

CAFOD Management Response to the UKAid Match Fund Mid-Term Review Report October 2014, updated November 2015¹

Overview and timing of this response

This management response was developed by CAFOD to ensure the recommendations of the UKAid Match Fund Mid-Term Review are followed up and the lessons learned are integrated by all parties. The evaluation was carried out from 26 February 2014 to 10 October 2014 by the external consultancy firm partnership ESI/IWEL.

Of the 28 recommendations made by the mid-term review team, we accept 21 (75%) and partially accept the remaining seven (25%).

General comments

We welcome the findings of this review as representing a fair and balanced assessment of the current status of the water and gender projects in our first UKAid Match portfolio, funded by DFID. Our full or partial acceptance of all the recommendations, and supporting commentary, reflects that we are already aware of many of the relative strengths and weaknesses raised by the review, are already building from or addressing many of them, and have learned valuable lessons for the future in managing this scale and type of multi-theme/multi-region/multi-year funding agreement.

We were pleased to see affirmation of the relevance of our projects to the communities and countries of implementation, and the appropriateness of our targeting, recognition of our good stewardship, most notably through working in effective and embedded partnerships, and the conclusions that 'significant numbers of beneficiaries provided with new services and knowledge' and, most importantly, that 'it is clear that important changes in the lives of individuals are occurring through Match Fund projects'.

However, we also accept that there has been variability in the effectiveness of our project implementation, some question marks regarding the efficiency of our allocation process in 2012 and subsequent project delivery, and room for improvement in more realistic assessment and resourcing of technical and M&E capacity, both in relation to our partners, and CAFOD itself. We have also recognised the urgent need to work with our partners to plan exit or transition strategies out of our Match Fund projects, and our future intentions and approaches in relation to water sector work.

The mid-term review has been a particularly useful exercise for us running in parallel with our internal learning review on water, and coinciding with project-level mid-term evaluations. As the mid-term review team highlight, the Match Fund has definitely provided an important opportunity for us to develop an organisational conversation about our water sector work, and all of these processes running in parallel and being able to 'talk' to each other has ensured that this dialogue is actively continuing across CAFOD and involving partners, programmes and humanitarian staff and managers. It has also generated some valuable lessons to inform the way we carry out this type of evaluation in future, which has fed into the recent refresh of our corporate evaluation policy and guidance. The external perspective of the mid-term review team and the insights they have been able to provide from their experience and expertise have been valuable for us at project, country and organisational levels, and reinforced our learning processes.

The review has also satisfactorily met its accountability objectives, allowing DFID to understand our progress at a portfolio level. DFID's UKAid Match Results and Evaluation Advisor (in Education and Partnerships) has read the report and confirmed that the review appears to have provided us with very useful and pointed feedback at different levels, with the report appearing valid and demonstrating good expertise. We appreciate DFID's willingness to finance this mid-term review and contribute towards our internal 'water workshop' to support cross-programme learning between country and partner staff.

¹ We agreed with DFID to update this response following our Year 3 annual reporting in June 2015, so that this could include detail on specific follow-up actions once our 2015-20 strategic direction and associated resourcing decisions were confirmed.

Response to specific recommendations²

Rec. ID ³	Recommendation	Accept, partially accept or reject?	Commentary
5.1 Programme management			
PM1	<p>Meaningful Outcomes: Design future programme log frames around meaningful project outcomes, considered at community or other appropriate level. (Partners then need support to monitor, analyse and report these, beyond activity level.)</p>	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any future ‘global’ log frames or results frameworks for any similar multi-theme/multi-country grant agreements will be better informed by our underlying thematic theories of change, with overarching outcome indicators which incorporate qualitative aspects relating to the depth and sustainability of our programming, as well as breadth, but still allow sufficient flexibility for more country or partner contextualisation underneath that, at the project level. • Since this programme was designed in 2012, we have further developed our theories of change in all key thematic areas, which can inform better design of results frameworks. For instance, this was the case with our most recent application to DFID’s now restricted UK Aid Match scheme. • The unrestricted nature of funding under this first UKAid Match agreement introduced challenges in identifying suitably generic global indicators which could be applied to the large number and wide range of proposed projects included under this grant, and to partners with varying starting points in terms of technical capacity. • New organisational guidance on definitions of goals, outcomes, outputs, activities, etc. have been incorporated into our Programme Management Manual to support a broader common understanding across CAFOD programmes. • We are still identifying areas for improvement in our own definition of indicators, such as suggesting changes to the former activity-level wording used for our gender mainstreaming output indicators. • We are exploring more meaningful organisational-level indicators and ways to evidence progress towards the Aims and Priorities under our strategic framework, <i>Just One World</i>. These go beyond aggregating numbers of overall beneficiary reach under our different thematic areas. • We will continue to work with our partners to better understand the changes expected through projects, and strengthen this within our project appraisal and grant approval mechanisms.

