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Overall Response to the Evaluation:
The FIAVOTA Program is a joint program with the World Bank to which UNICEF contributes 6% (in terms of beneficiaries and financially) for the cash component and supports the C4D component for the entire program. UNICEF also provides technical assistance in planning and advocacy for resource allocation. The recommendations are addressed to all stakeholders, UNICEF will use the lessons learned for advocacy and for the preparation of the next cycle of its country program.

Overall, the mid-term evaluation has shown that only 15 months after the launch of the program, it has positive impacts on beneficiary households in a number of areas (consumption, food security, child education, promotion of productive activities and increased resilience). Unlike other punctual and seasonal humanitarian assistance projects that are usually carried out in these southern regions, the FIAVOTA program enables households to improve their consumption and to make investments in human and productive capital that will have positive impacts on their livelihoods over the long term. The results of the evaluation suggest that this type of program is relevant in the South of Madagascar and must be maintained in the long term and as far as possible expanded to other localities. In addition, according to the new National Social Protection Strategy (NSPS), the Government intends to triple the number of beneficiary households over the next five years.

Planned Use of Evaluation:
The main objective of this evaluation is to improve the understanding of the Government, UNICEF and the World Bank on how emergency and early response cash transfer programmes impact households, women, children, and the local economy. Additionally, it provides evidence to judge whether large-scale investment in this type of programme is relevant and justifiable in Madagascar.
**RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS:**

**Evaluation Recommendation 1:**

The Fiavota programme had two components in Phase 1, a recovery fund transfer paid in a **lump sum to encourage investment** in productive assets and a recurring bimonthly transfer. The programme demonstrates large impacts on productivity, especially on livestock ownership, signifying that the recovery fund lump sum transfer worked as intended. We recommend **maintaining this component of the programme for future beneficiaries as they initially enrol in the programme and it seems to provide a good jump start toward building resiliency.**

**Management Response: Partially Agree**

*If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:*

We partially agree with this recommendation. It is necessary to advocate for the maintenance of the recovery fund (RF) for new beneficiaries because of its positive impact, but it is also necessary to strengthen the monitoring mechanism on the use of this fund to maximize the benefits over the long term. According to the evaluation data, only 12% of beneficiaries keep a monitoring booklet for the RF.

UNICEF does not plan to include new beneficiaries but the Government in the national strategy aims to triple the number by 2023. The role of UNICEF will therefore be to ensure that the recovery fund is budgeted for in the resources that will be mobilized and to support the establishment of a follow-up mechanism on the use of this fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions planned</th>
<th>Responsible Office</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Implementation stage:</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for budgeting (under national funds or other donors) of the RF for new beneficiaries during program expansion</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Luke Freeman, OIC Chief of Social Policy</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>In the NSPS developed with the support of UNICEF, the recovery fund has been budgeted which should facilitate the mobilization of funds for its financing.</td>
<td>NSPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a proper methodology to strengthen the monitoring mechanism on the use of the RF</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the efficacy of the methodology proposed to strengthen the monitoring mechanism on the use of the RF</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Recommendation 2:

Although we did not find programme impacts on young child nutritional outcomes, the evidence suggests that food consumption and access to healthcare rose. This result is common among many child-targeted cash transfers in sub-Saharan Africa. **We recommend linking the programme with other services and programmes that may also affect child nutrition to leverage a multidimensional approach to child nutrition.** Such services and programmes include improving access to clean water sources, education about water and sanitation practices, and counselling about optimal adolescent, maternal, infant, and young child feeding practices.

