

UK Department for International Development (DFID) - UK Aid

Abercrombie House, Eaglesham Road
East Kilbride, Glasgow G75 8EA
United Kingdom

15/10/2012

OUR REF.:
12/9654 - 30 / thqv

DFID PPA Independent Progress Review/Mid-term Evaluation & Management Response

Dear Madam/Sir,

We are pleased to submit the Norwegian Refugee Council's (NRC) Interim Progress Review (IPR) of the DFID funded CHASE PPA, together with our Management Response. The IPR was conducted by TFM Consult, a Dutch based consulting team, and the field visits were conducted between April and June 2012.

NRC is satisfied with the overall findings of the evaluation team – indicating that our programmes are innovative, well targeted and meeting real needs of vulnerable people. In addition, we largely accept the constructive and helpful criticism of the programmes and systems in place and are confident that the IPR will assist us in re-aligning our actions to enhance overall performance by the end of the DFID PPA grant.

We would like to highlight the following main points in response to the evaluation:

1. The **positive aspects of the report** that NRC would like to highlight are as follows: i. We are achieving our programme milestones and progressing towards our intended outcomes, and have already realised certain impacts as a result of the programme activities. ii. The IPR highlights that NRC's work is relevant, effective and efficient. iii. A number of multiplier effects have been identified, e.g. stimulating other humanitarian actors to replicating the quality of our work or to work in more remote areas. iv. The programme combines humanitarian field activities with advocacy efforts, thus addressing needs at different levels. v. NRC's approach to humanitarian assistance is unmistakably geared at making people more self reliant and to increase their self esteem and dignity.

2. Many of the **perceived shortcomings** of the IPR were in the project design. We accept many of the IPR's recommendations, including for example developing cascaded logframes with SMART country level indicators linked to an evidence based assessment of the overall PPA outcomes and outputs. The organisation has already taken on board many of the recommendations contained in the IPR and has developed clear, strategic and timely plans to respond to the remaining recommendations.
3. The IPR process has been an **valuable learning experience** for the organisation, both in terms of the findings of the IPR and the process itself. As you will see in the enclosed Management Response, the IPR has been taken very seriously by the organisation as a whole, with extensive participation from staff on all levels.
4. Longer term untied money is essential for NGOs to develop more effective strategic responses and we are already seeing the **added value of this approach** for the organisation, for example, including a causal link between the longer term and flexible nature of the funding and NRC's overall organisational efficiency and enhanced performance at the country level.
5. NRC recognises the tremendous effort of the evaluation team to review a broad scope of programming across a wide range of countries, against complex objectives. However, we would like to take this opportunity to highlight **challenges presented by the Coffey Evaluation Strategy and issues in the methodological and analytical approach of the evaluation team** (which are further elaborated in the annex entitled 'The Perceived Utility of the Evaluation):

I Coffey Evaluation Strategy

- a The evaluation strategy followed a scope and methodology better suited for a final evaluation of a unified development programme rather than a mid term evaluation of a humanitarian framework agreement. As NRC is a humanitarian agency utilizing the PPA CHASE funds within a framework model and our projects are mid way in implementation, **the strategy's methodology was difficult to adapt** in a manner that would address the most relevant areas of learning.
- b The evaluation strategy was received late into the start of implementation, preventing NRC from integrating the data needs of the strategy methodology into our projects' regular monitoring activities, which follow a **contribution measurement** on results through indicator tracking. Thus, all the data required for the strategy methodology were not available for this evaluation, e.g. cost effectiveness analysis and additionality, which require **counterfactual measures on outcomes**.

II TFM methodology and analysis

- a In part resulting from the scope and methodology of the Coffey evaluation strategy, the evaluation team's approach to assessing the framework was more relevant for longer term development programs. As a result, some conclusions and recommendations are **inappropriate for NRC and the particular CHASE component** of the PPA funding mechanism.
- b As recognized by the evaluation team in the main report, security and logistical constraints in DRC and Myanmar prevented the team from implementing a robust household survey. While the adapted,

largely qualitative methodology was acceptable within these constraints, **a clear presentation and analysis of the data is lacking** in the report. Thus, the process between identifying the findings and providing the conclusions appears to be based primarily on the opinions and subjective interpretations of the evaluation team, rather than on an objective and replicable analytical method.

- c The broad scope of the evaluation criteria coupled with the framework structure of NRC's use of PPA CHASE funding made it difficult for the evaluation team to dedicate enough time to assessing the management aspect of the Value for Money question. Analysis linking the management and measurement approaches' findings is thus weak and reduces learning from the cost variance assessment and peer comparisons.
- d In terms of the advocacy work of NRC, which is a central component of the PPA, we consider that the evaluation team did not assess the Advocacy and Information Department's (AID) work in sufficient depth to warrant some of the conclusions made in the report.

NRC would also like to take this opportunity to thank DFID for their continued support through the CHASE PPA. We look forward to working together throughout the remaining period of the grant to ensure that we deliver the highest quality results for our beneficiaries.

We look forward to receiving your feedback on NRC's IPR and the Management Response.

Best regards

Toril Brekke
Director, NRC International Programme
Department

Annex A: The Perceived Utility of the Independent Progress Review

How it was useful:

1. The IPR has helped NRC to identify where we are **performing** well and where we need to **make changes** or to improve our performance in the future (at both the programme and organisational level). As you will see from the level of detail contained in the head office and country level management response, NRC has identified many actions in response to the recommendation of the report.
2. Below, you will find a brief example of how the findings of the evaluation are already strengthening NRC's advocacy work:

Utility Case Study: Research on Colombian refugee women's HLP rights

The Advocacy and Information Department's (AID) within Oslo and the Colombia country office is already using DFID PPA funding to build on the findings of the DFID evaluation of the Colombia programme. The IPR highlighted that the assistance and training elements of the Colombia programme are powerful tools which could increase evidence-based advocacy to build on the programme strengths. The IPR also recommended the development of gender aspects of the programme. Based on these findings and the overall positive outcome of the evaluation, it was decided to use DFID HLP advocacy funding to further complement this programme by supporting research on two aspects of Colombian refugee women's HLP rights, which will enable an advocacy response at the national / regional and international level:

- The situation of refugee women for potential property restitution in Colombia
- DFID PPA funding will cover the research for Colombian women refugees and PNIP

3. The IPR has helped NRC to identified key areas of **additionality** for the DFID PPA.
4. The process of managing the IPR has been an excellent learning opportunity for the organisation.

