

# Evaluation Report

Mongolia Extreme Winter Emergency Appeal 2016



Compiled by:

Glenn Rose  
Sandra Romero Ruiz  
Heather Fehr

## Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	4
2. Background.....	5
3. Evaluation purpose and scope.....	6
4. Evaluation methodology and limitations .....	6
5. Key Evaluation Findings.....	7
6. Conclusions.....	11

### Appendices

- A. Terms of Reference
- B. Inception report
- C. Evaluation Schedule
- D. Key Informant list

## Acknowledgements

Thanks to the IFRC country team in Mongolia for logistical and organisational support to enable this evaluation to happen in quick time. Thanks also to the Mongolian Red Cross Society staff that took part in evaluation and also contributed to translation and fact checking which proved invaluable. Special thanks go to the mid-level branch coordinators staff and volunteers who hosted the evaluation team so well during the two field visits.

## Glossary

APRO	Asia Pacific Regional Office
Aimag	Province
BDRT	Branch Disaster Response Team
CCST	Country Cluster Support Team
CHF	Swiss Franc
CTP	Cash transfer programming
DRCE	Disaster Response Capacity Evaluation
DREF	Disaster Relief Emergency Fund
DRR	Disaster risk reduction
HQ	Headquarters
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies
INGO	International non-government organisation
MRCSS	Mongolian Red Cross Society
MOO	Mongolian operational options
NEMA	National Emergency Management Agency
OCAC	Organisational capacity assessment and certification
Soum	Sub district (county)

## 1. Executive Summary

Dzud is meteorological hazard unique to Mongolia. It is caused by successive seasons of drought followed by heavy snowfall, low temperature -40C which impacts the country's livestock and subsequent livelihoods of herders in large numbers. An international appeal was launched by the IFRC in 2016 to support the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) provide assistance to 25,500 affected by Dzud. Due to the expected continuation of Dzud conditions in 2017 and as a result of a request for assistance by the Government of Mongolia, a further international appeal has been launched in February 2017. This evaluation was commissioned primarily to establish the lessons from 2016 in an effort to inform the planning and implementation of this latest operation currently underway.

The evaluation team consisted of a team leader, and representatives from IFRC, British Red Cross and MRCS. The evaluation was rapid and practically orientated with only nine days spent in country. Field visits to remote Soums proved invaluable in recognising the remoteness of beneficiaries and travel required. Clear themes emerged from the observations, discussions and interviews and these were presented to the Mongolian Red Cross National Society for confirmation at the completion of the evaluation.

Despite some implementation delays which reduced the overall effectiveness of the operation, the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) have largely completed all the planned appeal activities in 2016 across the 17 affected provinces. MRCS have already internally identified and incorporated a number of lessons into their current operational planning. The technical knowledge, commitment and leadership shown by MRCS management staff and volunteers is of a high standard and should not be underestimated. MRCS has a relatively new leadership team who continue to implement significant organisational change and improvement over recent years. In addition, this was the first international appeal and plan of action for many of the MRCS headquarters and branch staff and volunteers.

Unconditional cash transfers formed the bulk of the relief-orientated activity and were considered to be mostly relevant and highly appropriate to the ongoing needs of the affected population despite some delays in distribution. The activity design was based on multiple data sources including market conditions and viability studies. Post distribution and satisfaction surveys were consistently reported as high.

The rationale for food distribution was based largely on secondary data analysis as opposed to individually expressed or assessed need at the household level and was found in some instances to not be fully justified or relevant in relation to the reduced access to markets rationale. The food distribution also came at a higher cost and was challenging to distribute according to some branches.

The psychosocial first aid programme for children was considered highly relevant and appropriate and would have benefitted from a broader implementation. There was insufficient data to clearly evaluate the DRR and livelihoods activities for effectiveness due to short time frame since its implementation and further follow up will be required.

