


February 2013

	منظمة الأغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة	联合国 粮食及 农业组织	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture		Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura
---	--	--------------------	---	---	--	--

## PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

**Hundred and Thirteenth Session**

**Rome, 18 - 22 March 2013**

**Follow-up to the Evaluation of FAO's work through the  
Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)**

Queries on substantive content of this document may be addressed to:

Mr Dominique Burgeon

Director, Emergency and Rehabilitation Division

Tel. +39 (06) 570-53803

*This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)*

### **Executive Summary**

i) The Evaluation of FAO's work through the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) was presented to the 107<sup>th</sup> Session of the Programme Committee (16 – 17 May 2011). The Committee appreciated the quality of the Evaluation, which made 22 recommendations, 4 of which were addressed to the CERF Secretariat. In its response, FAO Management accepted 14 of the 18 recommendations and partially accepted 4 of the 18 recommendations. In addition, the CERF Secretariat fully accepted 2, partially accepted 1 and rejected 1 of the 4 recommendations directed at the CERF role.

ii) In line with the FAO's policy on evaluations, this report provides for information an update on the status of implementation of the actions set out in the Management Response. It summarises progress achieved over the last two years describing key actions implemented.

iii) Through the continuous support of the CERF, which allocated over USD 40 million in 2012 to FAO, the Organization will pursue its actions to consolidate its humanitarian role in agriculture, food and nutrition in the immediate aftermath of crisis and to embed it into a continuum of longer-term investment, development and policy actions. FAO will continue to dedicate resources to document, communicate and advocate the importance of livelihoods protection for vulnerable smallholders, and for the scaling-up of risk reduction and crisis management good practices.

1. The Evaluation of FAO's work through the Central Emergency Response Fund was presented to the 107<sup>th</sup> session of the Programme Committee (16 – 17 May 2011). The Committee appreciated the quality of the Evaluation which made 18 recommendations to the Organization and 4 to the CERF Secretariat.

2. In the Management Response, FAO welcomed the Evaluation and accepted 14 of the 18 recommendations and partially accepted 4 of the 18 recommendations addressed to the Organization. In addition, the CERF Secretariat fully accepted 2, partially accepted 1 and rejected 1 of the 4 recommendations directed at the CERF role.

3. This report provides an update on the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation in terms of achievements, challenges and the way forward.

### **Achievements**

4. Overall the achievements on the implementation of the recommendation are very encouraging and significant progress has been made over the past two years. Detailed responses to each recommendation are found in Annex 1. Below are highlights of the key actions undertaken. The full impact of the actions taken will be monitored and measured over the next years in an evolving strategic and operational framework requiring close interactions with resources partners such as the CERF.

### ***Needs assessment, priority setting and project design and quality assurance (recommendations 1-4).***

5. Overall these 4 recommendations are the most challenging ones and require longer-term commitment:

- a) emergency and rehabilitation specialists are now part of the corporate FAO iRecruitment and iRoster systems and this reduces time for mobilisation to respond to crises. However, the pool of experienced experts in crisis management for agriculture, food and nutrition is still small for meeting the challenges of a planet at risk;
- b) progress on the participation of multistakeholders needs assessment is taking place on an ad hoc basis at country level, but is more systematic as part of the Multi-Cluster Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) and as part of the UN Disaster Assessment and Coordination Team (UNDAC). However, this is an area which requires further attention and

- investments in order to encompass the agriculture, forestry, fisheries and natural resources sectors;
- c) consolidated efforts on risk assessment monitoring, analysis and early warning has been implemented for the Rift Valley fever disease, for the desert locust and for food security monitoring in collaboration with WFP. These are examples showing the way forward. Multirisk monitoring and early warning systems for agriculture, food and nutrition at the global, regional, national and local levels should continue to be one of FAO's priorities for the coming years; and
  - d) the standardization of CERF projects for three main types of intervention has not yet been achieved and will be completed by the end of 2013. It will further support the decentralization process and strengthen quality and delivery of FAO's emergency interventions.

