

## DFID response to Real Time Evaluation Recommendations

Section	No.	Recommendation	DFID Response	DFID Comment	Transtec Comment
<b>Relevance 4.1.1</b>	1	To increase its overall relevance, a different approach to the Theory of change is required. This should address the uncertainty and volatility that has characterised humanitarian action in Somalia for 20 years and that will likely characterise it going forward.	Reject	Based on the lessons learnt from the current MYHP and the findings of the impact evaluation, a review of the theory of change will be done to inform the new business case. We feel the current Theory of Change is adequate for our purposes.	We look forward to assisting this process in whatever way may be useful
<b>Coherence 5.1.1</b>	2	Partners should develop a common definition of what community engagement means and the primary programmatic elements it includes. This definition should be common to both UN, INGO, and other organisations funded by DFID	Partially accept	Partners have identified parameters of community engagement that they utilize, while a common definition may not be arrived at, DFID will continue to encourage partners to share information on how they engage communities. Getting agreement across all partners is optimistic and attempting to push a common definition would not be the best use of our time.	Fair enough. Yet, one should be mindful that community engagement is not a distinct activity but rather a catch all phrase for a range of activities, some of which may be actually counterproductive or harmful.
	3	Partners should develop a common definition and possible approaches for how they address gender equality. This definition should be common to both UN, INGO,	Accept	DFID Somalia Humanitarian Team commissioned a gender review to be undertaken in early 2016; this will help determine how well gender considerations have been adopted and implemented by partners. Achieving a common definition is not	

## DFID response to Real Time Evaluation Recommendations

		and other organisations funded by DFID.		the main focus, but rather learning what works and obtaining best practice from partners.	
	4	Increase opportunities to draw on the definitions, policies and approaches used by OCHA, UNHCR, ICRC and CHF. These organisations are largely treated as separate to the UN and INGO consortia approaches. DFID is placed to facilitate this best.	Reject	Recommendation is unclear. Clarification sought from Transtec.	The intent here is to ensure that there is greater coherence between the DFID multi-year approach and its expected outcomes/outputs and what the Humanitarian Response Plan and Consolidated Appeal process set forth. This is inherent in coherence—that all major approaches and programmes are aligned with a common strategy. UNHCR and ICRC are mentioned, somewhat awkwardly, as they tend to fall beyond this common strategy as well.
<b>Efficiency 7.11</b>	5	Develop a set of ratios and systematic-based indicators to gauge the effectiveness of	Accept	Effectiveness of resilience will be measured during the impact evaluation of the MYHP. Terms of	

## DFID response to Real Time Evaluation Recommendations

		resilience. These should draw on common models, best practices and literature related to financial management and complex adaptive systems.		Reference for the evaluation take into account VfM on resilience	
<b>Effectiveness 8.1.2</b>	6	Develop metrics for measuring community engagement and how this contributes to better results for beneficiaries. This may include an analysis of different community engagement methods and their advantages, disadvantages, constraints, opportunities and risks.	Accept	BRCiS has developed indicators and continues to measure community engagement	See comments related to recommendation 2.
	7	Investigate the potential 'return' associated with longer start-up times that have occurred given the multi-year funding approach.	Accept	Follow up with Transtec	
	8	Ensure that IRF allocations are based on formal early warning and triggers rather than gaps in funding and/or budget shortfalls.	Accept	Process evaluation on the IRF will give indications on the basis of allocations for the IRF. Adoption of agreed triggers has been slow-but progress is being made and we are confident that some form of early warning triggers will be agreed in 2016.	

## DFID response to Real Time Evaluation Recommendations

8.1.3	9	DFID should limit information requests to those that are directly pertinent to partner performance and results. Ad hoc information requests should be limited, if not eliminated.	Partially Accept	DFID requests to partners need to be more structured however partners need to be flexible to respond to ad hoc information requests that arise out of necessity	Fair enough.
8.1.4	10	Have a detailed plan for how M&E system will achieve core objectives and functionality. DFID should ensure that the third party M&E contractor focuses on key functionality and data collection before entertaining any additional functionality.	Accept	Completed	