MRCS relies heavily on its primary level branches and community mechanisms to ensure reach and coverage with its relief operation. Analysis of distribution data indicated that target beneficiary numbers were assigned to affected areas as opposed to being driven by identified need. There was also some evidence to suggest that some quality in community engagement and MRCS independence may have been sacrificed for quantity of coverage, this was acknowledged by MRCS as a consideration a priority for future branch development. Key MRCS HQ staffs were reported to be heavily engaged in operational activities. For the future MRCS would benefit from clearly defining and differentiating between its strategic support and operational roles and responsibilities informed by recent DRCE and OCAC assessments.

IFRC provided direct assistance to MRCS in managing tenders and procurement. These processes were integral to completing the CTP and livelihoods activities but did suffer from some bureaucratic delays. The relevant costs were probably underestimated in terms of the timeliness of the plan of action and as a result could not be considered to be particularly efficient in terms of the outputs generated. There has been much

discussion by informants about the need for a designated IFRC presence to manage IFRC systems *in country* which was not in place in this operation. Placing the budget holder for the operation alongside MRCS was seen as being more efficient especially in relation to managing finances and leading decision making.

This evaluation has identified 19 recommendations to MRCS and IFRC to be considered for their current and future operations. The real time nature of some of these recommendations means that implementation will be time critical in some instances. As a result a real time briefing was provided to MRCS and IFRC at the completion of the field component of this evaluation which will be followed up with the submission of the final report.

## 2. Background

Dzud is defined in the literature in a variety of ways but can be best described as an extreme winter with heavy snow and plummeting temperatures below -40 Celsius usually preceded by a summer drought.<sup>1</sup> It is a meteorological phenomenon unique to Mongolia with strong links to climate change. The resulting lack of suitable pasture contributes to livestock suffering and death severely affecting the livelihoods and coping mechanisms of traditional herder families. Dzud and its impact can also be exacerbated by economic and environmental issues such as overgrazing, market instability and lack of preparedness. Dzud is further characterized by the prevailing or dominant secondary hazard (e.g. White Dzud meaning excessive snow, Black Dzud ice conditions and no grass.)

The Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) was established in 1939 and today has 33 mid-level branches and over 700 primary level branches working through its 7,000 volunteers and 75,000 youth members. MRCS holds the IFRC and its main partners British Red Cross, Finnish Red Cross and Australian Red Cross in high regard and is a warm, open and friendly National Society. Since 2008 MRCS has conducted six DREF operations, three of which relate to Dzud. The appeal launched in 2016 for extreme winter was only the second international appeal undertaken by MRCS and the first by the majority of the current MRCS management team. MRCS has previously undergone evaluations and capacity assessments and is very open to learning and development and regards itself also as a *“learning by doing organisation”*.

In 2016 the effects of Dzud killed at least 1.1 million livestock (camels, horses, cows, sheep and goats) across Mongolia; more than 80,000 herder families (around 400,000 people) in the northern and western parts of the country were affected. Despite the focus being on the extreme winter aspect of Dzud the critical time period and vulnerability for herders and their animals is spring (March to May) when weakened animals require access to food and herders lack access to seasonal income. Dzud has occurred 11 times since 1946.<sup>2</sup> Dzud has been confirmed by the Government of Mongolia again in 2017 although the impacts on animal loss appear to be a lot less.

A DREF allocation of CHF 158,459 was approved on 15 January 2016 for the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) to support 7,500 people (1,500 households) affected by extreme winter through the provision of food and unconditional cash grants. On 29 February 2016, the IFRC launched an Emergency Appeal for CHF 833,945 to support the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) to scale up delivery of humanitarian assistance and support to 25,500 people (5,100 households) for 12 months, with a focus on detailed assessments, food security, nutrition and livelihoods, and community preparedness and risk reduction. The Appeal was revised on 25 July 2016 to increase the budget to CHF 979,346 and the target to 27,000 people (5,400 households) and refocused geographic scope from 20 to 17 provinces (see [MDRMN005](#)). On 4 January 2017 a DREF operation was launched to enable MRCS to respond to 1,000 households that have been affected by a second harsh winter in a row. This operation has been scaled up into an appeal for CHF 655,512 which was launched on 10 February 2017 to support 11,264 people (see [MDRMN006](#)).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/11/06/lessons-from-dzud>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.acaps.org/country/mongolia/special-reports>