² The recommendations can be found on pages 27-29 of the detailed final evaluation report.

³ Please note the numbering sequence in the following table reflects that used by the mid-term review consultants in the report.

PM2.	Programme Planning and Project Selection:		
PM2.1	Build on the existing processes for selection of project areas and targets; and for careful project selection for funding. In the latter, however, ensure that staff and partner capacity are considered.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unrestricted nature of this first UKAid Match funding agreement, and the unexpectedly large amount of income generated, meant that equitable opportunity for project selection across our five regions of work was one important criterion, as is the case with CAFOD’s standard allocation of General Funds across all sources of unrestricted income. Our partnership principle of subsidiarity also applied, as partner and programme teams closer to communities put forward project proposals for prioritisation within regions/portfolios. • CAFOD does not only work with partners with established technical capacity in a given area, as they may be working in and with exactly the communities and people we need to reach. Supporting our partners to develop skills and experience in areas which enhances their ability to serve these communities is therefore fundamental to us. This UKAid Match funding agreement was an opportunity to develop the capacity of partners in some countries which little prior experience of working in water, but where community water needs had been identified. Initial capacity assessments informed concept note development and budget planning - CAFOD teams and partners identified anticipated needs and, where necessary, allocated resources for technical support, new staff, consultants, etc. • However, we have built CAFOD’s own capacity to understand and work with partners on capacity development since (this programme’s inception in) 2012. We have finalised our ‘Partnership Guiding Paper: Capacity Development’, and supporting tools for capacity needs identification/assessment/planning and resourcing. Where partner capacity needs are identified, in relation to three areas (organisational, thematic, compliance), this will be taken forward in new capacity development planning at partner and country-programme levels. • Future project selection for any similar restricted multi-theme/multi-regional grant agreements will continue to be informed by our country strategy/position papers, which inform identification of priority thematic and geographic areas. Specific projects which would contribute towards achieving these aims are then identified. For instance, this was the case with our second successful application to DFID’s now restricted UKAid Match scheme. We do recognise, however, that there will always be an element of opportunism in relation to responding to suitable institutional donor funding calls. • Our water projects have, where possible, been designed with reference to national or local standards or government priorities, and we welcome the findings of the review regarding the relevance of our projects.

PM2.2	It is beyond the remit of this review to look at CSP processes, but good procedures along with adequate staff resource for active management, project monitoring and oversight are important dimensions of strategic planning.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We fully agree and there is an existing policy and guidance in place for country strategy paper development and reflection processes. • Our response to PM2.1, regarding the importance we originally placed on equitable allocation (as one of the ways we used to allocate the funds) and the opportunity for capacity development, is also relevant here. • However, we also accept that: (a) there is some room for improvement in linking our regional and country annual resource allocation processes to sign-off on country strategy papers (CSPs), and specifically of the accompanying resource development plans, and we will be looking into ways of addressing this during the coming months, within parameters set by our forthcoming corporate funding framework; (b) we need to guide and support CSP development and reflection processes; (c) greater senior management oversight and forward planning of CSP development/reflection is needed across our International Programme Management teams in future.
PM3 Staff Capacity and Roles			
PM3.1	Avoid overstressing available capacity, both in technical support and management. Consider the workload inherent in a programme, bearing in mind existing staff and partner skills as well as the variety and geographical spread of the programme. Where regions or countries are relatively inexperienced, build in the use of staff capacity and experience from elsewhere to support them.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This recommendation echoes findings from our own internal learning review, that we ‘must ensure [we have] adequate human resources to implement our approach to water. However, CAFOD teams and partners allocated resources within their budget proposals for additional technical support, new staff, consultants, etc., and we also engaged an external consultant to assess project proposals and provide technical recommendations to be followed by the teams. The findings of this review do indicate that some of these processes were not optimal, but attempts were made at the inception of the programme to avoid the potential for ‘overstretch’. • See our responses to PM2.1 and PM3.3 regarding our approach to capacity development, which are also relevant here. We will also look for more opportunities for partner-to-partner peer review and learning, such as those adopted in our recent mid-term reviews in East Africa and Southern Africa regions. • See our response to PP2.1 regarding our approach to risk assessment/management, which is also relevant here. • The unrestricted nature of funding under this first UKAid Match agreement was an opportunity to develop the capacity of partners in some countries which had little prior experience of working in water, but where community water needs had been identified. Our subsequent second and third successful applications under DFID’s now restricted UKAid Match scheme have included larger projects with fewer partners. • This relates to wider reflections coming out of our strategic review process on how we can best use CAFOD’s unrestricted General Funds to support partner capacity development, recognising that the opportunities to do this with restricted institutional funding are likely to be more limited.

