

Follow-up Reporting

Reporting on Follow-up Action to Management Response, OSRO/LEB/701/UNJ and OSRO/LEB/702/UNJ				
Recommendations	Action Agreed	Action Taken?		Comment/explanation
<p>Recommendation 1:</p> <p>Projects should be followed up with technical advice and backstopping services</p>	<p>Projects 701 and 702 were extended to 30 April 2009 to follow up on the recommendations to provide technical support to beneficiaries.</p> <p>Project proposals have been developed to attract donor funding and the LRF has approved a \$2.5 million in Bekaa Valley.</p>	Yes	X	<p>The no-cost extension did provide six-months of intensive training and extension to farmers through backstopping missions from AGAS and support from Ministry of Agriculture staff. FAO also hired external trainers to assist in the training of farmers.</p> <p>Although the Evaluation Report highlighted engaging services from NGOs and other institutions for training, the budget available was too limited to engage in such services agreements. Therefore, FAO worked with its own existing resources and the cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and local experts.</p> <p>The Lebanon Recovery Fund did not provide further funding for south Lebanon and focused its efforts in other parts of the country which have been neglected stating that the South received recovery assistance. Therefore, FAO was unable to continue directly working in the area however, through its contacts at the Ministry of Agriculture, FAO has information that veterinary services reach farmers assisted through livestock distribution programme as the Veterinarian is the former national consultant of the livestock project. The installed greenhouses are considered model-greenhouses in all Lebanon. This design was used to make the greenhouses under a Joint FAO-UNDP project in north Lebanon to assist surrounding communities of the Naher El Bared Palestinian Camp in September 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2:</p> <p>For future projects, the introduction of cost recovery mechanisms should be considered.</p>	<p>Project proposals have been developed to attract donor funding. PAG meeting to be held on 13 January 09 and FAO has also submitted proposals through LRF.</p>	Yes	X	<p>A cost-recovery programme was discussed with the Government of Lebanon and for projects under the LRF, however, this mechanism was not considered appropriate for the objectives under LRF recovery programmes.</p> <p>For FAO's approved project under Phase II of the LRF,</p>

(For example, a passing on of goat kids to other eligible members)		However, the LRF decided to not approve further funding for south Lebanon and concentrate funding in other neglected areas of the country, particularly the Bekaa Valley where FAO received funding. FAO also received funding through Joint UN Programmes with UNRWA and UNDP.		OSRO/LEB/901/UNJ – activities were planned to service the community of dairy farmers as a whole in the Bekaa Valley. The rehabilitation of a milk collection centre benefits all farmers providing a marketing outlet for their dairy products. The inputs provided by FAO as well as extensive training throughout the whole project with expert national consultants hired as trainers as well as a thorough training of trainers programme for MoA staff.
Recommendation 3: Project documents, if aimed at initiating development processes need to be realistic and spell out the requirements for technical support and guidance	Take into consideration this recommendation in the preparation of future project proposals.	Yes X At the preparation of prodoc. The three projects currently being implemented were developed using a needs based analysis and a baseline survey was conducted to ensure the project activities were in line with beneficiary needs.	No	This lesson learned has been applied in the following project opened in Lebanon (OSRO/LEB/901-902/UNJ and LEB/10/001/01/34. Activities were designed in collaboration with the Ministry and focus group discussions with farmers to target appropriate interventions.
Recommendation 4: Particularly if a project document goes through a number of revisions and budget reductions, the final project document should be carefully reviewed to avoid flaws in the project logic.	Take into consideration this recommendation during project cycle and document changes or revise pro doc if necessary.	Yes X During project cycle. The Pro Doc for OSRO/LEB/901/UNJ has been reformulated and endorsed by the Minister of Agriculture. The contribution of the Ministry have been included under this project in a separate Memorandum of Understanding	No	Project OSRO/LEB/902/UNJ had a section on livestock distribution which was removed in order to benefit at large the community through rehabilitation of the dairy collection centre. The Pro Doc was revised and the new version endorsed at a Project Steering Committee Meeting by the Minister of Agriculture
Recommendation 5: Future project proposals could benefit from having a mandatory review of the project document shortly after project inception, to account for any changes in the project environment as well as to correct evident inconsistencies in the project document.	Review project proposals at project inception and document any adjustments required.	Yes X Inception of new projects. The new projects were reviewed as follows: 1) OSRO/LEB/901/UNJ: Updated needs assessment carried out at project inception and revised activities proposed at the first Project Steering Committee Meeting. Revisions were endorsed by the Minister of Agriculture. The new activities carried out under the unilateral funding from the Ministry are outlined in a Mutual Agreement between FAO and	No	As stated above regarding project OSRO/LEB/901/UNJ, once the projects was approved by the LRF, and prior to beginning implementation, all activities were reviewed to ensure appropriateness. At this stage, changes were made in collaboration with the Ministry. This project is now seen as a success story and the Ministry decided to invest its own funds to FAO to expand training activities to farmers and Ministry staff. The MoA contributed a further USD430 000 to FAO.

		<p>MoA.</p> <p>2) OSRO/LEB/902/UNR First activity under this project was to carry out a needs assessment with UNRWA and prepared a list of activities and agriculture inputs which were procured and delivered by UNRWA.</p> <p>3) LEB/10/001/01/34 In collaboration with UNDP, a baseline study was undertaken at project inception and all activities were planned in accordance to the needs assessment.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 6:</p> <p>For a project of short duration, a quarterly frequency of meetings may not be the most appropriate. A more flexible schedule to coincide with major decision points (in this case, about dropping certain project components, adjusting the time frame, etc) would be more suitable.</p>	<p>During project cycle, develop a project committee meeting as most appropriate to maximize the presence of members to pass any decisions in regards to project activities.</p>	<p>Yes X</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>TCES has been carrying out its PSC meetings when major decision points are needed to be discussed so the PSC timing has become flexible.</p>