How we could make it more useful in the future:

Norwegian Refugee Council:

NRC will have an internal review of our management of the evaluation and the management response within the coming weeks. We will forward any relevant feedback to DFID. However, as initial feedback, the scope chosen for this mid-term IPR was very vast and complex. As a consequence, the IPR was a very lengthy process for everybody involved (with discussions starting in February and running through to October 2012). This level of involvement from staff both in the field and at Head Office has been extensive and has demanded an unproportional amount of time for the benefits achieved. NRC will look into how to better focus the scope when facing complex and multidimensional evaluations in the future (including for the final DFID PPA evaluation).

Coffey's Evaluation Strategy:

1. The evaluation strategy/methodology developed by Coffey does not appear to be sufficiently adapted to humanitarian action. The impression is that the Evaluation Strategy has been designed mainly from a development perspective. While many of the requirements around Value for Money, Cost Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness obviously are useful to strengthen humanitarian action, little guidance is given with regards to how to concretely respond to and comply with these requirements in a humanitarian context.

2. There were a number of methodological challenges related to the evaluation strategy and criteria. Firstly, NRC received the evaluation strategy well into the implementation phase of the PPA, which meant that we had not built the data collection processes necessary to respond to the evaluation criteria. The VfM measurement/management approaches outlined in the evaluation were also complex, heavily time consuming and new to the organisation. Finally, the evaluation report structure was received (with additional lines of enquiry) after NRC had developed the TOR for the evaluation, the TFM Consult team had already completed the field work, and submitted the first draft report. As a consequence, it was agreed with DFID to submit a report in a format different to the template supplied, while making sure that the report as far as possible covers the same ground as that set out in the template and with the same amount of detail.
3. The IPR is structured more as a final evaluation rather than a mid term evaluation. In NRC's experience, a mid term evaluation would focus the methodology and criteria for assessment more on implementation, standards, constraints, adjustments and progress towards final outcomes, rather than on outcomes themselves. If DFID wants to assess the added value of their work, a mid term evaluation should look at an organisation's response to changes in context and their ability to be flexible and change course in response to beneficiary needs and emerging humanitarian issues.
4. Given the broad scope of the evaluation criteria, applying Coffey evaluation strategy to a framework of projects was very challenging. The evaluation strategy appears to be better suited to a programme (see also point 2 above).
5. As we are only part way through the implementation period (and the project was initially delayed due to a delay with the contract with DFID) – the outcomes cannot be fully measured yet. In particular, this has an impact on how we assess 'value' for money (when the 'value' aspect is not fully realised at this point in the programme). As stated in the IPR, many of the activities were only eight to ten months into the actual implementation period, when the field visits took place. This has limited the ability to analyse our activities at the outcome level.

TFM Methodology:

1. In some of their analysis, the evaluation team's approach was more relevant for development rather than humanitarian agencies, rendering some of their findings inappropriate for NRC. NRC is first and foremost a humanitarian organisation and the PPA is under CHASE. While continuing to improve the bridging towards promoting self-reliance and durable solutions from the initial intervention, NRC does not hold that capacity building, local partnerships and sustainability are foremost concerns of programming in all contexts. Thus, our responses to some of the recommendations in the attached management response template aim to address the planning and partnership concerns, but within the context of humanitarian aid and the need for flexibility, responsiveness and targeted action in a dynamic environment.
2. Due to access constraints in the field, the evaluation team was not able to conduct a full survey – thus most of the analysis for DAC criteria and additionality is qualitative, e.g. stakeholder analysis for the DAC criteria using focus groups with Beneficiares, IPs, stakeholders and NRC staff, document review. While the methodology is acceptable within the constraints, it is not clear how the evaluation team analyzed the data in order to categorize the stakeholder rankings nor how the stakeholder ratings were analysed with other sources of information (e.g. triangulation) in order to make the final conclusions. Additionally, the data were not presented in a manner that would allow for an objective presentation of the information, even if the analysis and interpretation followed a more subjective process. Thus, the analytical process appears to be opinion driven rather than based on an objective and replicable method.

3. The approach to assessing the Global Advocacy activities was revised so that they would be evaluated ***'not separately as described in the Terms of Reference, but in conjunction with similar activities of IDMC and the country programmes.'*** We consider that TFM Consult's chosen methodology to this revised approach did not facilitate a review of AID's work in sufficient depth to be able to draw some of the conclusions that are mentioned in the report. As TFM Consult state within the report: this *'reduced the evaluation of these focus areas in practice to a rather **superficial encounter** instead of an in-depth analysis of their functioning and delivery of results'.*

NRC Management Response to Evaluations

Evaluation: DFID Mid Term Evaluation of PPA Chase funding

Department or Country Program: NRC Head Office, IDMC, Colombia,

Date of Management Response:

Manager/Management Response Focal Point: Donor Support Section (DSS), International Programme Department (IPD)

Person(s) responsible for ensuring execution of the action plan: IPD Management

Rec. no	Recommendation	Actions <i>What/Who</i>	Follow up <i>What/Who</i>	Timeframe/ Planning Opportunity	Notes/ Comment
Programme design					
<p>ES¹ rec. # 1 & page 33</p> <p>Section 3, page 22, 1st bullet</p>	<p>Produce and/or update country specific logframe matrices with SMARTly formulated outcome indicators and revise the overall Programme logframe (to measure and monitor more appropriately progress of planned change during and at the end of the Programme)</p> <p>Focus implementation and monitoring on SMART outcome indicators, by producing and/or updating country specific logframe matrices, with specific milestones to measure and monitor progress of planned change during and at the end of the Programme</p>	<p>Development of country level (sub-) log frames, with strong linkage with the overall PPA log frame. Particular focus on ensuring coherence on Outcome level.</p> <p>NRC will continue to improve indicator formulations, with focus on Outcome level.</p> <p>A revision of CAD will contribute to improved indicator formulation.</p> <p>Develop a system for monitoring and evaluating the impact of NRC's advocacy initiatives.</p> <p>NRC will continue to enforce staff capacity and skills with regards to the logframe approach (LFA) and Project Cycle Management, as well as design individual training packages for new staff.</p>	<p>DSS/COs</p> <p>SMS/TSS</p> <p>SMS</p> <p>AID</p> <p>IPD</p>	<p>Autumn 2012</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Launched Sept. 2012</p> <p>Q4 2012</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>NRC has identified the need to improve outcome monitoring globally as a strategic priority for 2012 and 2013. The core performance indicators used for reporting in the Core Activity Database (CAD) are currently being reviewed and will be revised on both outcome and output level. In addition, NRC has established an M&E working group and strategy project which will address current weaknesses in our project monitoring and performance measurement at the outcome level. A set of guidelines that will encompass indicator formulation and methodology for outcome measurement will be available in 2013, along with the set of revised core performance indicators required for CAD reporting.</p>

