

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE MATRIX – EVALUATION OF FAO INTERVENTIONS FUNDED BY THE CERF

January 2011

The following lays out the CERF Secretariat’s response to relevant recommendations contained in the report entitled “Evaluation of FAO Interventions Funded by the CERF” prepared by FAO’s Office of Evaluation. Rather than commenting on all recommendations, the matrix focuses on those addressed, directly or indirectly, to OCHA and/or the CERF Secretariat.

<p align="center">RECOMMENDATIONS (numbers refer to sequence in evaluation report)</p>	<p align="center">Response and Action taken or Planned</p>	<p align="center">Responsible Entity</p>	<p align="center">Time frame - Expected - Ongoing - Implemented - Not applicable</p>	<p align="center">Status - Implemented - Partially Implemented - Not Implemented - Not Applicable</p>
<p>4. A standardisation of CERF projects technical approaches 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.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>The CERF Secretariat welcomes the “standardization of CERF projects’ technical approaches” proposed in this recommendation. The availability of standardized project approaches would be beneficial to ensuring rapid finalization of project proposals in an acute emergency. The CERF Secretariat stands ready to work with FAO’s Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division to review potential standardized project approaches.</p>	<p>CERF, Programme Unit</p>	<p>Expected end of second quarter 2011</p>	<p>Not implemented</p>
<p>5. If confirmed by the 5-year evaluation of the CERF, seasonal delays in the approval of CERF projects, 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>Partially agreed</p> <p>We have reviewed our timeliness data for CERF-funded FAO projects and are unable to confirm the presence of “seasonal delays in the approval of CERF projects due to a large number of UFE projects” outlined in recommendation five. Throughout 2010, 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. Processing times were at times longer in the past, including during the summer of 2008 when the special \$100 million for the food crisis coincided with the under-funded window (this is the period covered by the FAO evaluation. However, the addition of staff in the CERF secretariat has significantly decreased such delays. The CERF Secretariat will continue to monitor timeliness to ensure prompt review, approval and disbursement of projects.</p>	<p>CERF, Programme Unit</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>N/A</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS (numbers refer to sequence in evaluation report)	Response and Action taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame - Expected - Ongoing - Implemented - Not applicable	Status - Implemented - Partially Implemented - Not Implemented - Not Applicable
<p>8. 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 “catch the next crop”. 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>Agreed</p> <p>The view of FAO’s Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division is that they should try to “catch the crop” whenever possible. The CERF Secretariat will work with FAO on whether or not to apply for CERF funds in cases where project inputs might not arrive in time for the planting season. We recognize the time-critical nature of projects in the agricultural sector in that activities are tied to planting seasons. The implementation of the six month rapid response window will assist FAO in this regard. The issue has already been taken up in the November 2010 annual consultations between the CERF Secretariat and FAO, and will be continued.</p>	<p>CERF, Programme Unit</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Not implemented</p>
<p>20. The life-saving criterion of the CERF should continue to be interpreted flexibly 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>Agreed</p> <p>The CERF Secretariat, in cooperation with global cluster leads, revised the guidelines on the life-saving criteria in 2009 to take advantage of lessons learned over the course of three years of preparing, reviewing and implementing CERF projects. The CERF Secretariat believes that the guidelines in their current form contain adequate flexibility to support a range of emergency agriculture and livelihoods projects. The CERF Secretariat will continue to monitor project submissions to assess the need for any future revision to the guidelines.</p>	<p>CERF, Programme Unit</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>22. The CERF Secretariat should amend the narrative report format 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>Partially agreed</p> <p>The CERF secretariat would be very interested in receiving this information from implementing agencies. However, making it a formal reporting requirement will depend on its applicability beyond classic, distribution-oriented projects as well as agencies’ ability to consistently provide this information. The CERF secretariat is also collecting part of</p>	<p>CERF, Reporting Unit</p>	<p>Second quarter 2011</p>	<p>Not Implemented</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS (numbers refer to sequence in evaluation report)	Response and Action taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame - Expected - Ongoing - Implemented - Not applicable	Status - Implemented - Partially Implemented - Not Implemented - Not Applicable
	this information through the Performance and Accountability Framework,			
24. Clusters and the UNCT should be required to systematically review CERF country narrative reports 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.	Agreed While it is the CERF Secretariat's understanding that narrative reports should already be reviewed by agencies and clusters in the manner described, this will be further encouraged.	CERF, Reporting Unit	Second Quarter 2011	N/A