### 3. Evaluation purpose and scope

The purpose of this evaluation is to examine the validity of the programme design, the extent to which the goal, objectives and expected results of this emergency operation were achieved in terms of its relevance to the needs of the beneficiaries and its effectiveness and timeliness. The evaluation will highlight what worked well and what might have been done differently as lessons to be applied in future operations. In addition, the evaluation will analyze how disaster and other related policies are used as guidance for the planning and implementation of emergency relief and recovery operations that are slow onset and cyclical as in the Dzud occurrence.

Recommendations are to be made for improvement, and how to guide the operation of the 2017 severe winter conditions, specifically addressing what IFRC support structures will be required to ensure the desired outcomes are achieved and maximum support is provided to the MRCS. The evaluation covered the entire duration of the operation, including relief and recovery activities and addressed the following key focus areas related to relevance and appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency.

### 4. Evaluation methodology and limitations

The evaluation team consisted of a current IFRC operations manager as team leader, an IFRC disaster risk management delegate and DRR advisor from British Red Cross who was in Mongolia at the time. The team conducted an inception discussion by skype but only met for the first time on arrival in the capital Ulaanbaatar Mongolia. Mongolian Red Cross were unable to provide a fulltime representative onto the evaluation team. Instead two staff were co-opted from time to time according to their availability.

The evaluation team spent a total of nine days in country including five days split into two teams. This enabled separate field trips to be undertaken to the remote Aimags of Khuvsgul in the north and Uvurkhangai in the west. Only limited time was available to conduct interviews, synthesize data and develop findings - despite this key themes emerged relatively quickly which informed the body of the recommendations.

Eight remote herder families and one herder collective were visited who benefited from the appeal activities. This was a small sample in regards to the total target group but given the time restraints and travel required



to the regions concerned was fully understandable. The travel also highlighted the challenges facing the MRCS in conducting assessments and distributing relief to remote locations. The allocation of tasks and assigned roles to team members as described in the draft inception report were revised on arrival due to a change in the field visit teams and a realization that the draft plans established during the inception process were not going to be achievable given the revised timeframes and reduction of the evaluation by one day.

Fig. 1 Remote Herder presentation to community/MRCS focus group.  
Photo MRCS

In total 29 key informant interviews and six focus group discussions were conducted. These included INGO and government representatives as well as primary branch and community leadership. A brief literature review was conducted from 11 documents examining Dzud lessons and phenomena. A further 48 documents detailing current and previous operations and lessons from MRCS, IFRC and other agencies were also examined. Key Informant interviews did not take place with five private sector and humanitarian agencies due to limited response to invitations. Due to time constraints interviews were also not possible with all MRCS departments.

A verification of key findings and fact check presentation and consultation took place with MRCS on Thursday 16 February before a final presentation of the 19 key findings took place with MRCS leadership the following day. These initial key findings were also presented by the team leader to the evaluation management team in Kuala Lumpur on 20 February. A draft report was due to be presented by the 22 February but due to other commitments this was not possible and was deferred.

As described in the inception report each evaluation team member were assigned a specific evaluation criteria in which to identify, examine, and synthesize data. Due to changes in the field visits and reduction of one day from the schedule this approach was not practical. Instead emerging themes related specifically to lessons were identified by all team members then triangulated and prioritized using the five stated thematic outcomes from the 2016 operation. This methodology was adopted and used primarily to ensure that the findings had relevance and could be applied practically as lessons toward the 2017 operation. MRCS staff also used the post cash distribution monitoring questionnaire in Mongolian when beneficiaries were interviewed. This provided a valuable data set especially in relation to gender aspects and also provided a unique capacity building opportunity for MRCS staff.