***Efficiency and timeliness (recommendations 6-10)***

- 6. Main achievements on efficiency and timeliness were reached over the last two years through:
  - a) revised procurement procedures, training of staff, outposting of international procurement officers and increased delegation of authority, giving increased autonomy to decentralized offices;
  - b) new agro-ecological zones added to the crop calendar of the FAO Web site, as well as the preparation of guidelines and procedures for seed procurement favouring local and adapted seed varieties;
  - c) launch of the new FAO Disaster Risk Management (DRM) e-learning training and establishment of a DRM good practice and tool platform on Intranet; and
  - d) Standard Operations Procedures (SOPs) across seven functional areas (corporate support services, programming, logistics, preparedness, communication, surge and emergency declaration) developed in a participatory manner across the Organization.

***Partnership and coordination (recommendations 11-15)***

- 7. Achievements in improved partnership and coordination work have been reinforced through the Global and National Food Security Cluster mechanisms, co-led with WFP. Actions were taken with regard to:
  - a) partial mapping of NGO partners;
  - b) a new Manual Section for service providers, defining better their relationships and responsibilities with FAO;
  - c) signed stand-by partnership agreements for making available expertise in key areas of crisis response; and
  - d) visibility for service providers (formally implementing partners).

***Equity and targeting (recommendations 16-17)***

- 8. Over the past two years FAO developed two new corporate policies and guidance for emergency and rehabilitation work addressing the recommendations of the evaluation, which were completed in the course of 2012 and will now be further disseminated:
  - a) FAO corporate targeting and accountability policy - Accountability to Affected People (AAP) - in line with Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) commitments;
  - b) FAO cash transfer policy and standardized approach for operational guidelines on cash for work, voucher, food for work, input trade fairs, voucher schemes and livestock destocking and restocking.

### **Results (recommendations 18-19)**

9. The relevance of FAO's emergency support is promoted by the collection, documentation, dissemination and scaling-up of good practices on disaster risk reduction and crisis management, through various mechanisms such as:

- a) the FAO Technology for Agriculture (TECA) database;
- b) the FAO good practice corporate guidance;
- c) the FAO communication for development, including disaster risk reduction.

10. The importance of the role that FAO plays in the protection of livelihoods, as an essential and legitimate humanitarian issue. Regular informal meetings with donors and other partners are taking place to better communicate and advocate for livelihoods protection in times of crisis, including in the Committee on Food Security (CFS).

### **CERF-directed recommendations (recommendations 20 to 22)**

11. The CERF Secretariat implemented the accepted recommendations through the establishment of new procedures for project approval, the set-up of an umbrella Letter of Understanding signed by all UN agencies, the formulation of a new performance and accountability framework and enhanced guidelines on reporting and knowledge sharing.

### **Challenges**

12. In the coming months, the main challenge will be to pursue and consolidate the progress achieved over the last two years in an evolving strategic and operational framework, aiming at better integrating development, rehabilitation and emergency operations. Specific attention will be given to the following areas:

- a) needs assessment, priority setting and project design and quality assurance recommendations which require longer-term efforts and resources;
- b) efficiency and timeliness will be further sustained by the new Global Resources Management System (GRMS);
- c) on partnership and coordination, successes achieved via the Food Security Cluster mechanism at global and national levels must be maintained and reinforced further to have tangible impact on beneficiaries;
- d) for equity and targeting, the two 2012 cooperate policies developed for accountability and cash transfers, must now be communicated and implemented with dedicated resources on training and communication; and
- e) for the continued improvement of results in crisis situations, FAO should continue to invest in the technical role it plays in the protection of livelihoods, as an essential and legitimate humanitarian issue. The challenge is to scale-up the dialogue with its Members, donors and other key stakeholders to better communicate and advocate for livelihoods protection in times of crisis in a most professional and coherent manner (with validated good practices for risk management for agriculture, food and nutrition) as part of the new worldwide resilience agenda.

### **The way forward**

13. The results achieved through the implementation of the evaluation recommendations will be sustained and strengthened through the activities delivered under the current *SO-I Improved preparedness for, and effective response to, food and agricultural threats and emergencies* in the PWB 2012-13 and the *SO-5 Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises* in the PWB 2014-15. This work will consolidate FAO's humanitarian role in agriculture, food and nutrition in the immediate aftermath of crisis and embed it into a continuum of longer-term investment, development and policy actions. Building on emergency responses and disaster risk management, the new resilience objective will help FAO, its member countries and partners to shift paradigm from crisis management to risk reduction and prevention for agriculture, food and nutrition.