¹ Executive Summary

<p>ES rec. # 2 & page 33</p>	<p>Improve the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues such as gender, connectedness and environmental issues in the existing or future programme designs (in paying specific attention to the various issues, specifying targets and using appropriate analysis tools)</p>	<p>A plan of action for the continued improvement of gender sensitive programme design and implementation is under development and will continue over the next years. See also below.</p>	<p>Gender Adviser</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>NRC is expanding the capacity in cross cutting issues (new advisors envisioned in Gender, GBV, environment, youth and urban) and working on moving from a broad policy mainstreaming approach to a direct programme support approach as a means to change the way we programme based on the most relevant cross cutting issues in context.</p>
<p>Implementation</p>					
<p>ES rec. # 3 & page 33</p> <p>Section 3, page 22, 2nd bullet</p> <p>Section 3, page 22, 3rd bullet</p>	<p>Improve the relationship with IPs with long-term contracts and capacity building efforts to enhance their organizational, managerial and technical capacities</p> <p>Build a more equal relationship with IPs and promote a real partnership by offering them longer contractual prospects; by involving them into the reorientation of the country programmes; by sharing the same key management tools; by giving them a saying into planning and implementation processes; by encouraging to join in decision making with the participation of direct beneficiaries.</p> <p>By using NRC's experience and technical expertise, assist IPs into the enhancement of their organizational, managerial</p>	<p>NRC has over the years collected a lot of practical knowledge on partnership arrangements across Core Competencies. Recognizing the need to ensure stronger partnership models and based on feedback from the field for clear guidance and support in working with partners, NRC proposes to focus on this area during the next three years (with Norad funding), initially through education and ICLA programmes in selected transition countries. NRC plans to develop stronger partnership models and shared implementation methods, with the hopes that this will serve as a model of excellence for NRC global programmes in the future.</p> <p>Within NRC's partnership guidelines, it is noted that the nature and scope of partnership will always depend on the local and national context in which NRC is working. As result, the main actions for this recommendation are generated at the country level and have been addressed within the country level reports (annexed).</p>	<p>IPD</p> <p>IPD</p>	<p>Over 3 years, starting in 2013</p>	<p>NRC is not a partners based organisation and, as a humanitarian organisation, NRC has traditionally been implementing its programmes directly. However, NRC recognises the fundamental principles for partnerships as agreed upon by the international community (Paris/Accra/ Busan/Istanbul Principles) and their importance for building local resilience and ownership in response to complex and frequent humanitarian crisis. NRC has developed partnership guidelines and works in close cooperation with local partners, (including individuals, informal groups, government and non governmental institutions) in all its areas of work, particularly in the fields of education and ICLA.</p> <p>According to NRC's partnership guidelines, partnerships with national NGOs shall always be built on active dialogue, mutual trust, openness, commitment, and respect for each</p>

	and technical capacities. Increase, intensify and improve training activities as “means” to achieve the Programme purpose	Other initiatives include AID campaign in which NRC will support local partners to develop expertise and capacity in supporting displaced women’s HLP rights. See also Management Reponses from country programmes in attachment.	AID	Over 3 years, starting in 2013	other’s autonomy. We recognise the need to develop a more engaged and supportive programming agenda (in light of broader commitments by the organisation to enhance beneficiary participation, accountability and quality of work).
ES rec. # 4 & page 33 Section 3, page 22, 2 nd bullet	Strengthen coordination mechanisms with UNHCR through joint work plans Develop the alliance established with UNHCR by strengthening coordination mechanisms through the elaboration of joint work plans wherever found appropriate	See Management Reponses from country programmes in attachment	All relevant COs+IDMC		Programme cooperation with UNHCR is most frequently taking place locally in relevant programme countries. Consequently, the coordination will also be strengthened locally. However, this approach may sometimes be challenging and not always relevant.
ES rec. # 5 & page 33 Section 3, page 22, 4 th bullet	Engage in multi-year planning and programming increasing cost efficiency and cost-effectiveness and more durable partnerships NRC should more consistently take advantage of the opportunity that DFID funding represents by engaging in long(er)-term planning and programming thereby increasing cost efficiency and costeffectiveness and more durable partnerships	Further enforce multi-year planning and programming, e.g. through prepositioning of material goods. The purpose of such prepositioning would be to reduce logistical and climatic (e.g. rain season) risks; obtaining lower bulk price; and ultimately to more rapidly starting implementation the following year.	COs (IPD/DSS)	Ongoing	Some of the country programmes in the NRC PPA agreement have already engaged in multi year planning and programming (e.g. through large bulk purchase at an early stage), but NRC recognise that there is still room for improvement. This will however depend on the context and will be analysed and decided upon case by case, when applicable and realistic. Note: prepositioning would be limited to procurement/contracting for project within the PPA only, as most other donors’ procurement regulation does not allow pre-positioning, or committing funds in advance of project implementation periods. For donors with which NRC has multiyear agreements, such as Sida and NMFA,

		<p>and includes six country offices in its research and follow-up plans.</p> <p>Joint AID-IPD initiative on HLP challenges in shelter programming has already undertaken visits and made recommendations to four country offices and will consult with at least a further five country offices.</p> <p>Joint Country Office/IPD-AID efforts on protection of IDPs and navigating dilemmas when negotiating access feeding into internal reviews and policy as well as advocacy activities at the country and global level.</p> <p>Joint Country Office/IPD-AID efforts on access to protection for IDPs, enhancing the protective impact of humanitarian action and the role of humanitarians in comprehensive protection strategies.</p>	<p>AID/IPD</p> <p>COs/AID/IPD</p> <p>AID/IPD-CO</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>This will feed into internal reviews and policy as well as advocacy activities in the field and at the global level. DFID funds are used in combination with funds from the NMFA.</p>
Value for money					
<p>ES rec. # 9/ & page 33 Section 5, page 31, 1st and 2nd bullet</p>	<p>Conduct regular comparisons of unit costs of selected activities with peer programmes and monitor actual unit costs vis-à-vis budgeted unit costs</p>	<p>NRC is working on an internal unit cost analysis system, that will focus on key cost drivers and look at the unit cost variance within each country. Comparisons between countries will also be made when numbers are comparable for overall structural cost-efficiency analysis. A significant variance from the 'norm' will require justification.</p> <p>NRC budgets and log frames will include a budget breakdown per output for all new projects starting in 2013.</p>	<p>FAD, SMS</p> <p>IPD/FAD (DSS)</p>	<p>Q4 2012</p>	<p>NRC's Financial Management System has been updated to include an outcome dimension, as well as an activity dimension. These dimensions are linked to a new categorisation of programmes and this will also drive the reform of our global monitoring system creating direct links between financial and operational reporting. As this dimension will be applied to both budget items and expenditures, it will facilitate the internal unit cost analysis, by providing a filter to compare actual</p>

