

Evaluation Report Title: Independent Impact Assessment of the Chars Livelihoods Programme Phase 1

Response to Evaluation Report

1. Introduction

1.1 DFID, AusAID and the CLP Management Agency welcome this independent report which contains many helpful findings and recommendations. Although it is difficult for independent evaluators to provide a comprehensive analysis of a complex project in such a short period of time, an independent view is an important tool to verify the results of UK funding and scrutinise the management of the project. We will discuss the issues raised with our partners. Our conclusions will help us to strengthen the design and shape of the second phase of the Chars Livelihoods Programme (CLP-2), and ensure value for money for UK taxpayers. It will also inform other similar initiatives in Bangladesh and elsewhere.

Overall, the impact assessment provided us with valuable insights on the impact of the programme. This also helped us to identify a number of methodological challenges, particularly related to measurement of poverty, which came out only during the assessment. We will use the learning to design any future evaluation of CLP-2.

In this management response we provide our comments on the findings, process and the overall recommendations from the independent impact assessment.

2. Impact Assessment Findings and Methodological Challenges

2.1 DFID, AusAID and the CLP Management Agency agree with many of the key findings of the IIA.

2.2 However, we still remain unconvinced by the IIA team's baseline average income (of Taka 20 – 24 per person per day: see page 20) on which a number of their conclusions depend. The IIA team's baseline is substantially higher than that found in previous income studies in the chars, and calls into question whether landless, assetless (with assets of less than Taka 5000 – equivalent to under £50) and jobless people on the *chars* are actually among the poorest in Bangladesh.

The CLP team suggests that the IIA team should have excluded a number of key income streams from their baseline calculations the period between February 2009 – January 2010 as they were a direct result from the CLP inputs during the same time period (most notably the income earned from agriculture and savings). Although the IIA team did not fully accept this view, they undertook sensitivity analyses after advice from the expert panel that specifically excluded these two income streams (see pages 20-21 and 24-25; Section 4.11 and Table 4.3 and 4.4). However, the IIA team chose not to use the range of possible impacts from the sensitivity analyses elsewhere in the

document e.g. for calculating the range of numbers of people lifted above the selected poverty line, instead retaining their focus on the minima rather than the full minima-maxima range. A more detailed analysis of the CLP Management's justification why the IIA team's baseline figure is an over-estimate is attached as Annex 1.

2.3 Related to the above, we also believe that the IIA team's choice of headlines to report (e.g. the quoted figure of a minimum of 12,490 households lifted above the Taka 18 poverty line but not including the full range) is misleading. Almost all of the core households experienced increasing incomes over time. It would have been more appropriate to present the headline as a range of between 12,490 households (24%) and 29,281 households (56.5%) lifted above the extreme poverty line of Taka18 per person per day as a result of their participation in the CLP (i.e. attributable; see pages 24 - 26). On completion of CLP-1, on average, about 87% of CLP participants (cohort 2 and 3) have income above the extreme poverty line of Taka18 per person per day (pp. 25-26 : Table 4.4 and 4.5).

2.4 One of the areas that the IIA focused on was milk production. The report studied 80 households from the 2nd year of intake. The conclusions drawn (e.g. incidence of 35% calf mortality; see page 32) were not in line with the CLP's programme experiences and similar national studies, and would raise serious concerns if true. The CLP subsequently commissioned an additional independent survey to validate the findings related to calf mortality, calving rates and cattle-derived livelihoods. The study was conducted by the Bangladesh Agricultural University and contradicted many of the findings from the IIA (e.g. calf mortality at 7% rather than 35%; calving rates at 43% rather than 33%; milk yields at 1.9 litre/cow/day rather than 0.25 litre/cow/day; and 100% of households with dairy cattle had at least one heifer to bring forward).

2.5 Overall, the IIA team did not fully appreciate how participants in the CLP programme effectively used and transferred their assets, which, for the majority of people were their cattle. The IIA reports a "tendency to regard the cow (and her progeny) as a disposable, rather than an appreciating, asset" and "following the end of CLP-1 cows were often sold". These statements implicitly assume that some comparatively poor choices were being made or that the sales were inappropriate and contrary to the broader CLP aims. In reality, cattle are both appreciating and disposable assets. The CLP encouraged selling cattle, and re-investment of the proceeds from their sale in a variety of income generating activities at the appropriate time for the household. The CLP seeks to help households to maximise their profits (e.g. by selling cattle just before the Eid festivities), and not re-investing in cattle alone. Many beneficiaries choose to diversify into other agricultural investments e.g. leasing land.