14. Through the decentralization process, FAO will further promote its unique technical emergency crisis response capacity and integrate its operational expertise into a wider range of investment and development interventions in support of risk reduction and crisis management affecting agriculture, food and nutrition. In doing so, it will lay the ground for the scaling-up of FAO leading role on the global resilience and Zero Hunger Agenda.

FAO will dedicate resources to document, communicate and advocate the importance of livelihoods protection for vulnerable smallholders, and essential human right linked to the “right to food” and for the scaling-up of risk reduction and crisis management good practices.

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
<p><b>1.</b> Building upon its development programme and long-term presence in most countries, FAO should continue to <b><u>mobilize knowledgeable specialists from the government, pre-existing development projects and NGOs to participate in needs assessments</u></b></p>	<p><b>1.1</b> Continue to develop and update a roster for knowledgeable specialists in countries where FAO has a long-term presence and a significant field programme.</p>	<p>Emergency and rehabilitation fields of specialization were incorporated in new corporate iRecruitment and iRoster Systems to provide the organization with a surge capacity for disasters response.</p>	<p>FAO is able to mobilize knowledgeable crisis specialist in a timely manner. However, the pool of experienced specialists in crisis management for agriculture, food and nutrition is still small for meeting the challenges of a planet at risk.</p>
<p><b>2.</b> Time permitting, FAO should strive to <b><u>participate in multi-stakeholder needs assessments</u></b> to buttress objectivity, accuracy and transparency in identifying needs and priorities after disasters that are likely to have affected many sectors.</p>	<p><b>2.1</b> Explore IFI funding opportunities for multi-stakeholder needs assessments in the aftermath of disasters.</p> <p><b>2.2</b> Seek accreditation for FAO to become part of the UN Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) mechanism.</p> <p><b>2.3</b> Within FAO, identify and train a pool of staff to participate in UNDAC team on post-disaster multi-stakeholders needs assessments.</p>	<p>FAO participated in UNDAC team on post disaster multi-stakeholders needs assessments on a case-by-case basis. At the national level, FAO ensured to make available national staff to participate in local post disaster needs assessments. FAO played also an active role in developing and participating in Multi-Cluster Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA).</p>	<p>FAO contributes to multi-stakeholder needs assessment supporting the formulation of needs based CERF interventions. However, this is an area which requires further attention and investments in order to encompass the agriculture, forestry, fisheries and natural resources related sectors.</p>
<p><b>3.</b> In the most disaster-prone countries, the Organisation should continue to support <b><u>early warning systems and/or the collection of simple livelihoods profiles</u></b> and agricultural calendars developed on the basis of farmers' own knowledge initially captured at needs assessment time and further refined throughout the response under the aegis of the agriculture or food security cluster (or a similar coordination mechanism)</p>	<p><b>3.1</b> Implement the DRR/M Framework Programme on "security risk assessment, monitoring, analysis and early warning" in selected focal countries (i.e. countries where FAO has had a significant field programme over time).</p>	<p>FAO continues to support early warning systems such as: i) the establishment of the National Information and Early Warning System on Food Security aiming at providing reliable, timely and up-to-date food security information to decision-makers and wider stakeholders to help mitigate the impact of food shortages and hunger; ii) Crop and Food Security</p>	<p>FAO supports early warning systems enabling early actions. Multi-risk monitoring and early warning systems for agriculture, food and nutrition at the global, regional, national and local levels will continue to be one of FAO's priorities in the coming years.</p>

