

## **Management response to the Final Evaluation of the RETESA Project**

### ***Overall response to the evaluation***

The project management team is highly satisfied with the project's evaluation process (mid-term review and final evaluation). The Project Coordination Unit (PCU) states that the mid-term revision, carried out in August 2016, was an excellent exercise that strongly supported the team and the project stakeholders to get a common understanding and better alignment with the project objectives and which gave precise recommendations that improved substantially the development of the project. For the project management team, the fact that the same evaluation expert (an independent international consultant) carried out both the Mid-term review and the Final Evaluation was very positive as this allowed to give continuity to the recommendations as well as to be more efficient in the use of time for the final evaluation (considering that the expert was already contextualized and familiar with the project).

Both exercises have been very helpful for the project management team. The project management team appreciated very much the professionalism of the consultant. The methodologies carried out by the consultant in the field and during the institutional assessment allowed the stakeholders to auto-assess the various indicators that were under evaluation, enabling them to learn and improve their role in the project. The fact that both exercises (Mid-term review and Final Evaluation) included the celebration of a National Steering Committee of the project was a very successful initiative that allowed stakeholders to participate in a common debate on the preliminary findings of the review/evaluation.

Regarding the report(s), the management teams are highly satisfied. The reports are clear and easy to read. It has to be considered that the reports need to be read (and understood) by stakeholders who are not always familiar with technical evaluation language. The reports of the Midterm review and final evaluation combine technical quality and rigour with an easy reading style.

Finally, regarding the conclusions and recommendations, the Management Team is also satisfied. The conclusions stated in the reports are realistic and in line with the preliminary findings that were presented by the expert in the national steering committees. The recommendations of the mid-term review were more easily accomplishable as they were defined to re-align and improve the implementation of the project, being the PCU the major stakeholder to implement the recommendations (those to be implemented by the PCU) and to monitor the recommendations indicated to be implemented by other stakeholders. For the Final evaluation, the situation is different, as the project is closed and the recommendations need to be implemented based on the commitments of the stakeholders. The Budget Holder (FAO Angola Office) and LTO are highly committed to lobby for the implementation of these recommendations, but in some cases the effective implementation of the recommendations will be the result of negotiation among donors, the government (different departments), other technical units within FAO, other partners... etc. However having these recommendations in the final evaluation report is already great support for the responsible units to lobby and to advocate for these recommendations to be actually implemented, which are considered by the management team not only pertinent but also necessary to assure higher impact and quality in future interventions.

### **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 (see Box 1) and include:

- The recommendation number and text copied from the evaluation report;
- Indication of whether the recommendation is accepted fully, partially, or rejected;
- 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;
- The responsible party or FAO unit for implementing the action/s;
- The time-frame for implementation and/or an implementation schedule, if required;
- Indication if further funding from FAO or a resource partner is required for implementing the recommendation.

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

Management response to the (Evaluation Title)	Date				
Evaluation Recommendation (a)	Management response (b) <b>Accepted,</b> <b>partially accepted or rejected</b>	Management plan	Responsible unit (d)	Timeframe (e)	Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)			
Insert title of section, if any					
Recommendation 1 – Immediate follow up and implementation of the strategy for the sustainability of project results (FAO).	Accepted	On March, 9 <sup>th</sup> 2018, the National Steering Committee of the project agreed on the strategy for the sustainability of project results (see Annex 1). This agreement means that each designated institution (represented in the steering committee) will implement the indicated recommendations. FAO Angola, as secretariat, will monitor the implementation of this recommendation.	FAO Angola for supervision, and each institution is responsible for their	1 year : FAO Angola should be perform an assessment of the recommendations given in the strategy for the sustainability of project results.	N

