IRC Evaluation Management Response [Afghanistan/2021 Afghanistan Crisis Appeal]

IRC [Afghanistan/2021 Afghanistan Crisis Appeal] management response and follow-up on [Evaluation Report: Afghanistan Crisis Appeal].

Date: 2024/01/30
Completed by: Bostan Fahim, Sr. Meal Coordinator, IRC Afghanistan

Management response matrix

Evaluation recommendation	Management response	Responsible individual(s) or unit(s)	Priority level	Key actions	Timeframe
A total of 48% of the respondents were aware of the complaint response mechanism. While the project staff has already put in place considerable efforts to raise awareness (holding various sessions with communities throughout the project implementation), it is strongly recommended that awareness about the available complaint response mechanism is boosted through additional endeavors.	Partially Accept: The MEAL assessments during PDM show that over 90% of individuals were aware of the IRC feedback mechanism. Given that the evaluation covered the entire project period and was conducted years after some responses were provided by the IRC, people might have forgotten to remember these channels which could be a large driver for having a lower ratio in the evaluation.	MEAL team	Medium	Continue conducting community-based Client Responsiveness and Accountability (CRA) sessions.	Ongoing
As it stands, there are limited feedback/complaint channels for those who do not have access to phones/networks as the IRC's major mechanism is a hotline. It is recommended that the IRC also puts in place (and strengthens the existing ones such as community FGDs, community feedback gathering meetings, etc.) channels that are fit for the communities/individuals that do not have access to phones.	Partially Accepted: IRC has both reactive and proactive approaches. The hotline, WhatsApp, and email channels are part of the IRC's CRA reactive channels whereas on the proactive side, CRA staff visit communities and conduct CRA sessions with clients. Both the reactive and proactive channels are functional throughout the project life cycle	MEAL Team	Medium	Continue conducting community based CRA sessions.	Ongoing

IRC Evaluation Management Response					
Around 2% of respondents mentioned that they faced challenges/negative consequences as a result of the project. These challenges were reported to be cases of aid redistribution where other community members (mostly community elders) asked for a portion of the assistance received by a community member. It is strongly recommended that the IRC investigate any possible cases of aid redistribution and explore effective ways of preventing aid redistribution.	Accept: This has been one of the major issues IRC faces in the country. All cases are investigated by the IRC's Ethics and Compliance Unit.	Country Team (Program, ECU, MEAL, Field Coordinators, and Access Teams)	High	An accountability framework will be developed to clearly define everyone's role in eliminating/ reducing these types of cases. IRC MEAL team will continue to deliver key messages on rights during community mobilization, CRA sessions, distribution, and post-distribution monitoring.	March 2024
It is recommended that the IRC keeps abreast of complex dynamics within beneficiary communities and strengthen its outreach and sensitization efforts towards community elders in the beginning of such projects to help prevent potential cases of aid re-distribution.	Accepted	Field Coordinators and Access Team	Medium	Both the Field Coordinators and Provincial Access team coordinate with district governors and communities. In some districts, an agreement has been obtained from the Community Elders to ensure that they will not ask beneficiaries to re-distribute the assisted amounts but also report these cases with the organization.	Ongoing
A total of 9% of the overall respondents (whose responses were not included in this analysis detailed in this report) reported that they had not received assistance from the IRC while their names and contact details were included in the beneficiary list provided to the evaluation team. This may be an	To be confirmed	Program and MEAL team and Compliance team	High	The IRC has requested that the consultant share beneficiary details. Client distribution records will be	March 2024

error in the beneficiary list maintained or it is possible that the respondents may have provided incorrect information in hopes of getting more assistance. In any case, it is strongly recommended that the IRC carefully investigates such cases.				reviewed and cases will be referred to the IRC's Ethics and Compliance Unit.	
Limited time was allocated for the evaluation by the IRC. This meant tight timelines for the field work and for other phases of the evaluation. It is recommended that the IRC budgets in sufficient time for evaluation exercises as part of the overall project timelines, depending on the scope of the evaluation. It is important to factor in possible delays with fieldwork and securing access, and to factor in sufficient time for the different layers of reviews of the evaluation outputs.	Reject: The time for the evaluation was sufficient, however, due to the contextual barriers and recent restrictions imposed on INGOs' work in Afghanistan, obtaining the access letters has been a major issue.	MEAL Team	Medium	Considering the changing context, the MEAL team will ensure to secure more time for future evaluations.	N/A
It is recommended that the IRC use the best practice of close community engagement from this project (such as proactive information sharing and seeking of feedback from communities through community meetings and focus group discussions) and apply it to all other projects – whether these are DEC funded or others.	Accepted: Clients are consulted throughout the project life cycle by the IRC program and MEAL teams through community mobilization sessions, CRA sessions, and regular monitoring of the project.	MEAL and Program Team	Medium	Clients to be to be engaged in project design.	Ongoing
Cash as an assistance modality was found to offer the needed flexibility to beneficiaries to meet their news in the best way possible – hence, it is recommended that the IRC - in the design of similar projects - always ask the question of ''why not provide cash?''	Rejected: the modality of the response is based on the project theory of change which will be informed by context analysis, and analysis of supply-side and demand-side constraints to ensure the best modality for solving the problems faced by the clients.	MEAL, Program	Medium	Evidence from the multi-sectoral needs assessments to be shared by MEAL on time, and the clients feedback to be reviewed while designing projects theory of change	Ongoing
Finally, the IRC-led complaint response mechanism was found to be effective, and well established. The mechanism has successfully managed almost all complaints (except 7 that were being resolved at the time of writing this report). It is recommended that this be replicated for all future projects and for other future DEC supported interventions.	Accepted: These channels will be maintained, and the IRC will continue to consult with clients on their preferred additional feedback channels.	MEAL	Medium	MEAL to further coordinate with relevant departments in following and addressing clients feedback/complaints on time	Ongoing