					vs. budgeted unit costs across COs for any given activity. Ref. ES rec. # 15 below.
ES rec. # 10 & page 33	Explore the rationale for the differences in cost efficiency compared to other peer organisations and further explore the Value for Money of NRC's programmes in analysing their (cost-)effectiveness	As noted under ES rec. #15 for more information on how NRC plans to further investigate the value for money of its programming.			As suggested in the recommendation, the evaluation was unable to address explanatory causes for major cost drivers and areas for improvement in its value for money. In each of the country sections the evaluators simply used Budget vs Actual (tables) with comments that the Controllers had prepared re-written in a more narrative way. No conclusions/recommendations were made. Although the evaluators calculated the cost per beneficiary as part of the cost efficiency measurement, the management approach of the value for money assessment was limited in its connexion to the cost efficiency component, reducing our ability to understand how our cost efficiency affects the value of the services we provide.
ES rec. # 11 & page 33 Section 5, page 31, 3 rd bullet	Establish mechanisms and/or develop incentives to encourage country programmes to improve the cost-efficiency of their programmes	The updated financial management system, with reports and analysis facilitated by the controllers, shall contribute to enhanced awareness and encourage country programs to improve cost efficiency. Cost efficiency measurements will also be built into the management system planned as a part of an ongoing roles and responsibility project.	FAD SMS	Achieved 2013	

ES rec. # 12 & page 33 Section 5, page 31, 4 th & 6 th bullet	Enforce budget discipline, cost-efficiency awareness and discipline in applying financial and logistic rules and regulations	Budget breakdown per output (incl. in the logframe) is expected to strengthen the link between programme and finance, both at country and HQ level.	FAD/ IPD (DSS)	Ongoing	NRC continuously strives to comply fully with the financial and logistics rules and regulations of all our donors. NRC's internal handbooks take into account the rules and regulations of these respective donors, to the extent applicable and relevant to all programs/country programs. Rules and regulations specific to any given donor are clearly stipulated in NRC's Donor Fact Sheets, available to all staff on our intranet. Controllers regularly visit every country program, and external audits are carried out in every country office on an annual basis. The updated and enhanced financial management system should contribute to address this concern and contribute to improved cost efficiency awareness.
		Involvement of Finance staff in planning and definition phases applies to controllers at HO as well as Finance Managers/Coordinators at Country and Field office levels. It also applies to logistics and in particular key procurement staff. The mentioned staff should equally be involved in the annual strategy process.	COs	Ongoing	
		NRC is also piloting usage of LEAN methodology as an approach in DRC (see below) to creating efficient processes with increased flow and reduced waste. The pilot is showing encouraging results.	DRC/SMS	Ongoing	
ES rec. # 13 & page 33 Section 3, page 22, 6 th bullet Section 5, page 31, 5 th bullet	Enhance and streamline the reporting (and documentation) systems and the feeding-back of lessons-learnt into the organisation	An enhanced and streamlined data collection and reporting system at the project level will be developed in the M&E Framework Project	SMS/TSS	2013	Pooling of funds is complicated due to donors' different financial years, implementation periods, as well as procurement and finance rules and regulations. Major donors have developed comprehensive reporting systems, and will not easily be requested to allow collective reporting, e.g. ECHO and BPRM.
General					
ES rec. # 14 & page 33	Reduce the number of countries and sectors involved in the Programme and consider even to abandon the effecting of such an overall Programme, whenever an extension of the current Programme is foreseen;	No action required; please see comment.			NRC proposed a large number of programmes and activities over a broad range of countries in order to introduce DFID to the scope of NRCs work. The funding volume of this PPA was only given after the log frame was produced. When a budget was finally ascribed NRC

	Separate and independent funding to existing country or global programmes might be more appropriate and less complicated to execute				<p>was given the chance to revise the log frame. However, for strategic reasons it was decided to keep all countries/programmes within the PPA despite the wide spread of activities and relatively small volume per activity (in order to introduce DFID to NRC's scope of work). In the final design phase, Coffey International did not indicate that this decision was contradictory to DFID's aims and objectives for this PPA.</p> <p>The overall PPA logframe was revised in the spring 2012 and the suggested changes were approved by DFID in August. As a result of this revision, and given that the PPA is already halfway, no major changes will be made to the overall PPA logframe within the current PPA agreement. NRC will however strengthen the various components through joint work plans across relevant sectors and improved linkage between outputs and outcomes.</p>
ES rec. # 15 & page 33	Develop management and monitoring systems that are more outcome oriented / result-based instead of output-based. Combine these efforts with results-based budgeting.	<p>Work on this is included in the Proposal Process (LEAN) pilot currently being conducted in DRC as part of the Roles and Responsibility project. Implementation of this is planned in 2013 for the 5 largest NRC programmes.</p> <p>NRC budgets and log frames will include a budget breakdown per output for all new projects starting in 2013</p> <p>Develop a management system that will</p>	<p>SMS</p> <p>IPD/FAD (DSS)</p> <p>SMS</p>	<p>2013</p> <p>Q4 2012</p> <p>2013</p>	<p>NRC is currently developing a strategy for improved outcome monitoring as part of a larger initiative to improve results based management. This is described in greater detail above.</p>

		<p>focus on management information within three areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Operational capacity - Process quality - Results and cost-efficiency <p>To improve NRC's results-based budgeting, the Financial Management System, Agresso, has been updated to include an output dimension. The updated system is currently being rolled out to all NRC Country Offices. As of 2013 every budget line and every expenditure will be recorded against relevant outputs to facilitate reporting and monitoring against project outputs.</p>	FAD	Q1 2013	
ES rec. # 16 & page 33	Put comparable programmes under one umbrella (logframe) programme and persuade donors to allow for collective financial and narrative reporting.	No action required; please see comment.			This is somewhat contradictory to the recommendation of a cascaded sub framework/log frame for each country. Also it is going to be very difficult (impossible) in the current NRC setup to merge budgets and log frames of the same core competence (e.g. Shelter) in several countries (eg. Myanmar, Somalia and OPT). Each core competence has a separate project manager in country who is in charge of his/her budget. A merge would make actual budget management, and consequently also project management, more complicated, with a dispersal of responsibility. NRC will, however, establish sub-log frames on Country level during the autumn 2012 (see above).

