**Management Response and Follow-up of Evaluation Recommendations**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation title/year:** Ex-post internal evaluation of the project “Strengthening Disaster Preparedness and Response in Sierra Leone” (DP.1885), June 2021**Person or entity responsible for completing the management follow-up response matrix:** The Project Manager, the project team, the Chief of Mission, the project developers.**Overall comment on evaluation process:** The evaluation of the project is satisfactory. Based on the evaluation findings, some recommendations have been formulated in order to potentially enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, impact and gender of the current existing projects or of the future projects implemented by IOM Mission in Sierra Leone. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 1:** The project team should explicitly mention to beneficiaries when stipends are not foreseen under activities’ implementation and explain the reason why. |
| **Recommendation to:** The project team | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 1 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)***Indicate if management accepts, partially accepts or rejects the recommendation. Provide an explanation if management only partially accepts or rejects. Bear in mind that, ideally, enough evidence will have been provided to an evaluator that by the time the recommendations are finalized, there is not too much disagreement on the recommendations. However, disagreements do occur, and it is acceptable to reject or only partially accept a recommendation. However, this decision should be adequately explained in this section.* |
| **Implementation monitoring:** *Lists comments or actions taken at the indicated timeframe for implementation as well as the status (initiated, not initiated, completed, or no longer applicable). Do not complete this column when you are first preparing the matrix. Complete the column when following up and monitoring the implementation of the action. At that time, insert comments and/or description of the action taken.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 2:**When developing the project budget, project developers should ensure that staff costs are budgeted together with the Resource Management Officer in order to anticipate and reflect as much as possible the real costs of the foreseen positions. |
| **Recommendation to:** The project developers | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 2 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |
| **Evaluation recommendation 3:**The project team should familiarize with IOM Manuals related to gender (MA/59 & MA/62) in order to better develop gender sensitive projects by integrating gender sensitive indicators, thereby demonstrating the knowledge and application of the Organization policy on gender. |
| **Recommendation to:** The project team | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 2 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 4:**As per IOM Project Handbook guidelines, PRISM access should be granted to the Project Manager from the start of the project implementation or at the beginning of his/her assignment as such access allows to ensure an efficient project management. |
| **Recommendation to:** The Chief of Mission | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 3 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 5:**The Project Manager should familiarize with the contractual requirements stated in the donor agreement and notify the donor when delay or difficulty is foreseen. |
| **Recommendation to:** The Project Manager | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 3 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 6:**The Project Manager and/or the project team should regularly communicate with the donor (via in persons meetings if the context allows, emails and/or phone calls) in order to have the donor buy in. |
| **Recommendation to:** The Project Manager, the project team | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 2 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 7:**IOM in Sierra Leone should continue its work on disaster preparedness and response. Replicating such activities would allow to expend the impact to other disaster-prone localities and increase the chances for a future higher-level change. |
| **Recommendation to:** The Chief of Mission, the Project Manager | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 3 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 8:**The inclusion of an inception phase (from 1 to 3 months depending of the project length) in future interventions could be a good practice in order to set-up the project team, to launch the project, to familiarize with the proposal and donor agreement. |
| **Recommendation to:** The project developers | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 1 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation recommendation 9:**A monitoring system should be established in future interventions as it would help the project team to track the implementation of activities, to ensure compliance between activities and project requirements, but also to identify at the earliest potential threats towards project implementation. |
| **Recommendation to:** The project developers, the Project Manager | **Priority level (1 to 3):** 3 |
| **Management response (Accept/Partially Accept/Reject)** |
| **Implementation monitoring:**  |