PM3.2	Because humanitarian response is likely periodically to require the reallocation of staff roles, maintain some "slack" in the system (perhaps by allowing relatively elongated project time frames), so that movement of key personnel does not unduly disrupt project delivery.	Partially accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In September 2014, we added additional capacity to our humanitarian surge team, with a new Emergency Response Officer focusing on WASH, who would be the first line of any CAFOD response to an emergency situation. In the short term, this should reduce the need for programme staff working on UKAid Match projects to be reallocated to humanitarian response (e.g. as was the case with our response to the Philippines typhoon) for the remaining grant period. • We are exploring options in relation to our future models and resourcing of water technical support provision to partners. This may include training staff with a background in development to also be able to work in humanitarian situations. We will take a wider approach to this and not limit capacity issues to our own staffing structures. Capacities can be addressed in a number of different ways, which go beyond more staff or training. Our November 2014 strategic review has committed CAFOD to explore more effective ways of sourcing and supporting local in-country technical support for our implementing partners, where needed. • Planning and resourcing adequate 'backfill' capacity in the event of any short-term secondments of programme staff to humanitarian response will remain important to allow continued project delivery. Being able to build in 'slack' for institutionally-funded projects (which any future water work is more likely to be) is unlikely, but in the event of any major crisis which requires significant staff capacity, we would approach the donor for a dialogue about any potential delays. • We have also prioritised the capacity development of a group of strategic partners to prepare, plan and respond to emergencies through our Humanitarian Capacity Development Programme. In the long term, the increasing role of these partners in managing and leading emergency responses will be key.
PM3.3	Where CAFOD capacity needs augmenting, promote the use of (preferably local) consultants.	Partially accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAFOD's priority will always be to invest in developing the capacity of our partners ahead of our own. Our main focus in developing our new capacity development guidance, is to improve our ways of working with partners to understand and assess existing levels of capacity, and agreeing best ways to address any identified gaps. There will be different methods and approaches for supporting this, which may include the use of locally-contracted consultants as one, context-specific, option. • However, we accept, particularly in relation to our own capacity, that there may be situations in which engaging short-term consultants represents the most effective solution to address an identified immediate capacity gap. In these contexts, we have a definite preference for using local consultants, wherever possible, for their contextual knowledge. • One area we could explore further is developing relationships with a pool of core consultants or programme accompaniers who can work with us and our partners on

			<p>water as and when necessary, but with whom we will have collaborated to establish a better understanding of CAFOD, our ways of working with partners, and our approach to water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our November 2014 strategic review has committed CAFOD to explore more effective ways of sourcing and supporting local in-country technical support for our implementing partners, where needed. As we continue our work in this area, it will be important to ensure our resourcing of technical capacity is not dependent on a series of short-term consultancies.
PM3.4	Ensure that advisory staff have a formal mechanism for influencing decision-makers; this might be an audit process or a management committee on which they sit.	Partially accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The kind of mechanisms suggested are not completely suitable for our ways of working and the nature of the advisory roles, but there are some existing processes for this to happen. • For instance, our ‘thematic leadership forum’ was created in 2013 to provide space for advisory staff to come together to inform and shape opinions and ideas to feed into senior management decision-making. The country strategy paper advisory group and validation process also provides opportunities for advisory staff to input into their development. • As we develop our new thematic ‘foundational quality’ standards within our Programme Management Manual, for roll out from Spring 2016, we have identified the need to include clearer guidance on the roles and responsibilities of advisory staff and/or other technical support providers in relation to these. • We have some good examples of where thematic advisory staff input has played a key role into the design, selection and quality assurance of projects for highly technical areas of work, for institutional funding bids. We are now more formally clarifying the governance mechanisms for similar future institutional funding bids, and the role of thematic/technical support staff within them.
PM4	Quality Assurance		
PM4	Convene the Match Fund Performance Group urgently to review progress to date and likely achievements as of March 2015; where there are particular challenges (as with projects in Bangladesh and Mozambique), ensure specific action plans are developed in response.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was completed, including obtaining approval from DFID to extend results into Year 4. For Bangladesh, we provided additional budget and technical support to partners to address the acknowledged quality and sustainability issues. The follow-up to these has been largely positively assessed by a recent final evaluation (see summary findings on pages 6, 17 and 26 of PCR). Our projects in Mozambique were successfully completed following revisions by our (then) new country management team.
PM5.	Learning		