B. If you disagree with a recommendation or feel that a recommendation is not a priority for this action plan, please explain:

Please refer to Annex A: The Perceived Utility of the Independent Progress Review

C. If you agree with a recommendation, but think action is unnecessary, please explain:

Other important findings in the Executive Summary

Reference in report	Finding	Actions <i>What/Who</i>	Follow up <i>What/Who</i>	Timeframe / Planning Opportunity	Notes/ Comment
<i>Project structure, design and synergies</i>					
ES page 9, §3	Indicators are not measurable vs. imprecise: "NRC is reaching its Programme milestones, but progress towards programme outputs is difficult to assess as output indicators are not objectively measurable or precisely formulated"	See comments above under ES #1, related to the development country level (sub-) log frames and to the CAD revision.			
ES page 8, final § (Findings)	"...utilisation of generic needs assessments for the overall Programme instead of country/location specific problem definitions and needs assessments makes the Programme not sufficiently specific"	The development of emergency and post emergency needs assessment tools is a priority for 2013 and is being done in collaboration with the ACAPs programme (NRC is a member fo ACAPS).	TSS	2013	The above mentioned lean pilot in DRC is also investigating methods for continous needs assessment and knowledge management.
ES page 9, §6 (Cross-cutting issues)	Lack of an exit strategy: "The programme design does not contain an exit strategy nor is the potential synergy of cooperating with the private sector explicitly explored."	Raise in annual plans/progress reports for year 2 and 3 under the DFID PPA where relevant	Country Director (DRC)	Ongoing	All country programmes and projects do have exit strategies (NRC has an exit handbook in place), but there is no exit strategy designed specifically for the framework as it is not relevant (DFID is only partially financing country offices which have their own exit strategy when feasible and needed).

ES page 9, - §4	“Mitigation of unplanned negative side effects is not yet in place.”	Raise in annual plans/reports for year 2 and 3 under the DFID PPA	Country Director (Myanmar)	Ongoing	As noted in the report, a thorough analysis of risks to the programme has been conducted in relation to mitigating unplanned negative side effects. Following this, the implementation of a do no harm analysis on all COs as part of the CO strategy process might be useful.
ES page 9, §4	“Gender mainstreaming was not sufficiently incorporated into the programme design nor during implementation phase.”	A plan of action for the continued improvement of gender sensitive programme design and implementation is under development and will continue over the next years. It is important to note that this is a long-term process, which needs sustained efforts to succeed.	Gender Adviser	Ongoing	NRC generally agrees with this comment, although a number of efforts are currently being made in several countries to improve gender mainstreaming of programmes. The report points out some valuable examples of NRC going in the right direction (particularly in Colombia). It is worth noting that NRC’s gender mainstreaming strategy seeks to ensure that the different needs of women, girls, men and boys are taken into consideration consistently within the line of our programmes, rather than working towards long-term cultural/attitudinal change in society. This is due to the humanitarian nature of NRC’s work, which often has a shorter time-frame.
Partnerships and Coordination with other Agencies					
ES page 9, §2	Coordination with peer agencies in the field (e.g. we are perceived as being a lone actor), “NRC is [...] more operating in isolation, making its role less effective in advocacy.”	NRC will continue its efforts working in partnerships and with local authorities, as well as in coordination structures such as the clusters, Humanitarian Country Teams, in-country advocacy platforms, the IASC and the Global Protection Cluster.	COs, IDMC, NRC HQ	Ongoing	Please refer to ES rec. #3
Knowledge Management and Learning					

<p>ES page 10, §2 (Value for money)</p>	<p>“Some of the existing reporting and monitoring mechanisms do not offer sufficient and adequate management information to the field”</p>	<p>LEAN pilot in DRC looking at improving knowledge management (more on this pilot under ES rec. #12 & 15 above).</p> <p>CAD revision – see also ES rec. #1 above</p>	<p>DRC/SMS</p>		<p>Learning findings only focus on M+E systems, do not account for broader learning activities like NRC Global Seminars etc.</p>
<p>ES page 9, §7</p>	<p>Findings on lack of documentation. “Certain aspects of the learning environment in NRC (e.g. monitoring systems, documentation in general) need improvement.”</p>	<p>TSS supports programme development through TA support and visits, evaluations and the annual technical global seminar. New advances are captured in policy and handbook reviews.</p>	<p>SMS</p>	<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Development of a module based M&E Framework for NRC has been started. The work is organised as a project with participants from IPD and SMS. The Framework will provide guidelines and tools for all phases of M&E from the planning stage to the evaluation/ lessons learned stage. This work will provide important input into the Management Information System planned to be developed in 2013 as part of the ongoing Roles and Responsibility Project.</p>
<p>ES page 10, §2 (Value for money)</p>	<p>“Learning and innovation is not properly embedded in the organisation, all diminishing cost-efficiency benefits”</p>	<p>AID is fund-raising for pilot projects aimed at strengthening the ability to gather evidence on trends and patterns to inform advocacy through regular program activities as well as how to use advocacy to promote lessons learned and best practices from programs. Linking it with learning groups such as DFIDs will be part of these efforts.</p>	<p>TSS</p> <p>AID</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>NRC is also planning to develop an information system to improve availability of management information, such as results, manuals, etc.</p>

NRC Management Response to Evaluations

Evaluation: DFID Mid Term Evaluation of PPA Chase funding
Department or Country Program: IDMC
Date of Management Response: 25 September 2012
Manager/Management Response Focal Point: Head of IDMC
Person(s) responsible for ensuring execution of the action plan: Head of IDMC

A.