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
<p><b>4. A standardization of CERF projects technical approaches</b> is desirable from a quality control view point, following the approach developed by the Seed and Plant Genetic Resources Service. By virtue of their short duration, CERF projects must use simple and standard approaches and concentrate on replacing the most urgently needed production assets to ensure some level of food production and incomes, rather than aim at increasing food production levels as compared to pre-crisis times (see also recommendation 20).</p>	<p><b>4.1</b> For 3 main types of CERF funded interventions in line with life-saving and time-critical criteria, develop and/or consolidate 3 standard technical approaches and/or project profiles.</p> <p><b>4.2</b> <i>The CERF Secretariat stands ready to work with FAO's Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division to review potential standardized project approaches.</i></p>	<p>Assessment Missions used by local governments, international institutions and donors to plan their actions; and iii) the Desert Locust Information Service which provides key information for planning and prioritizing field operations, organizing emergency control campaigns and appealing for international assistance.</p>	<p>This is work in progress. It will support FAO's capacities to formulate faster, high-quality CERF funded interventions.</p>
<p><b>5.</b> If confirmed by the 5-year evaluation of the CERF, <b>seasonal delays in the approval of CERF projects</b>, due to a large number of UFE projects to be processed at specific times in the year, deserve consideration by the CERF Secretariat with a view to "insulate" rapid response projects from this effect, i.e. ensure that the approval process for RR projects remains unaffected by delays in the UFE window.</p>	<p><b>5.1</b> CERF - The CERF Secretariat will continue to monitor timeliness to ensure prompt review, approval and disbursement of projects.</p>	<p>Throughout the establishment of new procedures, the CERF secretariat remained within its stated time limits of ensuring the approval of rapid response projects within three working days of submission of the final proposal and within five days for projects submitted under the underfunded emergencies window.</p>	<p>Project proposals are approved in a timely manner by the CERF Secretariat.</p>

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
<p>6. Programme staff need to be better aware of the <b>typical delivery durations</b> to expect from various procurement approaches and should start procurement and contracting as early as possible; “pre-procurement” (starting procurement before the official project start date) should become the rule for CERF Rapid Response projects; repeat orders are a very powerful tool for rapid delivery, when based on previous tenders that were well conducted and answered to by a sufficient number of suppliers.</p>	<p>6.1 Continue to train FAO staff at headquarters and in decentralized offices on new procurement rules and procedures (field manual), stressing the importance of procurement planning and timing.</p>	<p>The introduction of a Revised MS502 (Procurement of goods, works and services) on 01/01/2010 with a guiding principle of best value for money, has provided an important resource for enhancing capacity in the field offices to deliver procurement within the increased levels of directly delegated financial authority. E-learning modules, comprehensive guidelines, templates and planning spreadsheets have been developed for use by decentralized offices.</p> <p>62 training courses have been held for 1,032 participants in 21 countries since the rollout of MS502.</p> <p>The new manual and related training led to increased staff awareness on procurement matters and in particular, opportunities for the appropriate re-use of tender (MS502.16.5).</p>	<p>Procurement time was shortened in CERF-funded project through the re-use of tenders, increasing FAO’s efficiency and project impact.</p>
<p>7. Taking greater account, and in some countries developing a <b>more precise knowledge of how cropping calendars change from one locality, elevation or agro-ecological zone to the next</b> would allow field teams to better schedule delivery and provide farming inputs before rather than during the sowing season, it is often the case currently. It may also help judge when catching the next season is doable and when it is more realistic to aim at subsequent seasons (see</p>	<p>7.1 Standardize and disseminate information on agro-ecological zones cropping calendars for focal or priority countries (i.e. those where FAO has had a significant programme over time).</p> <p>7.2 Ensure systematic recruitment of sound agronomists and implement quality briefing of new international and</p>	<p>New agro -cological zones have been added to the FAO crop calendar Web site. Today there are 159 crops, 493 agro-ecological regions and 83 countries in the crop calendar Web site. Information has been successfully disseminated through the crop calendar online database.</p> <p>Procedures are in place to recruit qualified agronomists for emergency operations.</p>	<p>Increased shared knowledge on cropping calendar fosters adequate emergency interventions.</p> <p>Better adapted crop varieties are used. Local procurement is increased, favouring the use of local input trade</p>



