

Management Response (reflection on the findings of external project evaluations)

To be completed by Programme Officers at UKNO, in collaboration with colleagues who were involved with the project where relevant.

GAD Number	PHL0453
Project Title	Strengthening Healthcare and Protection Services and Supporting the Rehabilitation and Diversification of Livelihoods for Typhoon Haiyan Affected Populations
Project Country	Philippines
Thematic Area	Response and recovery programming
Programme Officer	Savita Garg and Tala Budziszewski

Please select up to five recommendations from the evaluation that relate the work of UKNO within the project, and put them in the first column below.

In the second column please explain whether you agree or disagree with the recommendation and why, and add any other explanatory information that you think is relevant.

Recommendation	Comments
Put greater emphasis on project design to ensure that clear layered causal pathways are articulated. The updating and communication of this design is also important to save confusion and contradictions during project implementation.	<p>Plan UK and Plan Philippines agrees that the project design could have benefitted from clearer casual pathways, in order to improve project implementation. Although we had the DEC table 1, a more traditional diagrammatic logframe which visually linked the casual pathways could have been integrated in the planning and proposal design stage of the project – for example allowing us to see the links between different components and outcomes. Plan could have greater technical reviews from M&E experts from Plan as per the recommendations in the evaluation report. This could have strengthened the causal pathways and intervention logics from inputs to outcomes and goal.</p> <p>The design was updated during the project timeframe to reflect the relevant of the project and attempt to evolve it as per the needs. For example, formal changes included the gender component being revised so that gender was included as cross cutting issue. In November 2014 the project design was also reviewed and revised including the budget, which was topped up from the DEC. A Plan UK Programme Officer led the workshops for the revisions and re-planning exercises with the country office. As formal revisions, these updates were well documented and communicated. However, during the project implementation, there were also updates made to the project that undertook a less formal process as part of the day-to-day project management, such as to the health component with the BHS and HNPs, which could have been communicated better including recoding the rationale for these changes. There was also opportunity to update the project more systematically at certain intervals, which could have allowed for the evolution of changes to be discussed and captured in a more consultative manner at clear points.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logframes and intervention logic to be checked and revised

	<p>by M&E staff within Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More regular reviews of project design and discussions on any revisions to be done systematically. A format for project revisions to be developed and used to capture any changes, as a management tool.
<p>Plan UK and Plan Philippines focus more on capacity building and community engagement in future reconstruction and rehabilitation projects and less on construction and the supply of equipment.</p>	<p>Plan Philippines has sound experience with community engagement and capacity building which is an added value for many project interventions including the DEC Haiyan response. Experience with construction and the supply of equipment has been more limited with the country office but this was included in the Haiyan response from the assessing the needs and relative gaps when coordinating in-country. At the time the decision was influenced by the level of destruction which deprived a significant number of affected population from these basic services. It was therefore a strategic decision to include the rebuilding of destroyed health and education facilities.</p> <p>Action: As part of the 2017- 2021 Country Strategic Plan, Plan Philippines is integrating more emphasis on building the capacity of Local Government Units on Disaster Risk Management and will increasingly deliver it programme through partners and local NGOs. Plan will finalize a new partnership strategy in FY 2017. Coordination with partners including INGOs, local NGOs and government will allow programming needs to also be delivered through others working alongside Plan Philippines, including interventions related to construction. This also links to the recommendation that Plan Philippines continue to partner with existing institutions to enhance outcomes and improve the likelihood of sustainability. Furthermore, it is also noted and accepted that Plan Philippines should prioritise the design of future reconstruction and rehabilitation projects in a smaller number of communities, or target one to two specific sectors across a broad number of municipalities, to improve efficiency and effectiveness with such interventions.</p>
<p>Plan Philippines simplifies the beneficiary selection process, and improves the documentation and communication of processes to ensuring greater external transparency and sharing lessons learned.</p>	<p>Plan International UK and Plan International Philippines agree that the documentation of beneficiary selection systems used could be improved including better documentation and communication of processes to ensuring greater external transparency and sharing lessons learned. Plan International Headquarters is in the process of developing guidance on beneficiary targeting and guidance to be adopted by country offices.</p> <p>Action: The Programme and M&E teams of Plan International Philippines to take forward the guidance of Plan International to improve beneficiary selection and documentation of targeting mechanisms for use by future interventions.</p>
<p>Plan Philippines document and share the projects experiences integrating gender and the innovations of the Food Security and Livelihood Components, including the establishment of common service facilities, capacity building of farmers associations, establishment of Community</p>	<p>Plan International Philippines agrees with the recommendation and operates within the recommended premises. The experiences of the project are well documented (reports, presentations and this evaluation) and the lesson learning of the project including integrating gender and the innovations of the Food Security and Livelihood Components, including the establishment of common service facilities, capacity building of farmers associations etc will be taken forward through to other projects. Plan has consciously invested on its advocacy and communication capacity to enable it adequately shares</p>