Rec. no	Recommendation	Actions <i>What/Who</i>	Follow up <i>What/Who</i>	Timeframe/ Planning Opportunity	Notes/ Comment
1	Focus annual planning on strategic and specific goals by geographically concentrating resources, advocacy efforts and means of influence;	This is on-going and is happening in collaboration with AID and the CO for countries in which NRC has an operational presence	Head of IDMC, HoDs (Regions and P&R)	Country and thematic advocacy strategies to be presented in donor consultation in first half of November 2012	
2	Develop consistent management tools with specific outcome indicators and milestones;	This is being developed further as part of the development of country and thematic strategy development	Same as above		
3	Endeavour to have an all-encompassing external evaluation of the institute to assist in further developing IDMCs organizational and programmatic strategy;	IDMC has received funding from two donors for external evaluations of its work on natural disasters (to be carried out in 2013 – 2014). Currently, IDMC has chosen to seek resources for external evaluations of certain areas of its work rather than one evaluation of the impact of the whole of IDMC's work which we think would be too complex to achieve useful results	On-going		
4	In close coordination with country programmes and HQ, explore new strategic alliances with e.g. CSOs to better influence policy and governments on the situation of PAD in protracted	IDMC is already developing alliances with CSO around specific areas of work, such as training, research and submissions to the HRC. IDMC does not see this recommendation as relevant as it is already working along these lines.			

	conflicts;				
5	Keep staff costs as low as possible and regularly compare not only with peer-NGO-organisations in Geneva, but also with NRC HQ staff and the staff costs as proportion of total costs;	IDMC needs to remain competitive within the Geneva environment and therefore seeks to align itself to other NGO salaries in Geneva. IDMC ensures that the proportion of its staff costs does not go higher than 70% of its total budget.			
6	Try to establish more overt linkages with individual humanitarian NGOs and organisations ² other than NRC and the UN family, to widen the public and to discover potential future (research) clients, but at the same time avoiding to become too diverse in scope	IDMC already works in close partnerships with others, around specific projects or areas of work. For example with ODI on urban displacement, with HelpAge on older displaced persons, with Watchlist on IDP children, etc.... As for recommendation 4, IDMC does not see this recommendation as relevant as it is already working along these lines.			

B. If you disagree with a recommendation or feel that a recommendation is not a priority for this action plan, please explain:

C. If you agree with a recommendation, but think action is unnecessary, please explain:

² Apart from the existing cooperation with ICVA (a global network of NGOs).

NRC Management Response to Evaluations

Evaluation: DFID Mid Term Evaluation of PPA Chase funding
Department or Country Program: Myanmar
Date of Management Response: 18 September
Manager/Management Response Focal Point: Project Manager
Person(s) responsible for ensuring execution of the action plan: Country Director

A.

Rec. no	Recommendation	Actions <i>What/Who</i>	Follow up <i>What/Who</i>	Timeframe/ Planning Opportunity	Notes/ Comment
1	Build long(er)-term and genuine partnership-relations with CBOs / LNGOs;	<p>NRC shall review the partnership with the CBOs and work to build better relations with more training/ information sharing work within the communities. Expanded focus is likely on sanitation education and carpentry training with potential informational discussions on HLP, as the countries land laws are changing and will affect communities.</p> <p>NRC is including a Community Forestry component with a local NGO (thus continues building relations with LNGOs)</p>	PM and National PC	October 2012 for sanitation and carpentry; December for HLP information sessions; October for LNGO implementation to start	The project is being implemented under the auspices of the UNHCR LoU and the CBO relationship also includes UNHCR and other UNHCR implementing partners (i.e. NRC is not working in isolation and this recommendation extends past NRC's relationship with the CBOs)
2	Reconsider addressing only the needs of the most vulnerable/IDPs, e.g. more community work like water points / latrines / schools etc. and provide NFIs also to other community members;	This action is presently being considered on a village by village basis. Two villages receiving DFID shelter are now receiving NRC-built schools funded through other donors. NFI distribution is being planned for expansion to others within the communities.	PM	Ongoing	CO started this upon debriefing of evaluator.
3	Use procurement plans and well-defined budgets to demonstrate even more clearly the intention to aim for highest cost-	Procurement plans have been added to the present project concerning assets and are included in other CO programmes.	PSM and FM	Ongoing	

	efficiency;				
4	Document management decisions and work according to standardized workplans;	A more formalized documentation system for documenting decisions will be taken into consideration. Work plans are presently developed for the project area.	PM and National PCs	Ongoing	
5	Use needs assessments as baseline data and monitor also country specific outcomes (e.g. reduction in vulnerability) against these;	Outcomes as recommended can be captured in future monitoring activities. This may include occupancy rates, additions build onto the shelter (to extend kitchens, balconies, extra rooms, etc.), enhanced livelihoods opportunities resulting from the shelter, change of ownership, usage of NFIs and general satisfaction with the shelter.	National PC with PM	1 st quarter 2013	Needs assessments carried out by NRC field staff are already being used as baseline data for the project.
6	Use cost-effectiveness analysis to reconsider the number of beneficiaries (total investment per beneficiary - direct plus indirect costs - considered still fairly high);	Along with other trainings and NFI distribution the project is looking to increase beneficiaries and quality of implementation while maintaining costs. Community Forestry is being added to the project this year to improve cost effectiveness as well as take account of the environment.	PM	Dec. 2012	Please note that the unit cost per shelter was reduced dramatically by dropping contractors to work with CBOs.
7	Intensify and improve trainings for CBOs, especially on community mobilization / increasing social cohesion and self-reliance;	Trainings of CBOs is being reviewed and reinvigorated with the assistance of the NRC Education team. Additional and a more in-depth training is planned to include better financial and project management for the CBOs at the village level to build more self-reliance.	PMs (Shelter and Education)	Dec. 2012	
8	Continue to make the programme more gender sensitive;	This already an ongoing action and continues as such (as implied also by the comment). In late 2011 NRC Myanmar conducted a gender awareness training with staff from all offices in the country. Each office made their own gender plans.	All NRC offices	Ongoing	For the gender in plan Myeik issues such as inclusion of women within the Community Based Organisations has been included. NRC has further already increased female field staff working in the villages.
9	Include wherever possible other NRC core competencies (AID-HLP, ICLA, Educ. FS/IGAs) in the shelter programme	The country office is always open for new opportunities as they arise. Presently, NRC operates under the UNHCR umbrella agreement in Tanintharyi Region and will expand into other core competencies when possible. As mentioned in Item #7 the Education team will be assisting with trainings within this project area.	CD, PMs	As per opportunity.	It should be noted that adding new core competencies are subject to the creation of new MoUs with the