2.6 On page 15, the IIA team state: "While we found no evidence to suggest it, there is the possibility that [the] enrolment of such a large number [of people] under pressure of time may have prejudiced implementation standards." The IIA team should also have pointed out that it is equally possible that extensive experience up to this point may have improved

standards. Although the CLP enrolled a large number of core participant households during cohort 1.4, the Programme had at this point gained sound experience in training implementing NGO staff, monitoring the NGO implementation, developing systems to reduce the risk of leakage, developing financial management systems etc. The CLP had after all been through the cycle three times previously.

2.7 We consider that the IIA could also have explained more clearly the additional benefits of the CLP to non-core households. Other programme activities included: the provision of health services (706,000 patients were seen through satellite health clinics – including both core and non-core participants); 44,500 people participated in market initiatives in poultry rearing; as well as collective milk marketing and commercial fodder production (approximately 75% of these beneficiaries were not core participants).

3. Independent Impact Assessment (IIA) Process

3.1 The CLP IIA has been a very useful learning exercise in terms of drawing important lessons for country offices managing independent impact assessments. Key lessons from this process include:

- DFID Advisers overseeing such evaluations should have a minimum level of competence in evaluation methodologies and design, including evaluation management. Evaluation Department and regional results, statistics and evaluation advisers provide additional support, but where the IIA is managed by the country office it is essential that the lead adviser is conversant with the latest technical and methodological aspects of evaluations of this kind. This had a positive impact on this project.
- Strong evaluation governance arrangements are an important aspect of the commissioning and management process and inclusion of an expert steering panel and management group should be considered. We found this particularly useful in supporting both DFID advisers, programme management and support staff and the IIA team, by providing independent scrutiny and challenge on the choice of methods, approaches, views and perspectives when necessary.
- The commissioning process for the evaluation design should prioritise skills in the evaluation methodology and approach to be used, while previous experience of independent consultants in programmes similar to that being evaluated is not necessarily a significant advantage.
- Although there is a clear need to maintain their independence, the impact assessment team should ideally try to validate the interim results and conclusions with key stakeholders, including operational and programme management staff. Some of the apparent misunderstandings and misinterpretations of the CLP programme design could have been resolved much earlier in the evaluation management process with more frequent interactions and opportunities for feedback and clarification. Opportunities for sharing interim results and discussion of initial findings should be given

sufficient time in the management and commissioning process.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Overall DFID, AusAID and the CLP Management Agency agree with the key recommendations of the IIA. Brief comments on all are listed below.

4.2 Recommendations for Donors:

4.2.1 We fully agree with the need for evidence based decision making, and regular independent reviews (recommendations 1 – 3). For CLP-2 DFID has set aside up to £2 million for monitoring, evaluation, audit and other forms of supervision.

4.2.2 We fully agree with the 4th recommendation to ensure that a range of relevant poverty indicators are collected, to ensure that both intended and unintended consequences are effectively tracked. We also agree with the need to address the inherent complexity and contextual factors to include multi-dimensional indicators of poverty – and not to focus solely on a single linear indicator such as income.

4.2.3. Regarding value for money (recommendation 5), we appreciate that it was not possible for the IIA team to investigate the full range of issues envisaged in the TOR. The report usefully highlighted the need to identify additional information about programme costs and activities required. A follow-up study has already been initiated and VfM is now being comprehensively addressed within the CLP.

4.2.4. Recommendation 7 highlights a key limitation of the study. There was a lack of clarity on the proposed graduation criteria and/or a clearly agreed 'threshold' above which people could be considered to have been lifted out of extreme poverty. This forced the team to focus solely on income to address the question: "How many people have been lifted out of extreme poverty?" We partially agree with the recommendation to define clear graduation criteria in the context of a more detailed framework for measurement that feeds into the broader monitoring of DFID-B's operational plan and that is relevant across the extreme poverty portfolio. 'Graduation' out of extreme poverty is context specific, and the *chars* may require a different set of criteria and/or different levels due to their unique geography than some of the other programmes in the DFID portfolio.

4.3 Recommendations for CLP-2:

4.3.1. We agree with first recommendation to review and build broader ownership of the CLP-2 log-frame. A review was conducted in late 2011, and we will ensure that the Logframe is reviewed at each annual review to check its relevance.