<p>Savings Groups and the use of demonstration farms.</p>	<p>its best practices using a wide range of mechanisms including the social media.</p> <p>Action: As above Plan Philippines continues to document and share project experiences across projects and networks.</p>
<p>Plan International works with Plan Philippines to strengthen their finance and procurement systems, to ensure that they are fit for purpose and able to respond to the needs of post-emergency projects.</p> <p>Plan International works with Plan Philippines to develop strengthen human resource management systems so that are more effective in ensuring the timely recruitment and retention of key local staff (especially Project Managers) for post-emergency projects.</p>	<p>It is agreed that financial, procurement and human resource management systems should be strengthened to respond to the needs of post-emergency projects. This recommendation along with the more detailed recommendations around developing emergencies policies (human resources, procurement or financial manual) is in line with other evaluations conducted by Plan International.</p> <p>Action: The policies are disseminated from a global level and Plan International Headquarters has embarked on a process of revising existing processes and procedures, including in relation to humanitarian work that will assist in improving emergency work in the future.</p>

Based on both the findings of the evaluation and your experience of the project what do you think are the key lessons that can be learned from the project? (in relation to both things that went well and things that could have gone better)

Successes	Challenges
<p>The project was relevant and addressed the needs of the communities. The evaluation found that the project objectives were valid and appropriate for the context for healthcare, livelihoods and protection. The objectives were also in line with the United Nations (UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) led Multi-Cluster/Sector Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) (2013), the Government of the Philippine's Reconstruction Assistance on Yolanda (RAY) Strategy (2013) and Plan's Yolanda Recovery and Rehabilitation Strategy (2014). Plan's Yolanda Recovery and Rehabilitation Strategy (2014) guided the project design and drew on a range of data sources including in-house expertise, document reviews (of RAY and MIRA), consultations, key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Furthermore Plan's approach valued and respected by government officials and in synch with government plans.</p> <p>Plan performed well with integrating gender issues into the components of the project and successfully targeted women in the project with a high female participation. The evaluation highlights 'Gender issues were included in the project design, implementation and evaluation. Participation by women was high. The</p>	<p>The project would have benefitted from more consistency in project deliverables with the construction of Barangay Health Stations (BHS) and Health and Nutrition Posts (HNP). There were inconsistencies with the BHS and HNP being temporary or permanent structures and a lack of clarity on what was needed during the design phase. As above, clear documentation on the specifics of the design of the project against each component is required, drilling down into specifics beyond the proposal and overall plan. Changes in the design based on changes in context need to be clearly documented and communicated to all.</p> <p>Plan could have used the opportunity of a more flexible approach/ funding model afforded by DEC to adapt the project during the timeframe for better agility in responding to changing contexts and needs. Related to this, the evaluation comments the project could 'better promote the sharing of learning and techniques project activities and to have a stronger 'flow</p>

integrated approach to food security and livelihoods also offer an opportunity for learning and greater innovation. Combining Out of School Youth, Community Saving Groups, farming equipment, common service facilities, community-based technicians and enhancing the capacity of farmers associations may provide a model for others to learn from.'

Beneficiary accountability and feedback was well considered in the project. The beneficiary selection process is highly consultative with the criteria and the selection of beneficiaries integrating a participatory approach with the barangays and households involved in assessing which beneficiaries should be part of the project. There was also good community engagement throughout the project with communities able to discuss the interventions and Plan's work through the staff on the ground. The open dialogue was appreciated by beneficiaries.

over' effect to non-beneficiary communities. For example, the design of the project could have facilitated para-technicians and farmers associations sharing their experiences and providing expertise to neighbouring barangays so that they too could benefit from vermicomposting systems and other organic farming techniques.' The project had the potential opportunity to disseminate and share learning wider than the intervention communities and also be more innovative in the project design.

The project was output level focussed and the delivery of interventions with a gap on analysis and engagement at outcome level. Also the three project components of Health, Livelihood and UBR at times were operating as 3 different projects but the team proactively sought to make the project integrated where possible – for example through the introduction of nutrition gardens to health stations, the integration of gender and trainings. Improved M&E systems that measure and capture project outcomes and the relationship between different components of project would be beneficial in the future. Investing in M&E capacity in the early stages of a project in particular, through greater inclusion of M&E expertise in the project, would be able to set the scene and embed this into the project.

Is there anything you would do differently if you were working on a similar project again? If so please give details of what and why

As above.

Are there any other comments you would like to add in relation to the findings of the evaluation, the approach of the evaluator or lessons learned from the project more broadly?

N/A