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

		<p>These recommendations were defined in order to assure the sustainability and persistence of various products in the field and their sustainability due to the fact that some of the outputs would have required much more time (due to the nature of the approaches and to the context) to be definitely appropriated by final beneficiaries and institutions.</p>	designated actions		
<p>Recommendation 2 – Future projects are designed and financed for longer duration (GEF).</p>	Accepted	<p>Based on the experience of project GCP/ANG/048/GFF two lessons learnt are being already considered in the projects that are in preparation with similar thematic areas: 1) the necessity to focus projects on limited outcomes and outputs, so that resources, time and energy can be concentrated in few interventions, increasing the impact of the project. When reduced the diversity of action, resources and time is more effectively applied to have more impact, and 2) the understanding that processes that need changes in behaviors, related to natural resource management, need more time.</p> <p>Besides having this recommendation in mind for future interventions, it is expected that it will be taken into consideration in the formulation of the following projects which preparation is expected to be concluded before the end of 2018: the GEF 6 LD (Sustainable Land management in selected landscapes in Angola), ICE-SLM (Integrating Climate Change into Environment and Sustainable Land Management Practices) and FRESAN (Fortalecimento da Resiliência e da Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional em Angola).</p> <p>The indicated responsible units are concerned and committed to lobby on considering longer time frames</p>	FAOAO, LTO and FLO	<p>Before December 2108 this recommendation is to be considered in the preparation of GEF 6 LD, ICE-SLM and FRESAN. Then, these project will have 3 and 4 years duration.</p> <p>Until July 2019 to be considered: in IFAD projects and GEF 7.</p>	N

		for future projects, but it might occur that the donors do not fully agree.			
Recommendation 3 – Invest in training and certification of national experts on the successful innovative methodologies ( <i>GEF and FAO</i> ).	Accepted	As for the previous recommendation, this one counts with the agreement of the indicated responsible units which are committed to include these aspects in new projects. FAO Angola is specifically committed to invest in training and certification of national experts on FRESAN and IFAD Projects.	FAOAO, LTO and FLO	For FRESAN Project this recommendation needs to be included before December 2018. For IFAD Projects before July 2019.	N
Recommendation 4 – Carry on realistic diagnostics and assessments of the institutional capacities during the designing and start up phases of the projects ( <i>GEF and FAO</i> )	Accepted	Angola FAO Office has agreed with the importance of this recommendation which is being implemented as it can be probed in the detailed Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA) carried out for the PPG GEF 6 LD or other projects as the ones financed by European Union (EU) and African Development Bank (ADB). As indicated for previous recommendations, it might happen that for future projects, donors might not agree on investing on diagnostics and assessments. However, the designated responsible units are committed to lobby for it and to suggest methodologies and tools to carry out diagnostics and assessments in a very efficient and effective way.	FAOAO, LTO and FLO	This recommendation is to be always considered, but to be more specific, before December 2108 this recommendation is to be considered in the preparation of GEF 6 LD, ICE-SLM and FRESAN. Until July 2019 it is to be considered in IFAD projects and GEF 7.	N
Recommendation 5 – Promote partnerships with national universities/research institutes to produce national and regional knowledge( <i>GEF e FAO</i> ).	Accepted	As for recommendation 3, the responsible units are committed to promote partnerships with universities and research institutes for the preparation of new projects as well as to foster these relationships in current interventions. Specific partnerships are to be included in project GEF 6 LD with the University Agostinho Neto, the University of	FAOAO, LTO and FLO	This recommendation is to be included in the GEF 6 LD Project (Universty Agostinho Neto, University of Agrarian Sciences and Institute of Agrarian	N

		Agrarian Sciences and the Institute of Agrarian and Veterinarian Research.		and Veterinarian Research) before the end of 2018.	
Recommendation 6 – Include formal education in the capacity building processes. (GEF e FAO)	Accepted	This recommendation is considered by the responsible units but it has to be precise that the inclusion of new approaches or methodologies informal education implies complex institutional and bureaucratic processes which, based on experiences in previous projects, take time . However, the responsible units are committed to engage to support this inclusion	FAOAO, LTO and FLO	This recommendation is to be included in the GEF 6 LD Project (University Agostinho Neto, University of Agrarian Sciences) before 2018 and in the future Land Governance project to be financed by the EU. Medium Agrarian institutes should be included in the project to develop or foster formal education in natural resources governance and family farming.	N