## 5. Key Evaluation Findings

### 5.1 Livelihoods, Nutrition and Food Security

Provincial mid-level branches had varying capacities and reach and over relied in some instances on local authorities for relief distribution and transport. Due to the remote and widespread nature of the affected herders there was also a heavy reliance on secondary data and Soum level local referral in establishing the beneficiary lists. The result was high coverage but a reduction in MRCS-led beneficiary consultation and engagement. There is a very strong relationship and integration of primary level branch and local government activity. In some cases with the same person performing dual roles. Whilst practical within the context of these communities there is the potential for fundamental principles namely independence to be compromised and the reputational risk to MRCS that may eventuate from that.

The distribution of cash received high ratings during post distribution monitoring (PDM) and was assessed to be mostly relevant and appropriate to the needs of the beneficiaries. The high administrative workload associated with beneficiary list validation and bank engagement caused delays which may have been avoided if these processes had been assessed also during the cash feasibility study. The immediate impact of the cash grant was evident at the household level according to the PDM. Market level impact was found to be difficult to measure given the limited number of households covered per Soum.

The rationale for the distribution of food parcels whilst based on an identified need and reported reduction in access to markets was questioned by a number of informants including some beneficiaries. The reported high transactional cost especially relating to procurement, transport and the late timing of the distribution also raised some doubts about the overall validity of the activity. A larger sample would be required however to truly validate these findings which are mostly anecdotal. Some further market analysis conducted at the local level combined with an increase in beneficiary consultation may have improved the relevance and appropriateness of this activity given some of the conflicting feedback. Whilst gratefully received by the recipients, both the cash and food distribution occurred late and after the seasonal crisis period of spring where an earlier distribution would have had greater impact.

Livelihoods are not a traditional area of activity or expertise for MRCS. Despite the creativity in the partnership with World Vision, the vocational and business grant activity that was undertaken appeared to be quite technical in nature with coverage limited to only a hundred herders in three Soums. The success and sustainability of this activity was not able to be assessed given the short duration and seasonality of the activity. There may be other less complex livelihood undertakings with broader coverage that may have been considered but due to time constraints this was not able to be explored by the evaluation team.

## Recommendations

1. MRCS HQ to improve the monitoring of the workload and capacity of mid-level branches when planning and implementing emergency operations especially in relation to budget allocations.
2. MRCS to roll out Branch Disaster Response Teams (BDRT) training to strengthen its primary level branch visibility and capability.
3. Mid-level branches responsible for the delivery of cash transfers should also carry out the relevant data validation and PDM activities using mobile data collection and communication tools.
4. MRCS to strengthen its community engagement activities during emergencies to improve beneficiary consultation practice and exchange of information.
5. MRCS/IFRC to ensure that future preparedness and relief activities are better aligned with known seasonal risks and vulnerabilities. (e.g. spring thaw)
6. MRCS to develop more expertise in livelihoods and slow onset DRR at the mid-branch level consistent with its pending national DRM strategy.
7. MRCS to further evaluate the impact and sustainability of the livelihoods market training activity prior to undertaking future similar initiatives.

## 5.2 Health

The Health activities in this operation were quite small but consistent with MRCS strategy of focus and coverage within their capacity at the time. Population health needs in remote herder families are quite complex and especially with slow onset are linked heavily with nutrition and access to local healthcare. Some reports suggested a portion of the cash transfer programme was used to support existing chronic health needs including treatment and purchase of medicines.

MRCS after discussions with Save the Children did elect to pilot an innovative psychosocial first aid programme (PSP/FA) for school-aged children. Using a four step train the trainer, (ToT) mid-level branch staff and teachers become the PSP knowledge brokers. Despite the fact that herder families are traditionally shy when it comes to discussing personal matters or expressing needs, the activity was highly regarded by beneficiaries and informants in both organisations. According to the monitoring reports reviewed this activity was regarded by the evaluation team as highly relevant and appropriate. Clinical evidence or indicators as to impact, effectiveness or timeliness were not available and should be reviewed when available.