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
<p>recommendation 8).</p> <p><b>8.</b> Based on the selected procurement approach and possibilities of a repeat order or not, programme staff should make an educated guess about whether or not asking for CERF funds to “<b>catch the next crop</b>” . As a rule of thumb, if one can do a repeat order or sole source contract with a supplier that has the goods in stock, one should expect a lead time of one to two months from procurement start to delivery of the inputs to farmers. This lead time jumps to a bare minimum of 3 months, and more likely a period from 4 to 6 months if the procurement needs to be tendered nationally or internationally.</p>	<p>national FAO staff on the importance of respecting agro-ecological zones of cropping calendars. The same would apply for NGOs implementing partners.</p> <p><b>8.1</b> Improve procurement preparedness and possibly stand-by agreements with suppliers for main crops in highly and chronically vulnerable areas.</p>	<p>Guidelines and procedures for seed procurement ensure that adapted varieties are used by FAO and its partners.</p> <p>6 International Procurement Officers have been posted in decentralized offices with high volume and/or complex procurement.</p> <p>These officers have developed procedures and templates for enhanced local procurement planning and preparedness. They have expanded their local vendor rosters to ensure that there are viable suppliers available for invitation to tender with the capacity to prepare and submit responsive offers. In addition, these officers benefit increasingly from expertise available at country level and on the new MS502 for better project design.</p> <p>Moreover, protocols have been developed for identifying potential suppliers through expanded local rosters, through enrolment in the UNGM (United Nations Global Marketplace), the extensive clean-up of the main FAO supplier database to ensure that inactive vendors are removed.</p> <p><i>The CERF has extended its rapid response grant timeframe from three to six months in the umbrella Letter of</i></p>	<p>fair.</p> <p>The deployment of the International Procurement Officers has resulted in a significant improvement of the Organization’s delivery, not only in the respective countries, but also in countries where they have conducted procurement missions. It has also expanded the pool of FAO procurement officers available to intervene in countries requiring a rapid intervention to conduct high volume or urgent procurement activities.</p> <p>The International Procurement Officers use their local knowledge and close contacts with the project staff to identify opportunities for the appropriate re-use of tenders as under MS502.16.5.</p>
	<p><b>8.2</b> CERF - The implementation of the six month rapid response window will assist FAO in this regard. The issue has</p>	<p><i>The CERF has extended its rapid response grant timeframe from three to six months in the umbrella Letter of</i></p>	<p><i>Timely CERF funded interventions are meeting the livelihood immediate needs of affected population.</i></p>

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
	<p><i>already been taken up in the November 2010 annual consultations between the CERF Secretariat and FAO, and will be continued.</i></p>	<p><i>Understanding (LOU) signed with UN agencies on 7 June 2011. This extension allowed FAO to align its agricultural interventions with the planting seasons.</i></p>	
<p><b>9.</b> To support and manage the early response to emergency situations, the <b>FAO development-oriented staff at country level need to acquire “emergency expertise”</b> through the provision of an ongoing and specific awareness raising and implementation training programme. This may require to integrate emergencies in corporate training programmes, and to devote resources either from the FAO regular programme budget or from donors to training staff and consultants at the country level on the management of emergency programmes</p>	<p><b>9.1</b> Launch the DRM e-learning tool in mid-2011 and encourage all development oriented staff to undertake the online course.</p> <p><b>9.2</b> Adapt and repeat the FAOR course on emergencies.</p>	<p>A Disaster Risk Management e-learning training was released in November 2011. This course is currently available to all staff on the FAO e-learning platform. A Disaster Risk Management best practices and tools platform has been finalized and is available on intranet to all staff.</p> <p>Within the framework of integration of emergency and development programme, capacity building events are being implemented at regional, subregional and country level. In 2012, focus was on RLC, RAP and RNE while attention will be given to RAF in 2013.</p>	<p>Better staff awareness on Disaster Risk Management food and nutrition security.</p>
<p><b>10.</b> The FAO corporate information management systems need to catch up with increasingly decentralized operations. Ultimately, the Oracle systems used by FAO for accounting, managing human resources and processing procurement orders should be expanded to support field operations, including accounting, LoAs tracking and the monitoring of procurement. As developing and rolling out these applications at the country level may</p>	<p><b>10.1</b> Standard Operations Procedures (SOPs) developed and combined in an EOMT for human resources, procurement, contract and LoA management.</p>	<p>26 SOPs across 7 functional areas (corporate support services, programming, logistics, preparedness, communications, surge and emergency declaration) have been developed and serve as the foundation for the FAO Handbook for Emergency Response, which is currently under development. The FAO Handbook for Emergency Response will serve as the EOMT and will include all SOPs and related tools.</p>	<p>FAO’s coherence, timeliness and effectiveness in responding to emergencies will be enhanced by the systematic application of SOPs in the next years.</p>