## ANNEX 1: Strategy for the sustainability of results

### Acordo para a sustentabilidade dos resultados do projecto (Comité de Pilotagem)

#### SUSTENTABILIDADE DOS RESULTADOS DO PROJECTO RETESA - CARTA DE CONSENSO DO COMITÉ PILOTAGEM -

Considerando o aproximar do término do projecto RETESA o Comité de Pilotagem, reunido na cidade de Moçamedes, Província do Namibe, no dia 09 de Março de 2018, entende oportuno recomendar às diferentes instituições parceiras as seguintes acções para maior garantia da sustentabilidade dos resultados do projecto:

#	Acordo Consenso	Descrição	Instituições
COMPONENTE 1 – PLANEAMENTO E GESTÃO DE ÁREAS DE PASTAGENS			
1	Análise do estado dos recursos naturais	As Administrações Municipais, com apoio do Ministério do Ambiente, continuarão a envidar esforços no sentido de introduzir nos diagnósticos municipais a análise do estado dos recursos naturais, em particular através da metodologia LADA (Exemplo do Município de Quilengues)	Administrações Municipais MINAMB
2	Planos de Desenvolvimento Territorial (GreenTD)	Os serviços municipais de agricultura e IDA/EDA, continuarão a acompanhar a implementação dos acordos / compromissos alcançados no âmbito dos planos de desenvolvimento territorial junto dos sobas e comunidades.  Propõe-se que os <u>municípios identifiquem 1 pessoa</u> que seja responsável por fazer este seguimento, integrando-o nos seus programas de trabalho.  Propõe-se ainda que as administrações sensibilizem os sobas para a integração da gestão dos planos nas agendas das suas reuniões periódicas.	Administrações Municipais IDA/EDA ISV
COMPONENTE 2 - REABILITAÇÃO DAS ÁREAS DE PASTAGENS ATRAVÉS DA MELHORIA DOS PASTOS E DAS MANADAS			
3	Poster localização geográfica ECAPs	Entregar lista e mapa de localização geográfica (GIS) elaborado pelo projecto aos diferentes actores (Administrações, IDA/EDA e ISV) em formato <i>poster</i> .	FAO/Equipa Projecto
4	"Cartão de Identificação de Membro-ECAP"	Entrega de cartão de identificação a cada membro das ECAP que estão funcionais para aumentar a auto-estima, garantir a motivação dos membros e institucionalizar o processo de mobilização iniciado	FAO/Equipa Projecto Administrações Municipais
5	"ECAPs-Modelo"	Cada município dar seguimento às ECAP-campeãs para manter como modelo/exemplo da aplicação da	Administrações Municipais

		metodologia no seu território visando a sua continuidade e/ou replicação através de projectos futuros no terreno.	IDA/EDA ISV
6	Valorizar as ECAP como prioridade para intervenção dos programas públicos	Considerar as ECAP como prioridade de intervenção para os programas públicos (nível central e provincial) da área agrícola, pecuária e ambiental e respectiva canalização de recursos (e.g. apoio à agricultura camponesa; campanhas agrícolas, campanhas de vacinação, crédito camponesa, saneamento/ambiente, sensibilização ambiental, ADECOS).	Governos Provinciais
7	Desconto 10% para membros ECAP	Avaliar a possibilidade de oferecer desconto 10%-20% na compra de equipamentos, sementes e insumos aos membros das ECAP identificados com o "Cartão-Membro ECAP".	IDA/EDA
8	Currículos dos cursos de tratadores de animais	Incorporar nos currículos dos cursos de tratadores de gado a questão da etnoveterinária e capacidades para a produção e aproveitamento dos pastos visando a produção de forragens e introdução de espécies forrageiras.	ISV
9	Etnoveterinária – Ensino & Investigação	ISCED incluir temática nas disciplinas oferecidas no ensino superior e continuar investigação & desenvolvimento.	ISCED
10	Produção de mudas de espécies forrageiras	Continuar a produção de mudas de forrageiras (Leucena, Moringa, Mué, etc.)	Estações Zootécnicas de Caracula e Cacanda

Moçamedes, Província do Namibe  
09 de Março de 2018