## Recommendations

8. Subject to a positive evidence based review, MRCS is to consider the expansion of child focussed PSS/FA in future operations.
9. MRCS to also train its future BDRT volunteers in PSS/FA to be delivered during assessment/monitoring and relief activities with adult beneficiaries.

### 5.3 Disaster Risk Reduction

Risk reduction sits at the heart of resilience at the community level especially in relation to slow onset Dzud. It was felt by the evaluation team that more needs to be done in this area especially if extreme seasonality is to become more frequent as some predict.

The hay harvester activity<sup>3</sup> was certainly innovative in that it clearly supports a preparedness approach. The number of hay harvesters procured was based on a financial allocation as opposed to any assessed need and procurement was problematic and took time. As a result of these delays the main hay harvesting window was missed meaning that the relevance and appropriateness of this project could be questioned.

The hay harvesters were gifted to the MRCS branches and distributed out to the herders for a maintenance or hire fee. The evaluation team questioned the ethics of this activity which was described by some as a branch fundraising venture if this indeed was the intent. The evaluation team were not able to locate a maintenance plan or to determine the sustainability of an activity of this nature so more work is recommended in this regard. The evaluation team were not able to source any supportive research or consideration of other DRR activities that were considered.

The lack of monitoring indicators and follow up made it difficult to evaluate the relevance or effectiveness of the climate change training activity for herders. Some informants suggested that this activity was more of a consultation process as opposed to educational. MRCS does considerable work in community development supported by local and international partners. There is the potential to further link and promote this work with its emergency and slow onset activities especially where risk reduction is concerned.

### Recommendations

10. MRCS with its partners to further develop its early warning / early action systems at national, provincial and Soum levels with government and non-government counterparts including forecast based financing for future Dzud preparedness and response.
11. MRCS to closely monitor the use and review the validity and sustainability of hay harvesters prior to the procurement for further units in 2017
12. MRCS to review and clearly define the purpose of charging a fee for the use of hay harvesters to beneficiaries and to seek additional external policy advice as to the ethics of such an undertaking where required.

---

<sup>3</sup> See operations update for details.

## 5.4 Quality Programming

According to some MRCS and IFRC staff, there was some initial confusion and lack of a clear understanding of the role and function of DREF and the subsequent appeal and plan of action (PoA). This confusion may have resulted in delays in decision making and involved ongoing dialogue between MRCS, IFRC CCST and APRO. Some informants suggested that the APRO took a much larger role in this event than would be normal due to lack of a designated country office in Mongolia and reduced capacity at the CCST in Beijing. As a result, MRCS at times were not entirely clear on the division of responsibilities and roles between the IFRC regional office and CCST.

Many informants also agreed there was some confusion as to clear lines of technical responsibility also with many people consulting and inputting into decision making and advice than was felt necessary or warranted for an appeal of this nature. This input continued after the appeal launch and is attributed by many to the fact there was not an in country operations manager or designate with the required authority that was in country. For a number of reasons the recruitment for this position was delayed and then did not take place due to the eventual exhaustion of the budget allocation.

Some informants from MRCS and IFRC do believe that an IFRC operations manager would not be effective or an efficient use of appeal funds either in the 2016 operation or the one planned for 2017. There was a strong argument that MRCS being extremely technically competent managed to implement an operation without a designated in country operations manager in 2016 and therefore it would be less relevant in 2017 which has a much smaller operation. It was also felt that having the budget holder positioned in Mongolia would be more efficient and timely as far as managing the budget is concerned. According to some, this position may also enhance the ability of IFRC and MRCS to implement and monitor lessons from 2016 more readily into the operation than by having remote support.

