MFAT Management Response to Mid-term review of the Community Resilience and Economic Development (CaRED) Activity in Indonesia.

Evaluation:	This evaluation is intended to identify strengths and weakness, and describe the lessons learned for CaRED implementation and management moving forward and inform decision-making on the future of CaRED design and implementation.
	The review took a participatory, strengths based approach to build upon the knowledge and collaborative relationship between MFAT, UGM and their partners to practically contribute to learning and forward planning.
Background:	Community Resilience & Economic Development (CaRED) is a contestable fund for small grants. It provides funding for applied research and community development projects focused on Sustainable Economic and Livelihood Opportunities (SELO), Renewable Energy (RE), Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and Human Crises and Conflict Prevention (HCCP). It is part of New Zealand's development assistance package to Indonesia funded through a Partnership Agreement between MFAT and University of Gadjah Mada (UGM). CaRED's goal is to contribute to sustainable development in Indonesia through deeper engagement and cooperation between New Zealand and the UGM.
Evaluators:	Donna Leigh Holden
Link to evaluation	Access the report here

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 1: Focus of 2018 Activity – Strengthening Development Effectiveness and Results Orientation **Short term recommendation 1.1**: The current portfolio of research projects should be reviewed in detail and work plans strengthened to facilitate progress on development outcomes. *Priority: HIGH – URGENT.* **Short term recommendation 1.2:** Once it has processed the findings of the MTR and established the overall direction of the future partnerships, MFAT should commence immediate planning for the design in order that it runs concurrent to the final year of CaRED**. Priority: HIGH.**	**1.1:** Agree. Assessment of the current portfolio of projects should be the highest priority and plans put in place to strengthen work plans of activities which are continuing. **1.2:** Partially agree. A decision on whether the project is to continue, and in what form, needs to precede future design planning.	**1.1:** Post in conjunction with UGM. **1.2:** MFAT in discussion with UGM.	**1.1:** Feb – April 2018. **1.2:** June 2018.	

INTD-90-5159

Area 2: Addressing Weaknesses in the Results Framework and M&E System				
Short term recommendation 2.1: The 2015 revision of the Results Framework requires further **minor** revisions[1] which once completed should be submitted for approval and used as the basis of reporting. **Priority: HIGH**	**2.1:** Agree. The RMF should be assessed (drawing on the recommendations in the review) and minor adjustments made. This could be implemented with external support, or MFAT's results management team (or both).	**2.1:** DSE, MFAT or external consultant (sourced by MFAT).	**2.1:** Feb - April 2018.	
Short term recommendation 2.2: A simple and practical framework for M&E (and reporting) for the remaining life of the program should be developed and include key questions for each ongoing activity. **Priority: MEDIUM**	**2.2:** Agree. Simple tools and templates should be developed to better capture development outcomes across projects. Priority should be given to building the capacity of staff to use tools.	**2.2:** External consultant (sourced by MFAT) in conjunction with UGM and project staff.	**2.2:** April 2018.	
Short term recommendation 2.3: The current monitoring system should be augmented with external monitoring support to a strengthening of the potential outcomes of activities but also to ensure that risks (including risk of failure) are mitigated. **Priority: HIGH**	**2.3:** Partially Agree. While some external support (TA) would be useful to develop the tools and templates required, building the capacity of project staff to monitor and report on their projects should be the primary focus.	**2.3:** TBC	**2.3:** TBC	
Long term recommendation 2.4: In addition to the M&E team, external support for M&E will be required to support improved performance, quality management and capacity building in a future partnership. **Priority: HIGH**	**2.4:** Partially agree. While some external M&E support is useful, the priority in a new design should be to build the capacity of project staff.	**2.4:** TBC	**2.4:** TBC	

