



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

**FAO implemented projects in the Adriatic
and Straits of Sicily: GCP /RER/010/ITA
AdriaMed and MedSudMed; GCP /RER/021/EC
and GDCP/INT/010/ITA**

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.

Responsibilities and procedures for management response and follow-up reports on evaluations

June 2011

Introduction

1. Evaluation is an important management tool, and in order for it to play its role, there needs to be careful consideration of evaluation recommendations as a basis for management decisions. All evaluations will have a formal management response which will be complemented later by a Follow-up report on the implementation of the management response.
2. The Programme Committee (PC) and the Joint Meeting of the Programme and Finance Committees require standardized and assured quality in the Organization's responses to independent evaluations reported to them. This guideline outlines the roles and responsibilities for the preparation of Management Response and Follow-up Reports.
3. The evaluation reports themselves need to facilitate decision by management on recommendations and follow-up. Thus, the Office of Evaluation (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.

Format of the Management Response

5. The management response should comment on the utility of the report and illustrate Management's position on the evaluation. It will contain the following sections:
 - a. **Overall response to the evaluation:** In this section, Management presents its overall views on the report and its conclusions.

We thank the evaluation team for their careful and thoughtful review of the AdriaMed and the MedSudMed projects. The team made an enormous investment of time and consultations in the research and preparation of the report. We appreciate the team's recognition that the project has been well managed and their strategies have been consistent with the expressed requirements of the participating countries and agree with the team that the various trainings carried out by the Projects made significant contribution to capacity building in research and sustainable fisheries management at national and regional levels. We also strongly concur with the evaluation that the linkages between the Projects and the GFCM priorities and processes shall be strengthened in light of the recently developed GFCM Framework document. However, there are some areas we differ slightly with the evaluation team, for example, the responsibility and duplications of roles among the Lead Technical Unit, including its Operations staff and the Chief Technical Advisor, attribution of budget holder responsibility, and the work areas the projects need to strength. We provide detailed explanation in the following Response by Recommendation table.

- b. **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 and include: the recommendation number and text (abbreviated if necessary); a statement and a comment on whether the recommendation is accepted fully, partially, or rejected; action to be taken; the responsible party or FAO unit for follow-up action and time-frame for implementation. In the case of a partially accepted or rejected recommendation, reasons should be indicated. In some cases it will be necessary to supplement the list of actions and timing in the management response with an implementation schedule. Where implementation of a recommendation is dependent upon further funding from FAO or a resource partner, this should be made clear.

Management response matrix

Evaluation Recommendation	Management response to the (Evaluation Title)				Date
	Management response Accepted, partially accepted or rejected and comment on the Recommendation	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
Action to be taken		Responsible unit	Timeframe		
Insert title of section, if any					
Recommendation 1 FIRF should review and re-define areas and levels of responsibility including criteria of assignment of functions; rationalise overlapping and duplications of roles among the Lead Technical Unit, Operations and the Chief Technical Advisor.	Partially accepted The current arrangement among the FIRF technical and operations officers, and the Chief Technical advisor has proved to work well in the past and for other projects. The difference in responsibility, roles and functions is commonly recognized among the three groups. It must be realized that zero overlapping and duplication are not realistic. Close interaction and consultation with each other among the three groups are often the most efficient way to solve these issues. However, there is always room for improvement.	A meeting will be called to discuss how the assigning of responsibility, coordination, and sharing of functions can be improved, involving all the relevant FIRF technical and operations officers and the Chief Technical Advisor together with the project management team. FIRF will make effort to attend more regularly the project meetings.	FIRF (technical and operations officers) and the Project Management Team.	By the end of 2012	NO

Responsibilities and procedures for management response and follow-up reports on evaluations, June 2011

<p>Recommendation 2 FIRF should:</p> <p>a) review attribution of Budget Holder Responsibility respecting the principle of best placed knowledge-cum responsibility; and</p> <p>b) appoint the Alternate Budget Holder and document appointment accordingly</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>a) FAO has a formal procedure to assign a budget holder and its responsibility is also defined clearly, not only limited to approving financial documents, but also covering overall technical and operational issues. The budget holder is assisted by operations officers as well as the Chief Technical Advisor. Certainly, such a review would be useful for further improvement.</p> <p>b) Although no alternative budget holder has been assigned so far, the existing procedure and arrangement does not seem having caused any difficulties in the operation of the projects. The necessity of the alternative budget holder will be discussed and decided on by the FIRF, including its operations, and the project management team.</p>	<p>The FIRF will lead the process of reviewing the attribution of budget holder responsibility and the necessity of assigning an alternative budget holder, together with the operations and the project management team.</p>	<p>FIRF and the Project Management Team.</p>	<p>By the end of 2012.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>Recommendation 3 The projects should strengthen the following areas of work:</p> <p>a) improve the development and diffusion of scientific publications on activities and researches carried out within the projects, contribute to international scientific literature;</p> <p>b) enhance focus on multidisciplinary research in support of fisheries management compatible with EAF, by supporting the organisation of</p>	<p>a) partially accepted, Dissemination of scientific publications is already a primary driver of the Projects work (more than 80 technical documents have been produced since 2000). However, we do recognize that in the past few years the production of documents was relatively lower, due to a big reduction in staff experienced by the Projects. The Projects have also been publishing papers in international journals, although this is not their specific mandate nor required by the Project Document.</p> <p>b) partially accepted, This has already been part of the annual workplans of the two Projects, including, inter</p>	<p>a) a greater attention and an increase of effort will be devoted to this task through the re-organization of workflow,</p> <p>b) The Projects will put further effort to addressing training needs</p> <p>c) the projects will continue working towards this direction by involving relevant stakeholders in the cooperative framework established by the Projects. In addition, collaboration with the GEF funded MED-LME project will continue on</p>	<p>Project Management Team</p>	<p>Until June 2013</p>	<p>YES</p>