PM5.1	Take pains to document in particular the sanitation experiences of Match Fund work, so that more coherent approaches can be developed in future on the basis of the current projects.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our water and regional M&E staff have worked with the Water and Environment Adviser to do this. We have already identified some examples of where community-led total sanitation (CLTS) has worked well e.g. in Kenya with nomadic communities, which will make an interesting case study both within and beyond CAFOD. • Evidence of good practice and programme challenges have been documented and shared with CAFOD's water programme officers. • Guidance on sanitation has been documented and will inform our new thematic foundational quality standards for roll out from Spring 2016, and as part of the 'step ladder approach' developed in 2014. • See our response to TA1, which is also relevant here.
PM5.2	Consider the value of a global learning process around the gender-focused projects that have emerged in association with the Match Fund – Asia, Africa and Latin America. This could valuably inform CAFOD's future approaches to gender, including staffing and priorities.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have an existing global learning mechanism for gender, our Gender Community of Practice, so the priority will be to ensure that all our Match Fund countries are represented in this network, and that the lessons from these projects are shared widely. Our Gender Adviser has taken this forward. • We will also consider how to capitalise on the valuable learning from mainstreaming gender into our water projects, which could be applied to other sectors, and how this can be resourced and supported. • We have developed a management response to our wider gender mainstreaming review which is published on CAFOD's website.
5.2	Project Management and Partnership		
PP1	Partner Selection: Continue the practice of partnering with local Caritas branches and other organisations with real community roots and responsibilities. Consider the development of specific partner capacity building plans. Where Caritas does not have relevant expertise, continue the practice of building links with appropriate partners, ensuring an effective working relationship between them.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with locally embedded partners is at the heart of CAFOD's approach, and sister Caritas partners are core to our partnership portfolio. • Our response to PM2.1, regarding our approach to capacity development, is also relevant here. • We will be developing tools and ways of working to understand the specific roles which different partners are playing e.g. providing technical or service delivery aspects, and where and how we can best support them to fulfil these. • Where necessary, we will also continue to build and support local partnership coalitions, with a clear understanding of CAFOD's role and responsibilities in this, learning from where this has worked well in the Match Fund (e.g. DRC), and from where co-ordination has been less effective (e.g. Bangladesh, Mozambique).
PP2	Project Design and Monitoring:		
PP2.1	Ensure that adequate technical data and expertise are available, especially where innovative work is	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAFOD is developing thematic 'foundational quality standards' and guidance for water programmes (WASH and water resource management). This will roll out from Spring