4.3.2. We also agree with the second recommendation to improve the balance of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and to ensure effective qualitative monitoring of CLP.

4.3.3. Regarding Value for Money (recommendation 3) a study has been commissioned by the CLP Management Agency to assess the data requirements and to ensure that adequate systems are in place to conduct a more comprehensive VfM exercise in the future.

4.3.4. Regarding recommendation (4) to improve IMO (Implementing NGO) performance through annual feedback sessions, opportunities to improve will continue to be reviewed. The CLP Team already undertake regular meetings with all IMOs and there are quarterly meetings between CLP unit managers and Programme Managers from implementing NGOs. The frequency of these will be reviewed.

4.3.5. Recommendation 5 usefully highlights the disappointing findings regarding the longevity of key institutions after 18 months of CLP support, with suggested implications for sustainability. We accept that there could be opportunities to provide additional strategic support beyond the core 18 months. Examples already underway include testing the use of village health workers as facilitators for Village Savings and Loans groups.

4.3.6. We agree with recommendation 6 that field staff should be given a clearer understanding of why women are selected for the programme.

5. Summary of Actions taken since completion of the Independent Impact Assessment

5.1 Since the IIA, CLP has taken the following actions, partly in response to findings from the IIA process and study:

1. Reviewed the selection and graduation criteria; a set of multi-dimensional graduation criteria has been developed for phase 2;
2. Completed a study on seasonality and its effects on migration and remittances;
3. Gained a better understanding of share-cropping and the broader contributions to income;
4. Undertaken a study to assess the data requirements and to ensure effective systems are in place to conduct a VfM exercise in the future. A VfM strategy has been developed for phase 2;
5. Introduced an additional control group to assess the impact of CLP 2. This control is a random sample of households from villages which will not be included in the programme for at least 2 years. This is in addition to continuing the rolling baseline approach used in CLP 1, and should greatly strengthen the attribution under an Impact Assessment of CLP 2 by allowing for a stronger and more robust 'counterfactual';
6. Commissioned an independent survey to validate the IIA findings related to calf mortality, calving rates and cattle-derived livelihoods;
7. Introduced more qualitative approaches to monitoring and evaluation.
8. Reviewed Village Savings and Loan Association sustainability

Annex 1 – Key points to justify why the baseline income for ATP 4 during the period between Feb 2009 and Jan 2010 should exclude income from agriculture and savings

- **Income from agricultural sources:** On entry to CLP, all households were landless with no access to land; and even share-croppers were excluded. Therefore, if income was obtained from agricultural products after a period with the CLP, it is certain that these products must have been derived from land that the CLP helped households to procure through the sale of an asset provided by CLP;
- **Income from homestead gardens:** Before entry to the CLP, most extreme poor households lived at (or close to) the river level and were therefore fully flood-prone. As the report suggests, most of these families were likely to have had a “garden”. Up to this point, CLP management agrees that some (albeit very small) income could have accrued from the existing gardens. However, in practice management observed that for those extremely poor families not yet in the CLP the full extent of homestead gardens tended to be a few pumpkin plants (*pit crops*) climbing over the roof of their homes. On entry to CLP, households are raised on earthen plinths well above the flood levels, provided with training on how to establish and improve both bed and pit gardens, and given over a dozen different varieties of high quality seeds together with several fruit tree saplings. Thus we would argue that the programme had a real influence on the incomes accruing from homestead gardens;
- **Income from livestock:** During the period used to develop the baseline (between Feb. 2009 and Jan. 2010), 40% of the sampled ATP-4 households actively traded cattle they had purchased with CLP funds. This contributed an income of approximately Taka 3,400 per household or about Taka 1,400 if spread across the entire cohort. Many families also reported incomes from milk and manure sales but these sources of income are not considered to have been influenced by the CLP. The IIA team have assumed this income did not arise from cattle sales (plus milk and manure) but was instead derived from shared cattle or *Adhi*. However, a registration census of all ATP-4 households on entry to the programme showed that only 8% of ATP-4 households had any cattle-sharing arrangements. The IIA team may not have fully understood the complex cattle-sharing arrangements on the chars. Cattle-sharing is not a lucrative occupation and could not account for the uplift in income recorded, especially not when considered alongside the comparatively small numbers of households that actively cattle-share;
- **Income from savings drawdown:** During registration at entry to the programme, levels of savings were recorded. Registration showed that few families (less than 5%) possessed any savings and, when they did, they were less than Taka 600. Nevertheless, the IIA team state that beneficiaries were most likely “under-reporting income (notably savings)...” during registration. The Management team dispute this and believe that the savings of approximately Taka 6,300 reported during the year were not present on entry, and were generated from