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
<p>take some time, an <b><u>emergency operations management tool kit</u></b> is required in the interim<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p><b>11.</b> FAO, while upholding the humanitarian principle of neutrality, should <b><u>continue to develop and maintain working relationships with governmental and non-governmental actors</u></b>, with a preference for actors with a long-term commitment and good community links in the targeted areas, to allow faster and more effective emergency programmes and to facilitate sustainability and the transition into subsequent recovery and development programmes.</p>	<p>Continue to develop the mapping and partnership arrangements with key partners (governments, NGOs and others) in focal countries where FAO has had a long-term presence and a significant field programme.</p>	<p>Partial mapping of humanitarian NGO partners was conducted over 2012. A centralized database of NGO partners fed directly by the field and administered at headquarters is currently under consideration, pending funding availability. Partnership is also being enhanced by global and national food security cluster.</p>	<p>FAO is continuing to work closely with partners to timely implement CERF funded interventions and is supported by food security cluster mechanism.</p>
<p><b>12.</b> FAO should <b><u>include core implementing partners</u></b> in the scoping, design and specification of proposed interventions more than is currently the case; FAO should also support valuable projects designed directly by partners themselves, when appropriate</p>	<p><b>12.1</b> Apply the newly revised manual as soon as it has been approved on the collaboration with Implementing Partners (IPs) in emergency and rehabilitation interventions for delivery of services.</p>	<p>Manual Section MS507 governing Letters of Agreement became effective 01/07/2011. The relationship and the responsibilities in identifying and working with Service Providers (SP) – the new terminology for Implementing Partners (IPs) has been defined in both the MS and its accompanying guidelines.</p> <p>Training to familiarize staff with MS507 (Letter of Agreement) was rolled out across 2011 – 12 to 840 staff through 38 training courses in 17 countries. In 2013 further training courses will be held in every FAO region.</p>	<p>Services providers are inclusively participating to the scope, design and specification of CERF funded intervention.</p>

<sup>1</sup> This recommendation is in line with recommendations 5.2 and 5.3 of the Evaluation of FAO operational capacity in emergencies.

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
	<p><b>12.2</b> Reinforce and develop stand-by (substantive) partnership agreements with at least two key international partners.</p>	<p>Stand-by partnership agreements were signed with the Norwegian Refugee Council, Danish Refugee Council and iMIMAP (Information Management and Mine Action Program) over 2012. Discussions with other partners are ongoing.</p>	<p>Targeted expertise is reinforcing FAO's implementation capacities in emergency intervention.</p>
<p><b>13.</b> To <b>equalize the relationship with implementing partners</b>, the new FAO Manual Section 507 and new partnership instrument should be completed as soon as possible and made available to operational teams</p>	<p><b>13.1</b> Complete and launch the new Manual Section 507 on provision of services and partnership.</p>	<p>Manual Section MS507 governing Letters of Agreement became effective 01/07/2011. The relationship and the responsibilities in identifying and working with Service Providers (SP) – the new terminology for Implementing Partners( IPs) has been defined in both the MS and its accompanying guidelines. The supporting Annexes for the MS507 clearly identify the role and responsibilities of both FAO and the Service Provider.</p>	<p>Enhanced relationships between FAO and its Service Providers.</p>
<p><b>14.</b> Just as donors and FAO sometimes insist that local partners give some visibility to their assistance by putting their logos on boards or publications (“downward visibility”), <b>FAO should systematically include the logos of its implementing partners in project completion reports</b> and brochures to recognise the importance of their contribution (“upward visibility”)</p>	<p><b>14.1</b> In the overall TCE communication guidelines, insert a specific recommendation on the visibility of IPs where a significant role is played in project implementation.</p>	<p>TCE guidelines on final narrative reports to donors include several specific recommendations on the visibility of Service Providers. TCE communication guidelines include a specific reference to visibility of Service Providers and partners.</p>	<p>Service Providers are systematically acknowledged in all narrative reports to donors.</p>