3. NRC Country Coordinators [CC] – Panama, Ecuador and Venezuela

Rec. no	Recommendation	Actions <i>What/Who</i>	Follow up <i>What/Who</i>	Timeframe/ Planning Opportunity	Notes/ Comment
General Recommendations					
1	<i>As from the next planning period, problems and priorities should be identified and defined per country in order to better tackle specific impediments and consequently better achieve planned change</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the 2013 Planning exercise, the refugee program will carry out an in-depth assessment of protection gaps per each individual country (Ecuador, Panama and Venezuela). Furthermore, a totally revised advocacy strategy will be developed addressing main gaps identified in each country. Each country will undertake a specific plan of action with its implementing partners. A general meeting between NRC and its partners will take place for a participatory review of the progress and planning for the project's last year 	<p>PM, PD</p> <p>CC</p> <p>PM, PD</p>	<p>Q4-2012</p> <p>Q4-2012</p> <p>Q4-2012 or Q1-2013</p>	
2	<i>Produce and implement a bottom-up, evidence-based advocacy plan (documented cases produced by the lawyers at field level), in order to ensure country specific advocacy initiatives, in cooperation with the Advocacy Section in Oslo.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> A regional advocacy plan will be designed and implemented in 2013 with emphasis on ICLA and education-related gaps. The plan will be adjusted in each country according to main protection gaps identified and it will be revised yearly. In the planning phase, the refugee program will be supported and advised by the NRC Colombia PAA/APP Program Manager. Specific emphasis will be put in the quality of the documentation of cases at field level and the capacity to promote/handle emblematic cases. 	CC, PM, PD	Q4-2012	

		<p>2. Each country coordinator will draft a country specific advocacy plan to be incorporated into one consolidated regional advocacy strategy.</p> <p>3. To strengthen the advocacy component, specific advocacy objectives will also be included in the NMFA-sponsored project in 2013</p>	<p>CC, PM</p> <p>PM, PD</p>	<p>Q4-2012</p> <p>Q4-2012</p>	
3	<p><i>Make the Regional Refugee Programme a genuine Programme with pool-funding of the various donors, to ensure greater coherence and to better illustrate coordination and synergies with for instance other NRC's services and programmes (e.g. AID Department, Education). The production of country specific management tools (logframe matrices, calendar of activities rather than plans of activities per donor) might facilitate monitoring efforts and consistency of the overall programme</i></p>	<p>The Refugee Program cannot function in a pool-funding modality because NRC - with its project-driven modus operandi - cannot function differently unless changes take place institutionally at the Head Office. Moreover, the Program it is funded by 3 distinct donors each with a different timeline, two of which with a "humanitarian" focus (DFID, MFA) and one (SIDA) with a more development-oriented program.</p> <p>Aware of its shortcoming in this area, NRC Colombia's organizational priority in 2012-2014 is to further develop and consolidate its M&E and Result-Based Frameworks. It is however an on-going process which needs to be harmonized with the Head Office protocols and systems which are also currently under revision.</p> <p>The 2013 Refugee Program planning will be conducted with the goal of further harmonizing the various donors' objectives and to seek improved consistency between them.</p>	<p>PM, PD</p>	<p>Q4-2012</p>	
4	<p><i>Monitor more on qualitative/country-</i></p>	<p>Although the original DFID proposal does</p>	<p>PM, PD</p>	<p>Q1-2013</p>	<p>Additional</p>

	<i>specific outcome indicators with specific milestones to measure progress of planned change at the end of the project, in addition to indicators agreed in the PPA log frame</i>	not include qualitative indicators at country-specific level, the Refugee Program will design specific qualitative indicators during the regional event in Q1-2013 with its IPs/partners to be internally used in order to better monitor results at outcome level.			training on M&E/RBM will be needed. The PD will be in charge of it.
5	<i>Continue to develop strong operational and strategic coordination mechanisms with UNHCR at country and local levels, including specific joint plans of action (such as the one adopted in Venezuela).</i>	NRC will continue to define its operational relationship with UNHCR in the context of the Global and Regional MoU. Thus: In Venezuela, specific joint plan will be reviewed for the last year of DFID implementation. In Ecuador, negotiations will take place between UNHCR and NRC to design a joint work plan. In Panama, negotiations will be undertaken to draft a joint plan.	CC, PM	Q4-2012	The fulfillments of this recommendation will highly depend on UNHCR's will and capacity to design common work plans.
6	<i>Strengthen the capacity building component by developing structured and country specific capacity building plans that include key stakeholders such as relevant government, IPs and NRC staff. Conducting technical working sessions with the IPs to address legal and priority issues, problems and case management techniques would likely increase the quality of legal services provided, particularly in Ecuador</i>	The program will develop its country specific capacity building plans with IPs/partners which will also include the needs of internal capacity building for NRC staff. Capacity building will be structured and formal to the extent possible such as the diploma course in Venezuela or other training courses (such as Training of Trainers - ToT) aimed at replicating learning.	CC, PM	Q4-2012	Internally each country will meet with its partners to define country capacity building plans.
7	<i>NRC-Colombia should put more weight on cost efficiency and proper budgeting in general, and to continue to pursue partner's adherence to financial and administrative standards.</i>	NRC will further scale up its ongoing plans aimed at fostering capacity development of IPs/partners not only within the programmatic part, but also in their organizational dimension (administration/finance in particular). The Refugee Program counts on a specific staff to ensure this capacity building and follow-up to IPs/partners.	FAM – Finance and Administration Manager	Q1-2013	The process will be on-going all throughout 2013

