

Format for Management Response to Recommendations - OSRO/LEB/701/UNJ and OSRO/LEB/702/UNJ								
Recommendations	Further donor funding required (yes or no)	Acceptance by Management			Comment on the Recommendation	Action to be taken		
		Accept	Partially Accept	Reject		Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Recommendation 1: Projects should be followed up with technical advice and backstopping services	yes	√			Projects 701 and 702 were given no-cost extension to 30 April to provide further advice and backstopping. However, further funding is required to provide sustainability to the horticulture and livestock programme initiated under phase I as it could only target minimal beneficiaries due to limited budget.	Projects 701 and 702 were extended to 30 April to follow up on the recommendations to provide technical support to beneficiaries. Project proposals have been developed to attract donor funding and the LRF has approved a \$2.5 million in Bekaa Valley.	Jan – Apr 09	TCES
Recommendation 2: For future projects, the introduction of cost recovery mechanisms should be considered. (For example, a passing on of goat kids to other eligible members)	yes	√			TCES agrees that a cost-recovery programme should be considered in future projects as it would extend assistance to a greater number of beneficiaries.	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.	Jan 09	TCES
Recommendation 3: Project documents, if aimed at initiating development processes need to be realistic and spell out the requirements for technical support and guidance	yes	√			TCES makes every effort to provide the necessary project support to its activities in the field. It is agreed that the proposals must be realistic and with obtainable goals in logical timeframe.	Take into consideration this recommendation in the preparation of future project proposals.	at preparation of pro doc	TCES with technical unit and technical officers
Recommendation 4: Particularly if a project document goes through a number of revisions and budget reductions, the final project document	yes	√			TCES agrees. For any major deviations from the original project document, a Note for File or a revised pro doc will be prepared in order to better document project activities on the ground.	Take into consideration this recommendation during project cycle and document changes or revise pro doc if necessary.	during project cycle	TCES

should be carefully reviewed to avoid flaws in the project logic.								
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.	yes	√			TCES agrees with this recommendation. For projects 701 and 702, an inception mission was arranged to review the current pro doc; however, changes made were reflected in the work plan and not in a revised pro doc.	Review project proposals at project inception and document any adjustments required	inception of new projects	TCES
Recommendation 6: 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.	yes		√		These PSC meetings were arranged to discuss various issues and were organized not by timeframe but by major issues to discuss. Prior to such meetings, any decisions on project activities are reviewed in close consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture and relevant counterparts and at the PSC, such decisions are formally approved.	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.	during project cycle	TCES