but could it be more detailed to ensure it is a fail-proof reference manual. E.g: it should not only indicate that "FAO reviews and approves X" but it should be explained who in FAO reviews, who</p> | Accepted | We are currently going through the exercise of finalizing the project's operational manual, based on the comments provided by the ET and the RLC Support Team. The draft manual will be ready for discussion with our partners by the end of October 2021, and we hope to finalize and operationalize it by the end of November 2021. Efforts will also be made to ensure the manual is effectively understood, integrated, and adhered to. | PMU, FAO Guyana | 11-30-2021 | No |

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|---|--|--|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| approves, within how many days and who is in charge of steering this process. The Operations Manual should be fully explained to GLSC staff involved with the project and any possible new staff member should receive an induction. Appropriate efforts should be made that ensure the manual is actually adhered to. | | | | | |
| <p>Recommendation 8.</p> <p>To FAO.</p> <p>Complement a communications strategy with internal communications.</p> <p>The evaluation showed that poor communication between GLSC and FAO has been a major barrier for project effectiveness and efficiency. While the inter-institutional communication has recently improved, it is still not totally functional and there is no communication about the project beyond the two main partner agencies. The ET reviewed the recently elaborated communication</p> | Accepted | We have engaged the national counterpart, and internal communications have already improved. Internal communications considerations will also be incorporated into the communication strategy. | PMU, FAO Guyana working in close collaboration with GLSC | 11-30-2021 | No |

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|--|--|--|--|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| strategy developed for the project. This strategy is useful for its purpose to guide wider dissemination of project results and communication to a wider audience. This Strategy could be complemented with an internal communication strategy to respond to questions such as: <i>how can staff of both agencies create a better day-to-day working environment, sharing experiences and working together? how can decisions be taken and communicated internally? How can other agencies be up- dated with project work to improve engagement?</i> | | | | | |
| <p>Recommendation 9.</p> <p>To FAO and GLSC.</p> <p>Develop a sustainability strategy before for mal-project closure.</p> <p>The evaluation team rated the project's sustainability as unlikely, but it will improve when a feasible plan is accepted for the remainder of the project. The project document asks for an exit</p> | Accepted | The sustainability strategy will be developed jointly between GLSC and FAO. The inputs from consultants or consulting firms will also be incorporated into the sustainability plans for specific technical areas of the project. | PMU, FAO Guyana working in close collaboration with GLSC | 6-30-2022 | No |

| Management response to the mid-term evaluation of the project GCP/GUY/003/GRI | | | | | 11/2021 |
|--|--|--|------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Evaluation recommendation | Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected | Management plan | | | Further funding required (Y or N) |
| | | Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection | Responsible unit | Time frame | |
| strategy/sustainability plan that has not been initiated yet. Considering that the remaining project period, even after extension, will be short, a sustainability strategy should be developed and implemented immediately at least (2 years before project end date). This plan should include targets, tasks and responsibilities for the different project stakeholders. The plan should be presented to the Project Steering Committee and seek endorsement and commitment from the different agencies. | | | | | |

Office of Evaluation
evaluation@fao.org
www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available
under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.