	concerned (e.g. work in a new region, with a new technology or using a new approach.)		2016 and will require that all programmes follow national standards for WASH, and where there is concern that these are not adequate, staff and partners should refer to global WHO and SPHERE standards (for development and humanitarian programmes respectively).
PP2.2	Ensure that project designs comply with relevant national or other guidance and standards, as set out in CAFOD's minimum standards for water projects.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recommended in our internal learning review, CAFOD will not undertake WASH programmes where we have not identified adequate technical support, embedded in the project design. The roll-out of our '7Es' approach to financial stewardship within our Programme Management Manual incorporates a specific 'E' for endeavour which will promote greater reflection on which aspects of project are innovative for CAFOD and partners. However, technologies should be selected according to the local and national contexts, supported by a supply chain for parts and technical support, to ensure sustainability. New technologies and approaches are likely to introduce high levels of associate risk into projects, and these will require close management. Our response to PP2.3, regarding our approach to risk management, is also relevant here. It is important to be aware of national guidance and standards, but where we find these to be restrictive, we may also take a deliberate approach to pilot and promote other, more innovative solutions in line with global standards, and advocate where necessary to improve or update the relevant national standards.
PP2.3	Use the ongoing update of CAFOD's risk management approach to build staff capacity and commitment to carry out more detailed risk assessment to inform project design and funding decisions.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted by the review, we are currently strengthening our approach to risk management. This includes a new approach to partner financial management risk assessment (introduced April 2014), a risk-management process to authorise the submission of institutional funding applications), and revisions to project, programme, country and divisional risk register management processes. We also launched a new online post-specific induction and training package from April 2015, this will include risk management modules which will be available to programme staff and managers.
PP2.4	Allow adequate time for behaviour change projects. This means developing appropriate outcome indicators for behaviour change at an early stage in planning, and considering realistic time scales for reaching those outcomes.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See our response to PM1 regarding our meaningful outcome indicators, and learning in this regard. This will include careful consideration of what are appropriate intermediate outcome indicators relating to the duration of any project, which indicate progress towards the longer-term outcome. There is also a broader sector-wide conversation which we think important and in which we would like to participate, beyond CAFOD and our own programmes, relating to the typical length of funding cycles of DFID and other institutional donors, to better understand the degree of impact and more intermediate outcomes which it is reasonable to expect could be achieved within these timeframes.
PP2.5	Develop better indicators, tools and processes for monitoring behaviour change, building on the existing	Accept	

	good Match Fund examples by sharing good practice.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mid-term review concluded it was inappropriate at this stage to propose changes to the log frame, as redressing this would potentially involve changes to a range of activities at a late stage in many projects. It noted, however, that ‘many of the projects are in any case monitoring rather more progressively than is indicated by the [overall UKAid Match] log frame’. Where this is the case at project level, and we are able to evidence change, we have aimed to bring this out more strongly in our subsequent narrative reporting to DFID, in addition to the quantitative outcome indicator in our logframe. CAFOD’s decision to include a gender lens into the Match Fund WASH projects had the intention of promoting gender internally. The initial behavioural changes noted in this review are therefore significant, given that water-related projects tend to have strong technical components implemented by engineers who sometimes lack gender awareness. We are developing corporate key performance indicators to track our progress in gender mainstreaming, which also recommend developing tags to measure how many projects are addressing behavioural changes.
PP3	Build Sector Coordination		
	To maximise effectiveness, avoid working in isolation: coordinate with local government wherever it has responsibility for relevant service provision, and with sector coordination groups.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with local government is an intrinsic element in sustainability, which in itself has been identified as an area of weakness is CAFOD’s programmatic work in some countries. There are projects that work very closely with local government (Zimbabwe, Kenya) but this is not consistent across all countries or projects. In line with the findings of our internal learning review, CAFOD’s Water and Environment Adviser has worked with programme staff to identify ways to strengthen approaches to institutional, functional, financial, environmental equity and/or sustainability in any future water projects.
5.3	Technical Aspects of Projects		
TA1.	<p>Ensure the technical quality of remaining work in WASH and WRM, by making available sufficient technical capacity – with limited support from outside CAFOD where needed.</p> <p>TA1.1 Focus attention particularly on sanitation and sustainability.</p>	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our response to PM4, regarding our approach to quality assurance of Match Fund projects, is also relevant here. <p>TA1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sanitation and sustainability are recognised as two primary areas of weakness for our water projects (noting that these are also challenges within the wider WASH sector). The review found that sanitation approaches were inconsistent and sometimes confused, and the mid-term review team has suggested that we should develop responses to key questions, such as the subsidy debate and the appropriateness of Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS). In terms of sustainability, this will link to the outcome measures we use in future. See our responses to PP2.4 and PM5.1 about