<p>joint cooperative research activities with common and standardised procedures and reinforcing the activities on training and human capacity development of staff of fisheries institutions;</p> <p>c) enhance the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), by strengthening the capacity of the national institutions in terms of both human resources and organization, as well as direct support to the consultation process necessary for achieving this goal.</p>	<p>alia, the organization of joint cooperative research activities and trainings. The extent to which this recommendation can be fulfilled depends also on the capacity of the projects' partners to provide new human resources;</p> <p>c) partially accepted, See above, moreover the more complete consultation process, which is a fundamental component of the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), requires the involvement not only of the scientific experts but also of the other stakeholders (local and national administrations, fisherman organizations, etc.). This involvement has started especially in the Adriatic Sea and has been included in the future goal of the two projects.</p>	<p>these topics, and in practice through the organization of specific meetings, involving stakeholders, to support the consultative process needed. The projects will also explore alliances/partnerships with other FI projects with regard to the implementation of the EAF.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 4 The projects should include activities aimed at:</p> <p>a) increasing the understanding of the role of small-scale and recreational fisheries (including biological, technological, and socio-economic aspects) and reinforce the institutional capacity to address and manage also this component of the fisheries systems;</p>	<p>a) partially accepted, The attention the AdriaMed project paid to small scale and recreational fisheries has been variable over time, although this was due to the prioritization of activities that each year takes place in the workplan discussed and agreed by the Coordination Committee. The same also applies to the MedSudMed project, in which all the requests of the participating institutions on SSF were formulated to the CopeMed/ArtiFiMed project, due to their geographical overlap with the MSM project.</p> <p>b) partially accepted,</p>	<p>a) an AdriaMed technical Consultation on SSF has been already planned for this year and it will take place in November 2012. The expected outputs will be a series of guidelines for future activities of the Project on this subject;</p> <p>b) Further actions will be brought forward and discussed in the next meeting of the Coordination Committee of the AdriaMed project, to envisage the strengthening of</p>	<p>Project Management Team</p>	<p>Until June 2013</p>	<p>YES</p>

<p>b) strengthening the capacity to explicitly include the interactions between capture fisheries and aquaculture in the management process;</p> <p>c) reinforcing research and capacity development on the socio-economic component of fisheries, including ad hoc studies on consumer's expectations, marketing problems, eco-labelling and product certification. (copy/paste from evaluation report)</p>	<p>This has already been part of the AdriaMed mandate. In fact, the interactions between capture fisheries and aquaculture have been and are currently tackled by the AdriaMed project and further strengthening of this component can be envisaged in the future. No specific component on aquaculture are foreseen and included in the MSM mandate.</p> <p>c) accepted, Although these issues have already been addressed through the activities of the AdriaMed Project in the first year (studies on marketing, trainings), these are additional tasks which have already been discussed in a preliminary way in the Projects' Coordination Committees, although no specific request have been made up to now.</p>	<p>this activity;</p> <p>c) a specific proposal on this subject could be drafted and discussed before and during the next Coordination Committees.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 5 All parties concerned, i.e. the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, GCP/RER/010/ITA and GFCM Secretariat, should develop by end of 2012 a road-map to be proposed to partners for discussion, endorsement and funding that would allow the integration of AdriaMed and MedSudMed achievements within the 2013-2018 GFCM Framework Programme.</p>	<p>Accepted The project management team has made great effort to interact with GFCM and to make project achievements available to GFCM and its members in the past. Clearly the integration of the two projects achievements into the future GFCM Framework Programmes is an important task for both sides, which will contribute to the institutional formalization of the projects. As the evaluation team rightly pointed out these "institutional projects" have a lot in common with the structure of a real Programme. The projects together with FIRF will endeavour to work even more closely and more strategically with GFCM in the future to achieve the best integration and the best possible use of projects' achievements into the Mediterranean GFCM Framework</p>	<p>As a first step the projects are involved in the preparation of the GFCM Framework Programme funding proposal. This proposal foresees funding for 5 years from 2013 to 2018, and during this period the Projects might begin and complete the process of integration with the GFCM Framework Programme.</p>	<p>Project Management Team FIRF and GFCM</p>	<p>By the end of the projects</p>	<p>YES</p>

Responsibilities and procedures for management response and follow-up reports on evaluations, June 2011

	Programme established for 2013-2018.				
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--