the sale of cattle provided earlier by the CLP. This error probably arose because while the IIA Team did subtract any money reinvested from the sale of assets for a given month; the approach requires that the double transaction (selling and then re-buying) occurs in the same month. It is more likely that households sold cattle in one month – just prior to Eid is the most common time – but logically did not reinvest until the following month when the price of cattle falls significantly in local markets. The income from the sale would firstly enter “savings” and, when spent the following month to purchase assets, would become income from “savings drawdown”. Not surprisingly, if the reader refers to figures 4.1 to 4.3, they will note that incomes increase for households in all phases during the period November through to December 2009; coinciding exactly with the key Eid cattle selling season (in that year). With 40% of ATP-4 households selling animals in the reference year, Management believe the income uplift was more likely to have come from cattle trading than under-reported savings on entry.

Evaluation Report Title: Independent Impact Assessment of the Chars Livelihoods Programme Phase 1

Recommendations	Accepted or Rejected	If “Accepted”, Action plan for Implementation or if “Rejected”, Reason for Rejection
Recommendations for the donors:		
1. Any future programme-level decisions should be made based on the evidence of independent reviews of the programme. Reviewing discrete parts of the programme (e.g. the pilots and social development) commissioned by those responsible for their implementation is not sufficient in this regard;	Accepted Already under implementation	We fully agree with the need for evidence based decision making, and regular independent reviews (recommendations 1 – 3). For CLP-2 DFID has set aside up to £2 million for monitoring, evaluation, audit and other forms of supervision.
2. The future mid-term review and end of programme evaluation of CLP-2 should feature the following: a minimum three-week duration; a monitoring and evaluation specialist to support IML (and the Enterprise Development Unit); the revision of the log frame in line with programme developments; and equal importance being placed on the assessment of output to purpose assumptions (validity and value) and indicators;	Partially accepted Already implemented	Issues at the time of the mid-term review (and therefore the scope of the review) will define the duration and team composition. The mid-term review team will include expertise related to Market Development as well as M&E, in general. The logical framework will of course be reviewed and updated (as is the case after each annual review). The end of programme evaluation may go well beyond three-week duration (see below).
3. An ex-post impact assessment of both phases of CLP should be commissioned at the earliest one year after CLP-2 has been completed. The window of opportunity for establishing a RCT (Randomised Control Trial) approach covering the	Partially accepted Work in progress	Evaluations of programmes within the DFID Bangladesh portfolio are prioritised based on the evidence base and an appraisal against agreed criteria set out in the DFID Bangladesh Evaluation Strategy. If further evaluation of CLP is prioritised, the exact timing of this will be dependent on the design and methods of the

<p>whole of CLP-2 has already passed. However, based on lessons learnt from this assessment on how mixing cohorts across most villages resulted in disturbing the counterfactual, IML should commence monitoring a counterfactual sample at least two years in advance of exposure to programme interventions (to eliminate disturbance by direct programme impacts).</p> <p>The ToR should also make provision for fresh data collection. The limited fresh data collection for this IA points to the value of this as a cross-check and amplification of data collected by CLP-1.</p> <p>If DFID leads the next IA then it is recommended that its Evaluation Department, rather than the country office, commissions and manages the process, with support from an expert panel.</p>		<p>evaluation. The CLP Innovation, Monitoring and Learning (IML) Division continues with the rolling baseline approach but has also incorporated an additional counterfactual group to act as a comparison group for cohort 2.3. This counterfactual will be drawn from villages in which no CLP activities will take place for two years. After 2 years this counterfactual group will receive CLP support.</p> <p>The provision for fresh data collection will be considered.</p> <p>DFID evaluation policy supports a decentralised management of evaluations at the country level where the Lead Adviser of the Programme leads the process with inputs from the country Evaluation Adviser and central Evaluation Department. All terms of reference for evaluations and evaluation reports are now independently quality assured and governance arrangements that include external evaluation expertise are advised for all evaluations.</p>
<p>4. Overall care should be taken to avoid one specific target for a programme being preferred over other both in terms of importance in implementation and M&E (e.g. household incomes over women’s empowerment). There is a need to</p>	<p>Accepted Already implemented</p>	<p>We fully agree with this recommendation to ensure that a range of relevant poverty indicators are collected, to ensure that both intended and unintended consequences are effectively tracked. We also agree with the need to address the inherent complexity and contextual factors to include multi-dimensional indicators of</p>