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
<p><b>15. <u>Support from FAO to IPs in the form of technical assistance and training</u></b> during emergency responses, should ideally be conveyed by national experts with strong field experience.</p>	<p><b>15.1</b> Support the joint FAO-WFP FS cluster to better serve and assist country FS clusters and other related clusters dealing with agriculture and livelihoods.</p>	<p>FAO supported the global Food Security cluster (gFSC) in the design and delivery of face to face and e-learning trainings, as well as in the identification of FSC coordinators.</p>	<p>FAO supports an enhanced coordinated response.</p>
<p><b>16.</b> In the immediate response to a disaster, and hence in most CERF rapid response projects, <b>targeting for assets replacement projects should focus at the village level</b> (selection of most affected villages). In the interest of saving time and protecting cohesion/social capital at the community level at a time when they need it most, the targeted communities should be provided with the opportunity to decide how they want the proposed inputs distributed in a transparent way.</p>	<p><b>16.1</b> For asset replacement in the immediate emergency phase, develop standard criteria and guidance based on best/good practices for targeting affected households in rural areas at community levels, in relation to the prevailing degree of social cohesion. This implies that monitoring and accountability tasks also be standardized by FAO and shared with the IP (see recommendation 10).</p>	<p>Feedback from affected communities included that targeting individuals within community settings was often problematic, because: a) it incited friction and conflict amongst neighbours, and b) it presented a burden when those targeted then spent large amounts of additional time passing their learning on to their non-targeted neighbours. It was suggested that interventions be designed with an aim of fostering and supporting community cohesion. FAO has developed its own policy and guidance on accountability to affected people (AAP), combining the five IASC commitments with the corporate commitment on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA).</p> <p>This guidance was disseminated to all FAO country programmes in October 2012.</p>	<p>It is expected that the new FAO corporate targeting and accountability policy will foster better project impact once implemented. The challenge is now to further disseminate, train and implement this new policy and guidance.</p>
<p><b>17.</b> Just as FAO headquarters have delegated implementation for some of larger procurement activities to field offices, there may be opportunities to improve the effectiveness of procurement <b>by delegating procurement of some items</b></p>	<p><b>17.1</b> When feasible, promote voucher systems as per annex to the procurement manual based on Southern Africa experience (see recommendation 10 above on EOMT).</p>	<p>In line with 10.1 above on SOP, FAO has increased its support for cash transfer (CT) interventions over the last decade, gaining valuable experience and expertise in CT programming.</p>	<p>The policy and guidelines provide detailed guidance to FAO staff on the planning, implementation and monitoring of FAO CT interventions with implementing partners.</p>

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
<p><b>to the IPs or directly to the beneficiaries through a voucher and fair system,</b> especially when the type of inputs to supply varies significantly from one locality to the next. Experience from the pilot voucher-based distributions in Africa should be incorporated into FAO procedures and emergency operations management tool kits. However, when used in the context of a CERF project, input fairs should be kept as simple as possible, avoiding complex work-vouchers schemes.</p>		<p>In 2012, FAO formalized its role and position on CTs and standardized its approach. FAO CT policy paper was issued together with a set of operational guidelines on cash for work, voucher and food for work, input trade fairs and voucher schemes and, livestock destocking and restocking.</p>	<p>The challenge is now to further disseminate, train and implement these new policy and guidelines.</p>
<p><b>18.</b> FAO should always <b>procure varieties/breeds / types that are the same</b> as those currently used in the target areas and are familiar to beneficiaries, particularly in the emergency and early rehabilitation phase.</p>	<p><b>18.1</b> Research and document good practices promoting local varieties/breeds and develop a standard operating procedure (SOP) on this issue (see recommendation 10).</p>	<p>Standard forms in 3 languages are used in seed procurement. Seed in Emergencies Handbooks provide essential information about seed to emergency staff and local partners. A specialized database on good practices for Disaster Risk Reduction has been established in Technologies for Agriculture (TECA) repository. There is also the corporate guidance on good practices.</p>	<p>Procurement procedures are quicker and more local procurement of seed is being done through input trade fairs that strengthen local seed systems. Active promotion of Disaster Risk Reduction good practices is integrated in communication for development.</p>
<p><b>19.</b> FAO and other organizations involved in livelihoods should continue to <b>advocate, on behalf of the very communities they are trying to help, for livelihood protection as a legitimate humanitarian issue,</b> recognizing however that this line of work differs from palliative relief operations in that it aims to support the resilience of experienced economic actors whose technical know-how deserves</p>	<p><b>19.1</b> FAO reinforces its communication/advocacy in favour of agriculture livelihoods importance and protection with donor, affected governments and other UN agencies.</p>	<p>FAO reinforced its communication and advocacy to highlight the importance of agriculture livelihoods through: communication and information materials/reports; developed social media presence; donor meetings; press releases; and a new Web site highlighting the protection of agriculture livelihoods.</p>	<p>Donors, governments, UN agencies and partners are starting to understand livelihood protection as a legitimate humanitarian issue. However, the general public, the media and many donors are still focusing on livelihoods saving in a reactive manner rather than with a proactive risk reduction thinking.</p>

