

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

Evaluation Report Title: Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund Impact Assessment

Response to Evaluation Report (overarching narrative)

DFID Sudan commissioned a review of the DCPSF Phase 1. Undertaken in March 2010, it revealed some concerns about some aspects of the project activities. Specifically, this included the lack of engagement of women and young people in programme activities, and issues around the effectiveness of some partners in implementing activities. With a focus on activities, the review did not look at the outcomes and impacts of the DCPSF activities.

The objective of the DCPSF assessment is to provide an independent opinion on the project impact, identify mechanisms to better capture impact and results and to explore potential exit strategies. Lessons and recommendations from this impact assessment will feed into the current DCPSF phase 2.

As a result of both the review and assessment, a Programme Improvement Plan (PIP) was set out taking forward the recommendations. The PIP was agreed between DFID and the Implementing Partner and entails the detailed tracking of progress on the completion of the objectives, including agreed actions and deadlines. More detail can be found in the table below.

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

A large, empty rectangular box with a black border, intended for the Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan. The box is currently blank and occupies the upper portion of the page.

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

Evaluation Report Title:

Recommendations	Accepted or Rejected	If “Accepted”, Action plan for Implementation or if “Rejected”, Reason for Rejection
1. The capacity of the Technical Secretariat should be strengthened in areas of immediate need such proposal management and project reporting which will free up other resources to improve the management and coordination of the DCPSF with other actors.	Accepted	PIP objective 2; Technical Secretariat is fully staffed and operational.
2. Deepen the time and resources spent on identifying and capacity building local NGOs to complement (and eventually absorb) the work of the INGO implementing partners to improve sustainability. This may further be enhanced through carefully designed partnerships with local state authorities/units.	Accepted	A second phase for the DCPSF Small Grant Program Manager Project has been designed, proposing to take forward capacity building of NGOs for a further 2 years.
3. Develop a DCPSF donor-wide theory of change to commit donors and implementing partners to a shared vision of success which will enable the harmonisation of M&E systems across the portfolio and improve the fund’s evaluability at the both the project and programme level.	Accepted	PIP objective 1: DCPSF Results Framework is amended (considering the impact assessment recommendations) PIP objective 4; Programme reporting against results framework improved
4. Both the DCPSF and the project implementing partners need to develop clear gender policies and strategies. All the partners are dealing with gender issues on an ad hoc basis.	Accepted	PIP objective 10: Programmatic issues and sustainability: Proposal of action points to increase women’s engagement and participation in the DCPSF projects. This has led to a Gender analysis and Strategy development being planned by the Implementing Partner.
5. Develop a DCPSF-wide M&E handbook to ensure that common indicators, measurement approaches and attribution guidance are used allowing consistency in reporting and enabling results to be aggregated.	Accepted	PIP objective 6: M&E system functioning. The Implementing Partner is working on a Monitoring Plan which will be updated quarterly

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

<p>6. Introduce qualitative indicators to assess impact on the ground. Project reporting currently is heavily based on numbers of workshops, number of training sessions and number of participants without qualitative evidence to explain the quality and impact of these numbers.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>PIP objective 1: DCPSF Results Framework is amended (considering the impact assessment recommendations). The implementing partner is planning a workshop in August to review the results framework.</p> <p>PIP objective 6: M&E system functioning. The Implementing Partner is working on a Monitoring Plan which will be updated quarterly</p>
<p>7. A critical assessment of the peace committee model is needed to verify and validate their impact. The DCPSF projects focus on the number of peace committees that they are establishing rather than critically assessing the impact of these committees and the validity of the model.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>PIP objective 3: Evidence of effective DCPSF grassroots peace building initiatives collected and fed into the wider peace for and Darfur agendas. This has led to research on the peace committee model being planned by the Implementer</p>
<p>8. There is a need for more projects specifically designed to engage IDPs in the camps and returnees as well as ex-combatants in peace and livelihood activities;</p>	<p>Rejected</p>	<p>These specific groups are not excluded by the DCPSF, but they are considered to be specific target groups for other types of programming.</p>
<p>9. Organisation of literacy programmes, primary health care services along the opened migration routes in North and West Darfur</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>The call for 2012 proposals included a focus on migratory routes, and the 2012 conflict analysis explicitly included nomadic populations.</p>

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

<p>10. Pressure to engage women at all levels must continue. The focus groups revealed a phenomenon that can be understood as positive discrimination whereby the design and implementation of policies overly favour marginalised and disadvantaged women groups. The focus group discussions also elicited the following targeting recommendations for different types of women:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Priorities for urban women included capacity building in relation to the inclusion of women in decision making, wealth sharing and health (especially in relation to reproductive health and HIV/AIDS); ○ Priorities for agro-pastoralist women included water access closer to their homes, in addition to health and livelihood training; ○ Priorities for nomad women include training on health education for humans and animals, and livelihood training relating to handicrafts and milk production. 	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>PIP objective 10: Programmatic issues and sustainability: Proposal of action points to increase women’s engagement and participation in the DCPSF projects. This has led to a Gender analysis and Strategy development being planned by the Implementing Partner. Opportunities of engaging nomads planned</p>
--	-----------------	---