<p>monitor potential unintended consequences at different levels (in this case at the community level or at the intra-household level). This will allow for understanding, mitigation and defence of unintended consequences in the interests of the overall objective;</p>		<p>poverty – and not to focus solely on a single linear indicator such as income.</p>
<p>5. As CLP-2 is already underway, there is an urgent need to determine what information about programme costs and activities is required to monitor and assess the value being achieved from the programme;</p>	<p>Accepted VfM strategy developed, data requirement study carried out.</p>	<p>We agree with the need to identify additional information about programme costs and activities required. A follow-up study (VfM data requirement study) has already been carried out and VfM is now being comprehensively addressed within the CLP. A CLP Specific VfM strategy will be developed.</p>
<p>6. Revise down expectations on reductions in illegal social practices and transformative change for CLP-2. Most aid programmes cannot realistically be expected to transform entrenched values, norms and exchange systems, as well as provide effective relief to extreme poor households within 18 months;</p>	<p>Accepted Already implemented – further review will be done during annual reviews.</p>	<p>DFID-B accepts this recommendation. This is unrealistic in the short life-span of the Programme and in the context of Bangladeshi society. We will consider this during review of the Log Frame indicators and target milestone.</p>
<p>7. The use and definition of ‘graduation’ criteria in the context of a monitoring framework that feeds into the monitoring of DFID-B’s Operational Plan needs to be finalised and should be relevant across DFID-B’s extreme poverty portfolio.</p>	<p>Partially accepted Char specific CLP’s Graduation criteria already developed.</p>	<p>We partially agree with the recommendation to define clear graduation criteria in the context of a more detailed monitoring framework that feeds into the broader monitoring of DFID-B’s operational plan and that is more relevant across the extreme poverty portfolio. ‘Graduation’ out of extreme poverty is context specific, and the <i>chars</i> may require a different set of criteria and/or different levels due to their unique geography than some of the other programmes in the DFID portfolio.</p>

Recommendations for the CLP:		
<p>1.To review the Logframe developed for CLP-2 through helping to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It adequately defines the vertical logic or the basis for the programme’s theory of change that clearly distinguishes what CLP does and what it delivers (its activities and outputs) with the short and longer-term changes these are expected to bring about, where, to what extent and among whom (CLP-2’s outcomes and impacts). • The envisaged changes at household level are associated with indicators that are adequately and precisely defined in both quantitative and qualitative terms. • Reference is clearly made to any systemic changes envisaged by the programme relating to the continued functioning and performance of Village Development Committees (VDCs), Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLAs) and <i>Char Shasthya Karmis</i> (CSKs/Char health workers) and Paravets. • Its contents (including its assumptions) are used to define the primary design factors for 	<p>Accepted</p> <p>On-going, Logframe has already been revised in line with the recommendations .</p>	<p>We agree with the recommendation to review and build broader ownership of the CLP-2 log-frame. A review was conducted in late 2011, and we will ensure that the Logframe is reviewed at each annual review to check its relevance.</p>

<p>IML's monitoring function.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its contents are periodically revised based on lessons learnt informed by the results of IML's work and recommendations made by external reviews. 		
<p>2. Develop a more balanced approach to monitoring and understanding change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that plans for monitoring change are more balanced than those carried out during CLP-1 in order to provide adequate coverage across the purpose/outcome level indicators. • Design and carry out a set of qualitative case studies among core beneficiary households from CLP-1 to understand why and how increases in their incomes are related to CLP-1 support. • Review the assumptions contained in the CLP-2 Logframe and develop ways in which they can be assessed and the implications communicated to promote learning. • Balance the need to demonstrate impacts upon individuals and households with the need to monitor the existence and performance of 	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Under implementation – qualitative case studies are collected on a regular basis,</p> <p>Logframe revised after the Annual Reviews</p>	<p>We agree to improve the balance of M&E and to ensure effective qualitative monitoring of CLP.</p> <p>Effort will be made to introduce more qualitative approaches to supplement monitoring data. All research will attempt to strike a balance between quantitative and qualitative methods (where appropriate).</p> <p>The CLP Logframe (including assumptions) will be reviewed at least annually.</p> <p>With guidance from a social development consultant the Programme will monitor the existence and performance of structures such as VDCs</p>