**Management Response: Partially Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

We partially agree with this recommendation. The FIAVOTA program (cash + approach) is already linked to other sectors (nutrition, water and hygiene, sensitization on maternal and child health). Rather than creating links with these sectors, it will be necessary to strengthen them. For example, only 38.6% of women beneficiaries participate in sensitization sessions in EBE (Espaces de Bien-Etre) and linkages to WASH services offered in the same intervention areas are not yet established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions planned</th>
<th>Responsible Office</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Implementation stage:</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen participation in EBE: Identify (during supervision missions) and take action to tackle low EBE presence</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen linkages with WASH services implemented in the same UNICEF intervention communes</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist (with the support of the WASH chief of section)</td>
<td>Sept. 2019</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>The program is currently working uniquely on awareness raising for water and hygiene issues, and has not yet created links with existing WASH services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the monitoring of the quality of services at the level of the nutritional sites (ONN) and advocate for the continuity of funding after June 2019 (date at which the WB funding for</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Recommendation 3:

When investigating the operational performance of the programme, as described in more detail below, we learned that recipients of the programme may have misunderstood key aspects that might affect their behaviour. For example, recipients did not understand clearly why they were eligible to receive the programme and what the selection criteria are. Similarly, they may have falsely believed that the programme could end abruptly or that they may not know when they will receive their next payment, affecting their spending behaviour. We recommend clear communication about the programme to the community and beneficiaries that may improve programme operations for how people use the transfers.

Management Response: Agree
If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:
We agree with this recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions planned</th>
<th>Responsible Office</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Implementation stage:</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the communication (C4D, EBE, FID, MPPSPF) on duration, periodicity and objectives of the programme</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist (with the support of the C4D chief of section)</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>A C4D consultant has been recruited by UNICEF to support FID, she could also work more on these aspects of communication and include information on program design in the C4D communication plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Recommendation 4:

This study did not include baseline measures for the comparison group. The evaluation team were not part of the baseline study and thus could not address this concern when baseline was conducted. The lack of baseline measures for the comparison group meant that the study could not establish baseline equivalence between the treatment and comparison groups to demonstrate that they started at the same place. It also prevents the evaluation team from using a longitudinal analysis that controls for factors affecting outcomes over time unrelated to the programme. For these reasons, best practice is considered to include both the treatment and comparison groups in a baseline measure of an evaluation study, and we recommend future studies to follow these best practices.

Management Response: Partially Agree

If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:

We agree that in the future it will always be necessary to plan the impact assessment in advance (which was not the case for the FIAVOTA program) and to include a baseline also for the control group. However, an emergency program has timing requirements that may not be compatible with optimal planning of the impact assessment.

We believe that other than the impact evaluation the program should also put in place a light, effective and efficient monitoring system to track progress information in the achievement of results and possible bottlenecks. The FID MIS does not currently allow an optimal use of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions planned</th>
<th>Responsible Office</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Implementation stage:</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In collaboration with FID, identify possible way to strengthen the monitoring system to collect data more systematically during the year</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot this light, effective and efficient monitoring system in the 3 UNICEF communes</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Elena Celada, Social Protection Specialist</td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Greetings Nirina,

The management response if fine with us. On the template, please indicate names of staff in responsible person column, as the system only accepts UNICEF staff names.

Best regards,

Justus

Justus Kamwesigye
Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist
United Nations Children’s Fund
Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
United Nations Complex, Gigiri
P.O. Box 44148 – 00100, Nairobi, Kenya
Mobile +254 740 029 164 Office: +254 20 5122 224
Email: jkamwesigye@unicef.org

From: Ndriakita Solonionjanirina
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2019 10:23 AM
To: Urs Nagel <unagel@unicef.org>; Justus Kamwesigye <jkamwesigye@unicef.org>
Cc: Michel Saint-Lot <msaintlot@unicef.org>; Jean Benoit Manhes <jmanhes@unicef.org>; Luke Freeman <lfreeman@unicef.org>; Elena Celada <ecelada@unicef.org>; Jean Dupraz <jdupraz@unicef.org>; Pamela Dale <pdaie@unicef.org>
Subject: Gentle Reminder - 5 pages to review : Madagascar CO - Management Response for review of FIAVOTA Midterm Impact Evaluation

Dear Urs and Justus,

Just to remind you we are waiting for your feedback for this Management Response, we already had feedback from Social Policy team. Please see attached:

- MR drafted in the word document
- Evaluation’s conclusions and recommendations in p 62-68 of pdf file

Best regards,

Nirina

From: Ndriakita Solonionjanirina
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 3:54 PM
To: Urs Nagel <unagel@unicef.org>; Justus Kamwesigye <jkamwesigye@unicef.org>