	<p>TA1.2 Ensure that relevant water quality parameters are always assessed in potable water projects.</p> <p>TA1.3 Assess all infrastructure plans in terms of the need for erosion control.</p> <p>TA1.4 Institute regular recording of water resource measurements, including spring flows, pump or pipeline yields, and water levels in ponds, dams and wells.</p>		<p>outcome indicators for behaviour change and learning in relation to our Match Fund sanitation experiences respectively, which are also relevant here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our water workshop in April 2014 had a capacity-building session looking at two of these issues. Where our work in water is to continue, it will be a high priority to strengthen partner capacity in addressing sanitation and sustainability. <p>TA1.2 The following commitments will inform our thematic foundational quality standards relating to water quality to be rolled out from Spring 2016 via CAFOD's Programme Management Manual:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff/partners are able to identify water quality risks at the development stage of project proposals • Staff/partners have proposed which parameters (in line with national/WHO standards) will be used to monitor and safely manage water quality risks, and are able to liaise with relevant government bodies (wherever functional) to analyse and monitor water quality parameters. <p>TA1.3 The need to identify environmental risks related to soil erosion will inform our forthcoming environmental foundational quality standards.</p> <p>TA1.4 CAFOD will explore how best to encompass water resource management monitoring approaches into our water projects, where this can be carried out by CAFOD and/or partner staff, involving communities wherever possible. We will also ensure that staff and/or partners liaise with relevant government bodies and universities in-country to gather the necessary information. Fulfilment of the above objectives is subject to strategic review outcomes and decisions regarding future technical support/staffing.</p>
5.4	Future Programming		
FP1.	Future Resourcing:		
FP1.1	Urgently resolve the current lack of clarity on future funding of the technical posts now supported by the Match Fund. Technical support that can reach partners is required for effective management of water projects. If organisational learning and coordination on water is desired - for example on standards - capacity at the centre is also needed.	Partially accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing of technical posts supported by this first Match Fund have now been clarified, at least in the medium term. In some country contexts in which water has not been identified as a relatively high priority as a thematic area in future programming, contracts have not been renewed and staff have now left CAFOD (e.g. Bangladesh). • Our recent successful proposal for another (CAFOD's third) related DFID UKAid Match programme 'improved access to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for disadvantaged communities in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda and Zimbabwe' will ensure ongoing CAFOD staff technical posts in these three countries, which were also included in this first UKAid Match-funded programme.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elsewhere, our November 2014 strategic review has committed CAFOD to explore more effective ways of sourcing and supporting local in-country technical support for our implementing partners, where needed. This will include for water as a thematic area in future programming. An organisational change project has already been initiated to take this intent forward. The need for ongoing capacity at the centre in future will be monitored and kept under review, although this in any case may fall more under integrated ‘resilience and sustainability’ capacity, rather than water as a more standalone thematic area, except in our emergency response WASH capacity.
FP1.2	Put in place a strategy to raise funding to support core water sector costs in the medium term (five years). This may come from new grant funding (to succeed the Match Fund) and/or from CAFOD's core grant-making. This strategy should answer the requirement of safeguarding and building on the gains in capacity developed through the Match Fund.	Partially accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We recognise that WASH programming is an area that aligns well with many institutional donors’ funding priorities, and is highly likely to feature within our future strategy. This will be determined on an individual country basis (where this was an identified priority within country strategy papers/country position papers), rather than globally. Since our initial management response in October 2014, we have submitted a successful proposal for another (CAFOD’s third) related DFID UKAid Match programme ‘improved access to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for disadvantaged communities in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda and Zimbabwe’ which will build on gains in capacity in both CAFOD and our implementing partners developed through this first UKAid Match-funded programme. In the intervening period, our country teams in Bangladesh, Kenya, Myanmar and Zimbabwe have also been working closely with our partners there to enhance elements of sustainability from this first UKAid Match-funded programme, in our (second) UKAid Match programme focusing on climate-resilient agriculture. We will look at how to involve other Caritas members in any future plans in relation to future water programming, including how to optimise the sharing of financial and technical resources.
FP1.3	In the light of difficulties with technical design in new work areas, consider the need for a budget line for contingency funding and/or feasibility study funding for projects, possibly to be held by the London office.	Partially accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some projects did consider contingency allowances in their budget planning during the design phase. Our existing internal flexible funding allocations, such as CAFOD’s General Development Fund, allows us to be agile and responsive to emerging needs from partners or opportunities or challenges in our external strategic and operating environments throughout the financial year. We also have some flexibility within countries and regions to reallocate (unrestricted) General Funds for contingency scenarios. For instance, we funded the feasibility study for our project extension in Zimbabwe (see response to PM4) from unspent funds in our Mozambique WASH project. This worked well as we have worked in the area before and knew the challenges and the best options to proceed.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such flexibility for contingency scenarios is not usually possible for institutionally funded projects; the important factor here is that we ensure sufficient budget allocation is built in to conduct feasibility studies, where necessary, during the project design phase, with sufficient flexibility to also accommodate the higher risks around delivering big infrastructure.
FP2.	Efficiency		
	Focus water sector work on specific countries and regions that prioritise it; and on larger, longer-term projects that provide opportunities for the kind of integrated work towards which CAFOD is moving. At the same time, avoid isolated and short-term projects that do not allow the maintenance of sufficient technical and management capacity to ensure sustainable outcomes.	Partially accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our response to PM2.1, regarding our approach to project selection, and identification of sector/thematic priorities in country strategy papers, is also relevant here. Although 2- to 3-year Match Funding of water projects is relatively short-term, the long-term nature of many of our partnerships means that our institutional relationships with partners will remain, and partners will still be able to access technical support through CAFOD where mutually agreed. As we have transitioned out of closing Match Fund projects, we have discussed carefully with each partner their future plans for water work, and options for how CAFOD can support this, even where we are unable to directly fund this. Since our initial management response in October 2014, we have submitted a successful proposal for another (CAFOD's third) related DFID UKAid Match programme 'improved access to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for disadvantaged communities in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda and Zimbabwe' which will build on gains in capacity in both CAFOD and our implementing partners developed through this first UKAid Match-funded programme. In the intervening period, our country teams in Bangladesh, Kenya, Myanmar and Zimbabwe have also been working closely with our partners there to enhance elements of sustainability from this first UKAid Match-funded programme, in our (second) UKAid Match programme focusing on climate-resilient agriculture. 'Isolated' projects in some circumstances cannot be ruled out given our way of working, which responds to needs identified by our Church and non-Church partners and communities. There are scenarios in which a one-off intervention may be what is required and appropriate, with a clear transition or exit process planned. Similarly, we recognise that some interventions can be successful even within a relatively short timescale, so it is not necessarily the duration in and of itself that is of overriding importance, but the quality of the programme design. There is also a question for CAFOD to explore further with our partners as to how we can be more innovative or think about different models for the provision of maintenance, etc. We should not aim to respond to this on our own, but through