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
<p>respect and attention during needs assessment, selection of deliverables and timing of their delivery (see recommendations 3, 20 and 7, respectively).</p>	<p><b>19.2</b> The CERF Secretariat continues to monitor project submissions to assess the need for any future revision to the guidelines.</p>	<p>The CERF Secretariat continues to monitor project submission and agrees with the importance of agricultural livelihoods protection and resilience building in a humanitarian response.</p>	
<p><b>20.</b> The “<b>life-saving</b>” <b>criticism of the CERF should continue to be interpreted flexibly</b> as a bulwark to focus the funds on humanitarian needs, including the protection of self-reliant livelihoods and food availability through time-critical agricultural interventions in accordance with CERF sectoral guidelines.</p>	<p><b>20.2</b> FAO continues to brief and communicate with the UN RC/HC, UN Country teams and cluster leads on the importance of interventions promoting self-reliant agriculture-based livelihoods and local food availability in response to crisis.</p>	<p>At country level, FAO Representatives are advocating for the protection of self-reliant livelihoods and food availability through time-critical agricultural interventions.</p>	<p>Livelihood protection interventions are fully supported by the CERF.</p>
<p><b>21.</b> The CERF Secretariat should <b>amend the narrative report format</b> so that each and every CERF annual country report contains, per sector and for each agency, a timeline of interventions, including the dates for procurement and delivery of assistance to beneficiaries.</p>	<p><b>21.1</b> The CERF Secretariat is also collecting part of this information through its Performance and Accountability Framework.</p>	<p>Disbursal and activity start dates are requested for sub-grants in revised reporting format. In addition, three to five emergencies are reviewed per year under the PAF providing, amongst other things, an overview of the timeliness of interventions. In 2011, the CERF received information on timeliness for more than 600 sub-grants through the RC/HC final reports, compared to less than 200 of such information in 2010.</p>	<p>CERF intervention provides timely assistance to beneficiaries and meets its performance and accountability framework. CERF has now more information on the timeliness of implementation of CERF funds.</p>
	<p><b>21.2</b> FAO to investigate the feasibility of having common standard timelines of interventions including dates of procurement and delivery to IPs and beneficiaries and simple tracking/monitoring of procurement for FAO at headquarters and field level in some</p>	<p>The full deployment of GRMS over 2013 will ensure that FAO is able to track systematically its procurement activities.</p>	<p>Enhanced procurement information data are available for the CERF report.</p>

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
<p><b>22. <u>Clusters and the UNCT should be tasked to review narrative reports</u> and the performance of each project annually, with a view to providing some degree of peer review and improving report quality. Along the same lines and similarly to what is often the case during needs assessments, the clusters and UNCT could usefully evaluate responses and learn from the experience as a group.</b></p>	<p>focal countries and as part of the proposed EOMT mentioned in recommendation 10 above.</p> <p><b>22.1</b> In FAO, promote lesson learning and sharing within the cluster system for CERF-funded interventions and possibly with the production of at least one lesson learned per project.</p> <p><b>22.2</b> CERF Secretariat will further encourage the review of CERF project narrative reports by the UNCT.</p>	<p>The revised CERF reporting format introduced in 2012 requests additional information on the consultation process leading up to report submission and how widely the document was shared. In addition, the new CERF reporting guidance in 2013 further stresses the need to ensure systematic consultations of the reports within the clusters and humanitarian country teams.</p> <p>In addition, the CERF After Action Reviews (AAR) will be promoted more systematically in 2013 to facilitate joint learning and common assessment of performance and results.</p>	<p>Lesson learns from CERF funded interventions are widely circulated within the UN country team, ensuring relevant and enhanced intervention.</p>