INTD-90-5159

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 3: Strengthening Cross Activity Learning and Capacity Building **Short term recommendation 3.1:** A series of cross activity learning events should be integrated into the 2018 program cycle to support efforts to strengthen the development effectiveness, monitoring and reporting of CaRED activities. **Priority: HIGH**	**3.1:** Partially Agree. While facilitating cross activity learning would be ideal, this is realistically beyond our ability to implement in the next 12 months. However we can look at other ways to build capacity of project staff in development effectiveness, monitoring and reporting (see **2.3** above).	**3.1:** External evaluator conducting assessment (sourced by MFAT), Post.	**3.1:** TBC after initial assessment.	
Long term recommendation 3.2: A platform and strategy for cross activity learning is integral to a future partnership/program and should be integrated into the program architecture. **Priority: HIGH**	**3.2:** Agree, but is not relevant until further discussions regarding a next phase.	**3.2:** TBC	**3.2:** TBC	

INTD-90-5159

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 4: Activity Reporting **Short term recommendation 4.1:** MFAT should identify how it can access intermediary support to reduce transaction costs of reporting. **Priority: MEDIUM**	**4.1:** Partially agree. Suggest that this could be done as part of the rapid assessment. Ensure (when developing) any new tools that they look at reducing these costs. MFAT to discuss what (if any) intermediary support would look like in this context.	**4.1:** External contractor (sourced by MFAT).	**4.1:** March -April 2018.	

UNCLASSIFIED

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 5: Staffing Arrangements **Short term recommendation 5.1:** The current staffing structure of CaRED should be reviewed immediately to ensure that CaRED has sufficient management and technical resources to support the management of the current grant portfolio as well as to strengthen attention to monitoring, learning and the delivery of development outcomes. ***Priority: HIGH - URGENT***	**5.1:** Agree. However unsure to what extent changes in the staffing structure are feasible within the next 12 months. Could look to add expertise, rather than change structure significantly.	**5.1:** Post in conjunction with UGM.	**5.1:** TBC after assessment.	
Long term recommendation 5.2: To ensure that approaches align with development good practice, the CaRED architecture needs to include a leadership position with extensive development expertise within the PF team and ensure that the TAG composition includes members with development practice expertise. **Priority: HIGH**	**5.2:** Partially agree. Is not relevant until further discussions regarding a next phase. Would note that this doesn't need to be in a formal leadership role.	**5.2:** TBC	**5.2:** TBC	
Long term recommendation 5.3: A future program needs to be structured in a way that ensures that research teams are sufficiently resourced through implementing partnerships with experienced development partners to deliver on community development activities and outcomes. **Priority: HIGH**	**5.3:** Partially agree. While this is important, addressing some of the primary tensions in the partnership logic, for example working with other partners (such as NGO's or the private sector) could address this without providing significant additional resourcing.	**5.3:** TBC	**5.3:** TBC	

INTD-90-5159

UNCLASSIFIED

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 6: Cross Cutting Issues **Short term recommendation 6.1:** To support strengthened analysis and reporting of cross cutting issues, capacity building support should be provided to i. the CaRED Secretariat team and ii. the research teams involved in ongoing projects. This should include plans to i. strengthen gender assessment and reporting of research activities and ii. an assessment and reporting of risk where specific environmental and human rights safeguards have not been applied to existing projects. **Priority: MEDIUM**	**6.1:** Agreed. MFAT to identify personal who could deliver (based on assessment) targeted capacity building, or development new tools or templates which support cross-cutting data collection and reporting by project staff.	**6.1:** TAG and PMC, external consultant (sourced by MFAT), post.	**6.1:** March – April 2018.	
Short term recommendation 6.2: A few simple questions/metrics should be developed for assessment of cross-cutting issues use during routine monitoring and reporting. **Priority: HIGH**	**6.2:** Agree. This will support consistency across projects. Suggest the use of an external consultant here.	**6.2:** DSE, MFAT, external consultant (sourced by MFAT).	**6.2:** April 2018.	
Long term recommendation 6.3: Cross cutting issues should be strongly integrated into any future design. This includes practical guidance for the integration cross cutting issues into all business processes and project documentation (guidelines, calls for proposals, assessment criteria, M&E plans, reporting frameworks and learning processes) and technical assistance and/or capacity building as required. **Priority: MEDIUM**	**6.3:** Agree. Not relevant until further discussions regarding a next phase.	**6.3:** TBC	**6.3:** TBC	
Long term recommendation 6.4: In the absence of codified ethics protocols, any future research program should develop a Code of Ethics that establishes a set of minimum ethics standards that reflect cross cutting issues, protection the rights of research subjects and promote good research practice. **Priority: HIGH**	**6.4:** Partially agree. Not relevant until further discussions regarding a next phase.	**6.4:** TBC	**6.4:** TBC	