			stronger community participation, engagement with local authorities and relevant private sector actors, etc.
FP3.	Integration		
FP3.1	Actively pursue the development of integrated thinking within CAFOD's community-focused projects, to cover the links between development, resilience and disaster relief; and between WASH services, multiple uses of water and water resources management.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will continue to pursue an integrated approach to resilience and sustainability, where this has been identified as a priority within country strategy papers, eg in our East Africa (Kenya/Uganda) programme. Our Livelihoods and Water and Environment Advisers have continued to work, through the Resilience and Sustainability cluster, to support these countries. The cluster will also continue to work on developing integrated thinking in this area. For instance, the multiple uses of water services (MUS) approach has been identified as a relevant and useful approach for CAFOD's work. It was shared through the Resilience and Sustainability Community of Practice in October 2014, with support from the Winrock Foundation. It has been incorporated by Zimbabwe in the programme design for our (CAFOD's third) related DFID UKAid Match programme.
FP3.2	CAFOD's focus on gender and its integration into the work in other sectors in the last three years is applauded and should continue.	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We welcome the review team's recognition of our progress in this area, which is echoed by our 2014 independent review of our organisational approach to gender mainstreaming.
	Final Evaluation		
N/A	The mid-term review team commented on the potential for carrying out a final evaluation in 2016.	(Accept)	We will no longer be proceeding with an overall final programme-level evaluation, following the recommendation from the mid-term review that a 'standard end-of-project evaluation would not be the most useful exercise. Impact assessment is likely to be of limited use because there is little baseline material available and because of the short time scale available for behaviour change'. A number of project-level final evaluations and end of programme reviews have been completed. CAFOD also agrees that a follow-on final overall UKAid Match portfolio/programme-level evaluation would not add significant value to these existing plans or sources of evidence from a learning perspective; DFID also does not require one to be carried out for accountability reasons. During the final months of this UKAid Match programme, we have maintained focus on further identifying, consolidating and documenting the important lessons that have been learned through this work, at project/programme, country and global levels.