



IFRC Management Response to Recommendations for Look Back Study of Community-Based Development Initiative project

Background information:

- **Date and duration of evaluation:** August – October 2015, 8 weeks (4 weeks carried out without consultant, 4 weeks carried out under the lead of the consultant with 25 billable days).
- **Evaluator/s:** John Vijghen, Lead Consultant (external consultant), Selina Chan, WASH delegate IFRC Bangladesh, Shakhawat Hossain, Monitoring and Reporting Officer IFRC Bangladesh, IFRC Md. Sazzad Ansari, senior PMER officer IFRC Bangladesh.
- **Evaluation Management Response Team members:** Selina Chan, WASH delegate IFRC Bangladesh, Keramot Ali, Programme Coordinator Community Development (CD) department BDRCS, and Stuart Jordon, WASH Practice Lead Australian Red Cross (ARC).
- **Background Information:** The Community-based Development Initiative (CDI) project was implemented by the BDRCS with funding from the IFRC through remaining funds of the Cyclone Sidr Operation. The project was implemented in two communities in each of the four districts of Nilphamari, Natore, Kushtia and Magura from May 2010 to June 2012. The project was a first of its kind implemented by BDRCS in tackling community-based disaster resilience through an integrated and holistic development approach with activities for 12 intervention sectors. The Look Back Study (LBS) focuses on the water and sanitation and hygiene (WASH) component of the project but some additional information was collected alongside the WASH data.

Summary of Management Response: This management response is developed in direct connection to the LBS finalised in October 2015 with a total number of 7 recommendations. While most of these recommendations will be implemented in the continuation of the CDI project - the CDI 2 WASH project implemented 2014-2017 - some recommendations of the evaluation indeed cover working methods and systems of the IFRC Country Office and the BDRCS that are beyond the scope of this particular project. The management response team's ambition is therefore to share the learnings from the LBS with other departments of the BDRCS and other programme teams of the IFRC Country Office.

Recommendation 1: Tube wells in known arsenic project locations should be tested or retested to assure that the water is safe for drinking by humans. Similarly, distributed arsenic filters should be checked to assure that they are maintained properly. This testing should be done by appropriate local government agencies, while the local BDRCS unit should support the government agency and facilitate this process. To this end the IFRC should encourage and support the BDRCS to allocate resources to the units and/or lobby the central and local government to allocate funds.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
X Accepted	Was completed	Continue to follow government protocol for water testing	Fixed practice	Each WASH project manager
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially				



accepted				
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected				
Comments:				
<p>Recommendation 2: BDRCS units in the former CDI 1 project areas should systematically follow-up on benefits and activities remaining from the project implementation, to assure continuity of development and sustainability of assets and behavioural change. This can likely be done without much financial input as the units are established and do have access to contact persons (e.g. youth leader, former community organiser) and community committees. However, the IFRC should encourage the BDRCS to allocate the necessary funds to the units for this purpose and organise training to the unit's staff on the follow-up approach if required.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected		Community fund already started after the project, with community development committee, and the fund becomes registered with social welfare department as a CSO. A guideline has to be formalised as to how tariffs are spent, and to develop a self monitoring 'participatory' package to go with the guidelines for the CDC.	6 to 12mths	CD department of BDRCS. ARC support with specific examples that exist in the Pacific context
Comments:				
<p>Recommendation 3: BDRCS's activities should be promoted and made visible through promotional material and using appropriate communication channels, such as websites and social media, not only during but also after any project has closed. It should be avoided that project funds will be used to facilitate any promotional activity which is not directly benefiting the communities concerned, for example by hosting VIP dinners and excursions. Good examples for promotional activities would be to organise and document in-formation and follow-up meetings at concerned communities using the Community Information Centres provided by the project. Such documentary material could be linked to websites and communicated through social media.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		Every quarter a case study is produced, and distributed to the CS WASH Fund. Will be delivered also to the relevant Bangladesh WASH	During CDI WASH programme	CD department of BDRCS.