INTD-90-5159

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 7: Public Diplomacy and Strategic Partnerships **Short term recommendation 7.1:** In finalising revisions to the Results Framework, MFAT and the PF should seek to identify one or two simple metrics which will assist to articulate CaRED's contribution to public diplomacy and people to people linkages between Indonesia and New Zealand. **Priority: MEDIUM - URGENT**	**7.1:** Partially Agree. This has been valuable to Indonesia and NZ and would be good to explore measure around this. However the difficulties of measuring diplomatic outcomes are well known.	**7.1:** DSE, MFAT or external consultant (sourced by MFAT).	**7.1:** April 2018.	
Long term recommendation 7.2: A future program should be based on a strong partnership approach which seeks to builds on existing partnerships as the starting point for programmatic interventions[2]. **Priority: HIGH**	**7.2:** Partially agree. Any new phase needs to re-evaluate the partnership model (to be discussed at a later date).	**7.2:** MFAT	**7.2:** June 2018.	

INTD-90-5159

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 8: The MFAT UGM Partnership **Short Term Recommendation 8.1**: MFAT and UGM should establish a regular (annual or biannual) Partnership Dialog to review and reflect on the strategic benefit of the partnership beyond the programs that it supports. **Priority: MEDIUM**	**8.1:** Agree. Future high level meetings should be more focused on discussion around strategic benefit of partnership rather than project activities updates. Agenda should be agreed with PMC prior to Rector and Ambassador meetings.	**8.1:** MFAT and UGM.	**8.1:** July 2018.	
Long term recommendation 8.2: The design of a future research partnership should consider the potential benefits of extending eligibility for research partnerships to one or two other Indonesian universities. This will require careful consideration of any possible (positive or negative) impacts of this on the wider UGM MFAT Partnership. **Priority: HIGH**	**8.2:** Agree. The partnership with UGM has greatly benefited the NZ profile in Indonesia. Partnership with other Universities in different sectors can also be assessed in the future in conjunction with UGM.	**8.2:** TBC	**8.2:** TBC	

INTD-90-5159

Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
Area 9: Research Selection Processes **Long term recommendation 9.1:** The design should explore the feasibility of a set of new business processes around the design of research activities and partnerships such as: two stage selection processes, the provision of grants for research design and mechanisms which linked researchers to development projects and organisations. **Priority: HIGH**	**9.1** Agree: This will be a priority in any discussions regarding a new phase. Only relevant if CaRED is progressed to a new phase.	**9.1:** MFAT in conjunction with the UGM.	**9.1:** TBC	
Area 10: Communications: **The promotion of research partnerships opportunities to NZ public and private sector institutions is challenging and time consuming.** **Long term recommendation 10.1:** A communications strategy should be developed at the commencement of any future research partnership program. This should extend beyond promotional opportunities but be aligned with a partnership model that seeks to create opportunities to build meaningful, mutually beneficial and sustainable two-way partnerships between Indonesian and New Zealand academics and institutions. **Priority: HIGH**	**10.1**: Partially Agree. Any communications strategy needs to be consistent with broader MFAT and UGM communications plans.	**10.1:** MFAT in conjunction with the UGM.	**10.1:** TBC	