<p>structures (e.g. VSLAs and VDCs) post CLP-2 support in parallel with the income and expenditure and nutrition surveys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a complementary approach to enumerator-led questionnaires that provides more voice to beneficiaries (and others) to help CLP assess and understand social and economic change. It is hoped that the qualitative methodology developed for the present IA and its limitations are of some use in this regard. Opportunities for building this into the Social Development Groups, the VDCs and the VSLAs could be usefully explored. 		
<p>3.Develop ways to help assess the economy and efficiency dimensions of Value for Money</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CLP management team, based on Recommendation 5 to donors above, should redesign their information systems, where practicable, that delivers integrated financial and management information accurately and in a timely manner. • To help ensure CLP-2 has an integrated financial management system, output data received from IMOs and CLP district offices 	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Already implemented- further work is in progress</p>	<p>Regarding Value for Money a study has been commissioned by the CLP Management Agency to assess the data requirements and to ensure that adequate systems are in place to conduct a more comprehensive VfM exercise in the future.</p> <p>A CLP specific VfM strategy will also be developed that outlines what improvements the Programme can make in terms of monitoring and packaging information related to economy, efficiency, effectiveness and cost effectiveness with support and guidance from an external VfM expert.</p> <p>This recommendation on integrated financial management system has been put into effect.</p>

<p>should be collated differently at CLP head office to inform on-going, quarterly and annual reports on the performance of each IMO. The following information should be brought together into one performance report: contract values and deliverables; relevant data from monthly financial reports; funds claimed for outputs delivered, as per invoices submitted; outputs reported to CLP Operational Units; and, for annual reports, key lessons learnt, based on feedback from beneficiaries.</p>		
<p>4. Develop opportunities for learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide a basis for improving future IMO performance and for CLP-2 management to support them, the IML and the Operations Division should organise and moderate an annual feedback session with IMOs that is based on achievements and lessons written up in their respective annual reports. Space should be provided in the IMO progress reporting formats in which to articulate lessons learnt. 	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Already implemented through quarterly feedback sessions.</p>	<p>Agreed in principle.</p> <p>The CLP Team undertakes regular formal meetings with all IMOs (Implementing NGOs) and there are quarterly meetings with the Executive Directors (EDs) and Programme Managers. CLP senior management undertake the meetings with EDs while Unit Managers meet with Programme Managers from implementing NGOs. The former are conducted in English and the latter in Bangla. They cover progress, constraints, and provide a platform for lesson learning and sharing. These meetings began in 2009.</p> <p>Further, at approximately quarterly intervals, CLP financial staff undertakes financial audits and provides necessary feedback to individual IMOs.</p> <p>Should problems and issues arise, the CLP prefers to deal with these on a timely basis (as at present) by inviting the relevant EDs to discussions during which feedback is provided rather than on an annual basis as proposed.</p>

<p>5.Enhance prospects for sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To recognise and make clearer the degree to which household benefits derived from the programme depend on the continued and effective functioning of, for example, the operations of Village Development Committees, the Village Savings and Loan Associations and satellite clinics. • Opportunities should be identified for supporting and sustaining critical structures and their functions beyond the main 18 months of support. 	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Work in progress</p>	<p>We accept the recommendation partially that there may be opportunities to provide additional strategic support beyond the core 18 months. Examples already underway include testing the use of village health workers as facilitators for Village Savings and Loans groups. However, structures such as VSLAs and VDCs will only continue post CLP support if their members feel they are valuable.</p> <p>Some projects supported by the Programme such as the health project are not sustainable, nor are they intended to be. This is the reason why the CLP places importance on attracting other service providers.</p>
<p>6.Be more specific about the reasons why women are selected to participate in the Asset Transfer Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To communicate these to women and men – specifically whether it is to do with an objective or more to do with pragmatic reasons that explain why the programme works with residual household members due to male out-migration. 	<p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Work in progress</p>	<p>While this is already quite explicit in CLP operation that it transfers income generating assets to women for female empowerment in both their family and community, the CLP should ensure that it continues to explain this to their field level staff for a clearer understanding.</p>