Country-specific Recommendations					
8	ECUADOR <i>Develop a specific plan of activities, with a strategic outlook, in close collaboration with San Francisco University and UNHCR</i>	A detailed plan of activities and collaboration will be drafted with the San Francisco University on “high impact” cases with strategic guidance and inputs from the NRC ICLA Adviser (HO-based) who will be visiting Ecuador in October 2012. UNHCR has not yet defined its 2013 planning if they will continue to support high impact cases let alone being part of the technical platform. NRC will seek to engage UNHCR to find out its plans and intention for the year to come.	CC, PM, CD	Q4-2012	UNHCR in Ecuador has shown little interest in raising high impact cases as a bottom-up advocacy strategy.
9	<i>Clarify SJRM's position as to legal protection, advice, priorities and mechanisms applied to asylum seekers, in close coordination with UNHCR</i>	A specific meeting will take place with UNHCR and SJR to establish a common protection strategy in the context of challenges related to the 1182 Decree. Attention will be put in protection mechanisms such as refugee status determination and other regularization mechanisms to be used only after final denial for national authorities of refugee status.	CC, PM, CD	Q4-2012	
10	<i>Encourage and support SJRM to establish a monitoring and coordination internal unit. Field visits of ICLA officer could be a good opportunity to technically assist field lawyers</i>	NRC will plan and promote the recruitment of a legal coordinator for SJRM. A participatory monitoring plan will be drafted with SJRM including regular field visits from NRC country coordinator and ICLA officers.	CC, PM	Q1-2013	
11	VENEZUELA <i>Streamline activities and services provided by Caritas' lawyers, in close coordination with UNHCR. Continue to use NRC's experience and expertise to contribute to the standardization of case management techniques and the documentation of best legal practices.</i>	NRC will promote coordination meetings and mechanisms to guarantee standardized quality for Caritas both in San Cristobal and on San Antonio. NRC will strengthen the San Antonio border office in 2013 with other funding.	CC, PM	Q4-2012	The fulfillment of this recommendation will highly depend on UNHCR's openness to NRC suggestions

--	--	--	--	--	--

B. If you disagree with a recommendation or feel that a recommendation is not a priority for this action plan, please explain:

- By and large, NRC agrees with the proposed recommendations. Eventual minor differences are explained in the text in the table.

C. If you agree with a recommendation, but think action is unnecessary, please explain:

NRC Management Response to Evaluations

Evaluation: DFID Mid Term Evaluation of PPA Chase funding
Department or Country Program: DRC
Date of Management Response: 28/09/2012
Manager/Management Response Focal Point: Programme Director
Person(s) responsible for ensuring execution of the action plan: Programme Coordinator EFSD

A.

Rec. no	Recommendation	Actions <i>What/Who</i>	Follow up <i>What/Who</i>	Timeframe/ Planning Opportunity	Notes/ Comment
1	Establish genuine and more equal partnerships with its local IPs, increasing gradually their responsibility and documenting/exchanging good practices stemming from their field experience;	Analyze and identify practical options to transfer a portion of procurement responsibility to IPs with respect to IGA chosen by the beneficiaries	Programme and project coordinators	By end November 2012	To be done in collaboration with Logistics and Finance Departments
		Pilot with 1 selected partner	Programme and project coordinators	December 2012 to March 2013	
		Workshops on yearly final evaluations	Programme and project coordinators	1 st workshop held in June 2012	Other workshops will be held at the end of each year when the final evaluation results are available
		Sharing best practices through regular workshops Each workshop will be followed by the dissemination of a Best Practices Report, including a list of recommendations to be included in the Y3 partnership agreements	Programme and project coordinators	Ongoing	4 workshops until end of project
2	More actively involve IPs and target groups into the decision-making process concerning project orientation and implementation;	NRC will strive to improve and enlarge the participation of target groups in the decision making process. However, IPs cannot be involved at this stage as they are selected at a later stage when IGA have been identified.			
3	Reduce the number of IGA activities	The programme team will participate in an NRC global	Programme and	Nov/Dec.	

	and/or the direct involvement of NRC in it; eliminate the – probably- non-viable activities (e.g. mushroom production) and promote those that are financially sustainable (e.g. rabbit breeding, provided technical and managerial capacities are up to standards) and/or have positive, wider market perspectives by for instance linking the initiatives to value chains / the private sector (e.g. soap making, agricultural production);	<p>Business and Marketing training.</p> <p>The preliminary analysis (feasibility survey, business case, etc.) will be strengthened for each IGA requested by /proposed to beneficiaries before commitment is made formally. Based on analysis results, a limited number of IGAs will be approved.</p> <p>A detailed cost/benefit analysis of each IGA undertaken in the year 2 of the grant will be conducted at the end of year 2 to inform activities in Year 3.</p>	project coordinators M&E coordinator	2012 Preliminary analyses on-going May/June/July 2013	
4	Intensify and improve trainings (the only asset IDPs are always able to carry with them);	<p>NRC will collaborate with IPAPEL to prepare training and confirm content and quality.</p> <p>Other actors will be contacted to compare training materials and venues/partners (ex. Oxfam Belgium). Their best practices will be taken on board by NRC and potentially adapted to the local context</p>	Programme and project coordinators	Starting now until end of project. End December 2012	
5	Apply cost benefit and other (e.g. gender-, power-, feasibility-) analyses prior to engaging in innovative initiatives (e.g. water-powered mills, food stores / warehouses);	As described in point 3 above, all IGAs will be subject to a cost/benefit analysis before selection. In addition, any innovative proposition will be further analysed and a decision will be taken on findings and documented by senior management.	Programme and project coordinators M&E coordinator + senior management	As needed	
6	Concentrate more on country specific project outcomes and result based monitoring systems and promote these as well towards the IPs;	<p>This recommendation will be addressed through a wider revision of the M&E strategy for NRC in DRC.</p> <p>Promoting new M&E processes and tools with partners through formal training sessions as well as on the field coaching</p>	Programme and project coordinators	End of 2012 June 2013	Analysis of the current situation and strategy for the coming years will be ready by end of 2012
7	Put more emphasis on cost efficiency (e.g. unit-cost comparison, procurement plans, involving the FAM more in planning and budgeting) and document major programmatic and budget deviating	A new Requisition process is being designed by the Logistics team which will allow us to follow individual unit cost more closely and facilitate unit cost comparison.	Logistics team	On-going	The logistics team will train all NRC staff.
		Procurement plans will be designed at the beginning of each cycle of the project	Programme and project coordinators	On-going for Year 2	Procurement plan for year 3 will be designed in April 2013

	decisions.	All programmatic deviating decisions (including budgetary) will be documented and archived in the programme's files.	Programme and project coordinators		-
--	------------	--	------------------------------------	--	---

B. If you disagree with a recommendation or feel that a recommendation is not a priority for this action plan, please explain:

Referring to recommendation 2, IPs cannot be involved in decision making process at the project orientation stage as they are selected at a later stage. However, they will be consulted in designing implementation methodologies and plans.

C. If you agree with a recommendation, but think action is unnecessary, please explain: