

Management Response

Evaluation Manager: **Lucy Brealey**

Evaluation Commissioner: **Alex Carle**

Date completed:

Evaluation Conclusion/Recommendation	Management response			Comments	Action to be taken	Timing	Responsible team/individual
	Accept	Partially accept	Reject				
<p>1. Ensure a timely comprehensive desegregated situation analysis that will systematically feed into response design (for BRC and NRCS)</p> <p>BRC</p>		Y		<p>We assume that this means a needs assessment. Assessments did take place however there were rooms to improve.</p> <p>PDNA identified the major sectors and key intervention which are in line with NRCS recovery priorities. In addition, NRCS did consultations with district and sub-chapters, undertook multi-sector assessment to contextualise the PDNA findings and decided 4+1. NRCS mid-term review (MTR) report findings showed that the programme interventions are in line with the community needs. The 4+1 interventions and general activities were designed by the NHQ and the specific activities of each component such as livelihoods were designed by the local chapter in consultation with local stakeholders such as Ward Citizen Forum (WCF), political parties and ward secretaries (MTR findings).</p> <p>BRC considers standardising its recovery needs assessment approach to ensure clarity on standards such as CHS in line with IFRC tools. Assessments should be community based and take place before</p>	BRC UKO to agree on Recovery needs assessment standards	Ongoing	ESTA Team

Evaluation	Management response			Comments	Action to be	Timing	Responsible
				sectors have been defined. We agree that disaggregation and targeting of specific groups is essential and we have invested significantly in working with NRCS towards a more targeted approach both over the course of Recovery and in wider programming.			
NRCS		Y		<p>Following key assessments were carried out in Kathmandu valley districts as a part of situation analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS carried out initial rapid assessment and provided relief in the affected area. • Real time evaluation was conducted to improve service delivery and accountability to beneficiaries, donors and other stakeholders and to capture lessons for the improvement of disaster response system. The evaluation also provided suggestion to improve recovery programme. • Government of Nepal carried out post disaster need assessment (PDNA) in the earthquake affected districts. • In addition, NRCS carried out multi sector assessment in 14 earthquake most affected districts including Kathmandu valley districts. <p>Based on the PDNA findings and multi-sector assessment findings, recovery programme was finalised in Kathmandu valley districts.</p>			
2. Envision multi-sectoral intervention as a single approach as opposed to parallel sectoral activities (for BRC and NRCS) BRC		Y		<p>This is best practice for future and should be part of the standardisation of the Recovery process. BRC should be clear about expectations on integrated programming.</p> <p>NRCS recovery framework had a vision of integration but in implementation, the sector and activities lost true systematic integration. However, planning,</p>	BRC UKO to agree on Recovery needs assessment standards	Dec 2018	ESTA Team

Evaluation	Management response		Comments	Action to be	Timing	Responsible
			<p>PMEAL, CEA and reporting were done in an integrated basis.</p> <p>However, some integration observed in the programme are; at Golhunga, Tarkeshwor municipality of Kathmandu district, LHs and WASH activities are integrated creating more employment and better facilities to water and sanitation – CGD toilet, rain water harvesting, foot trail, etc. and helping 45 HHs with multi layers of supports.</p>			
NRCS		Y	<p>The recovery programme was assessed, planned and implemented through integrated approach.</p> <p>Multi-sector assessment was carried out to identify problems and issues of different sectors. Then based on the findings, integrated recovery plan was developed together with sector team and management teams of NRCS and BRC.</p> <p>Some junior engineers are working on both livelihood and WASH related infrastructure reconstruction in communities such as DWSS and irrigation canal. Likewise, during debris clearance activities, shelter team provided technical support although the activity was led by livelihood team.</p> <p>PMER officer, finance officer and district programme coordinator are common to all sectors. One of their responsibilities is to monitor integration of different sectors and activities during planning, budgeting and implementing. Integrated M&E and reporting system have been developed and followed in the programme.</p> <p>Examples of synergy between different sectors have</p>			

Evaluation	Management response			Comments	Action to be	Timing	Responsible
				<p>been found in the programme. Some of them are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debris clearance activity provided selected vulnerable household with opportunity to earn through cash for work to clear debris of their own destroyed houses. While discussion with household members, they said that the cash for work support helped them not only in livelihood and shelter but also provided psychosocial support. • Likewise, people worked together for rehabilitation of community infrastructure such as footpath. This helped to develop mutual relationship with their neighbour. 			
<p>3. Ensure that programming is inclusive of all the different groups (for BRC and NRCS)</p> <p>BRC</p>		Y		<p>Yes, this is good practice. This is already well defined within the programme, though of course can always be strengthened.</p> <p>This will continue to be a key focus of BRC, as CEA has been identified as a strategic priority.</p>	<p>The role out and implementation of the BRC CEA Theory of Change as well as the CEA strategy for NRCS to be developed as part of the CEA learning review.</p>	Ongoing	P&A team
NRCS		Y		<p>NRCS provided service according to need of people. NRCS ensures participation of all groups (e.g. ethnicity, age group, gender, minorities, etc.) during planning and decision making process.</p>			
<p>4. Draw clear targeting criteria and methodologies from the situation analysis and make sure it is</p>	Y			<p>It took time to establish targeting criteria and the CEA strategy to communicate these at the start of the programme and they subsequently needed revision and navigation with local government, NRCS and other stakeholders. There was also tension</p>	<p>Already addressed over the course of the programme</p>	Completed	Recovery team

Evaluation	Management response			Comments	Action to be	Timing	Responsible
communicated clearly and transparently across recipients and non-recipients (for BRC and NRCS, communication specifically for NRCS) BRC				between government and civil society on blanket approach. This was however addressed over the course of the programme with targeting criteria revision and a robust CEA strategy (including a CHS review).			
NRCS		Y		It took quite some time for the Government and partners to agree on blanket vs. targeted approach on various sectors, e.g. it was blanket approach in relief. But during recovery, it was blanket approach for shelter but for WASH and livelihood it was targeted intervention.			
5. Strengthen supply and finance processes by considering developing standing agreements with service providers and updating existing manuals/policies to reflect the potential scale of future responses and the use of new modalities (i.e. CTP). BRC	Y			Though aimed at NRCS, BRC will continue to develop capacity in cash forecasting, anti-fraud and corruption, asset management.	Continued capacity development	On going	BRC finance and recovery team
NRCS				NRCS has already decided to prioritise CTP in its development programmes and humanitarian response in a strategic and programmatic manner. Likewise, a framework on anti-fraud and corruption exists in NRCS. Its capacity dissemination are further required.			
6. Make sure monitoring allows for determining	Y			Some progress has been made though this remains a challenge as we worked at different levels;	Continued capacity	On going	BRC PMEAL team

Evaluation	Management response			Comments	Action to be	Timing	Responsible
whether the response is reaching its target and is used to make programmatic decisions (for BRC and NRCS)				One area of continued investment is data analysis and management and documentation.	development		
7. Set targets for outcome indicators (for BRC and NRCS)	Y			Agreed. This has now been done for the remainder of the programme, and all other BRC supported programmes	Addressed		BRC PMEAL team to monitor
8. Programme implementers should make sure to foster the appropriate linkages between community, committees and local government entities, and also ensure the roles and responsibilities of each are understood (for NRCS).				For NRCS the programme has created linkages with key stakeholders that should be maintained. It includes community members as potential volunteers, government bodies and other civil society organisations.	Initiated but for NRCS to sustain.		NRCS
NRCS			Y	NRCS, as being auxiliary to the Government in humanitarian field, works closely with Government at all levels. NRCS is also represented in several committees established by the Government.			
9. Consider the retention of staff and volunteers as a key factor for sustainability (for BRC and NRCS). Having been part of the ERO should be an important criteria for being selected as part of future programme team. Future NRCS and potential BRC programmes could also			Y	It's not a precondition for sustainability to retain all staff that have been recruited. Sustaining the skills that you need to move your organisation forward is. BRC is a key participant in NRCS' transition dialogue and has been investing in institutional capacity building throughout the programme. BRC has contributed to the development of cash SOPs, documenting CEA/PMEAL approaches (e.g. MSC), and encouraging a learning approach to key elements of the 4+1 strategy.	Ongoing		BRC recovery team, PMEAL team and Country Manager

Evaluation	Management response			Comments	Action to be	Timing	Responsible
use the same community volunteers to keep them engaged BRC							
NRCS		Y		For ERO staff management/recruitment was done through 3 different ways. First, permanent staff seconded to ERO, PNS staff seconded to ERO (though this did not take place as expected) and third recruitment of staff through competitive process. A large number was recruited as per the third option above. It was not possible to ascertain retention. However, adjustments have been done for qualified staff where possible.			
10. Further encourage NRCS to be at the forefront of CTP in country BRC	Y			Ensuring that NRCS is a cash ready National Society is well underway through capacity building through the cash grant programme, the IFRC regional programme and through connections with the cash working group in country. NRCS also need to invest their own resources and drive that strategy.	Continue existing work	On going	Livelihoods delegate, recovery manager and CM
NRCS	Y			CTP guidelines have already been developed. A large CTP has undertaken during earthquake relief and recovery. NRCS and WFP have stand-by agreement. CTP is also a part of this agreement. It used to focus only on commodity support in the past.			