<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted		sector website, essentially written for donors. BBC media stories of the project will be televised nationally.		
--	--	---	--	--

Comments:

Recommendation 4: The project plans should have included transparent and efficient target area selection procedures based upon clearly defined and documented criteria. Target area selections should be done using clear criteria and through a transparent and documented process. Baseline survey data should be accurate to avoid that distributions are made in less needed areas. No procedure or criteria for the district and community selection process was found in any available document, while also some key informants not could explain why four districts were selected for the relative small target group of about 2.150 households. Spreading this target group over four districts - which each are populated with multiple millions of households without essential basic needs – seems in hindsight not efficient. Indeed, project efforts and inputs have therefore been more than otherwise would have been needed to serve the same number of beneficiaries. Furthermore, including one community in an urban slum area seemed similarly inappropriately for this rural-based approach. Protocols should be developed for strict implementation of every target selection. Independent third parties should be consulted to assure that the selection criteria are appropriate and that baseline data is correctly collected and reported. Look Back Studies should include assessment of the appropriateness of the target selections.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected		A selection process procedure will be documented to ensure that locations of projects are selected based on need, vulnerability and criteria, from BDRCS level, down to village level. It will be evidence based, considering national level data, UNICEF, MIMU, etc, and protocols should exist from national level through each government / RC level down to village level.	Before any new WASH project concept paper commences	CD department of BDRCS.

Comments:

Recommendation 5: When designing project waste disposal or composting activities these should include recycling plastic and other non-biological waste. In urban or rural areas the collection of such waste should be done collectively by local government or through licensed private waste collectors so that non-degradable waste not will end up in the environment. It could be considered to involve local entrepreneurs for this waste collection as income generation.

Management	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------	----------------



<p>Response</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected</p>	<p>Terms of reference, funding and a specialist or consultant environmental engineer would be required to facilitate this worthy recommendation. As a minimum, existing environmental sanitation approach should be documented</p>	<p>A standardised approach to environmental sanitation will be developed.</p> <p>Establish ToR using the recommendation as a background, Secure funding, recruit a consultant environmental engineer to consult with stakeholders, design and scope a pilot site for any new pipeline WASH project approval. Document lessons learned for inclusion in subsequent WASH projects</p>	<p>12mths</p>	<p>CD department of BDRCS and ARC.</p>
<p>Comments:</p>				
<p>Recommendation 6: Future projects should be designed as integrated and holistic approaches, including all sectors that have been determined as relevant for action through needs assessments. If not all sector activities can be implemented by Red Crescent Society or affiliated societies, for lack of funds or expertise, other civil society organisations and/or government agencies should be encouraged to join as a partner so that the successful CDI model can be replicated as a whole. This strategy should be adopted for all development projects.</p>				
<p>Management Response</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected</p>	<p>Decision Rationale</p>	<p>Action/s to be taken</p> <p>The CDI model is already documented, but requires revision to include learnings, including the recommendations taken forward from this look back study. Specific attention should be made to distinguish approaches to project design, participation, community management, hygiene behaviour change, water supply, sanitation, environmental sanitation, and how other sectors and themes are interlinked.</p> <p>Develop a common WASH approach</p>	<p>Timeframe</p> <p>12 to 18 months</p>	<p>Responsibility</p> <p>CD department of BDRCS with support from ARC.</p>
<p>Comments:</p>				
<p>Recommendation 7: Any future attempts to collect quantitative baseline or endline data should consider the lessons learned during this Look Back Study, in particular regarding baseline-endline comparison and proper survey interview techniques to assure consistency and appropriateness. Any survey should</p>				



include data on gender, education and basic needs issues. Also, the need for quantitative data collection methods should be carefully determined in view of financial and human resource inputs. In general, a qualitative assessment should always be part of the Look Back Study process and better could precede any quantitative survey. In that way qualitative findings can be measured during the qualitative survey to assess spread and depth.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected		Qualitative and quantitative surveys will always be combined for future baseline surveys, and a comprehensive MAGPI tool will be developed A proper sampling methodology will be used, which considers follow up endline surveys.	18 months	CD department of BDRCS with support from ARC
Comments:				