Notwithstanding, the 2016 appeal did suffer from a number of delays where a designated coordination and decision making presence at the country level may have made a difference. Some informants have suggested that some confusion as to statutory roles and responsibilities between MRCS and IFRC in relation to appeal management remain now especially in the areas of support services such as HR, Finance, Admin, and Logistics. It should also be noted that a number of the more technical processes such as procurement were supported by IFRC in 2016 due to lack of MRCS capacity and the requirement for transparency, are now to be undertaken solely by MRCS in 2017.

A monitoring framework with indicators was not developed to accompany the POA or its revision and this was a key oversight by MRCS and IFRC. The POA was not used by MRCS as a guiding or implementing operational document. MRCS did complete a number of high quality monitoring and field visit reports but these did not directly match the appeal reporting needs but rather were adapted or interpreted for them. A more clearly defined and managed monitoring and reporting process would have saved considerable time and energy especially for tracking and measuring of activity and outcomes.

### Recommendations:

13. Appeal revisions and operations updates in 2017 should promote and reflect the strong community and development day to day activities and expertise of MRCS and its national and international partners which also contribute to the operation.
14. MRCS to incorporate the results of the recent IFRC PMER Capacity Self-Assessment findings where relevant into PMER support for future emergencies.

15. MRCS with IFRC assistance to develop a monitoring and reporting framework, with tracking table with measurable indicators specifically for the 2017 plan of action.
16. MRCS to develop some policy guidance informed by the recent DRCE and OCAC and VCA findings in relation to preparing for and responding to slow onset events such as Dzud.
17. IFRC with MRCS agreement to place the 2017 appeal budget holder responsibilities within an IFRC position at the country level in Mongolia.
18. IFRC to review and update the Asia Pacific response SOPs to focus on more clearly identifying technical and operational decision making responsibilities between the regional and country IFRC cluster offices.
19. IFRC to invest in refreshing its POA toolbox and checklist so that it is fit for purpose and better reflects modern project management technology, principles and processes.

## 6. Conclusions

As discussed with MRCS by the evaluation team there should really be no surprises in this evaluation given the technical competency of the key staff involved and their learning by doing nature. MRCS have already taken on a number of roles relating to tenders and procurement in 2017 that were performed by IFRC in 2016. This reflects the growing confidence and the ability to assimilate capacity development support in quick time. MRCS would do well to carry over that development willingness into preparedness and risk reduction as the focus of its disaster risk management agenda for the future. The recent research commissioned by IFRC conducted by the University of East Anglia on building capacity in DRM<sup>4</sup> would also be of benefit in the view of the evaluators. Whilst not a specific finding or recommendation, the evaluation team also recommends the recent CHS alliance research into surge in slow onset disasters<sup>5</sup> and IFRC review of slow onset response in Africa<sup>6</sup> to be considered as relevant as well.

Much of the research around Dzud over recent years suggests it is a known quantity and a one in ten year proposition which has the potential to increase<sup>7</sup>. At a recent lessons event co-hosted in Mongolia by UNDP and NEMA, the dominant message was that preparedness and risk mitigation at multiple levels was the key and the future to improving the resilience of herders and their livelihoods. This is not a new proposition. Similar recommendations have come from other research and this approach is consistent with a number of global policy frameworks especially where meteorological hazards and climate change are concerned.<sup>8</sup>

Mongolian Red Cross enjoys a strong relationship with Government at the national and local level. MRCS has a seat at the National Emergency Commission which is represented by the Secretary General. MRCS is also one of the few national organisations to participate in the humanitarian country team (HCT) coordination mechanism which is co-chaired by the UN resident coordinator and National Emergency Management Agency. MRCS has co led with Save the Children the lessons process relating to cash programming include the establishment of a working group. As a result MRCS is a respected leader in the humanitarian sector with a growing reputation and also growing expectations from stakeholders.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.ifrc.org/en/get-involved/learning-education-training/research/capacity-building-for-disaster-risk-management/>

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.chsalliance.org/files/files/Slow-onset%20Crises\\_Review%20of%20Surge%20Practices.pdf](http://www.chsalliance.org/files/files/Slow-onset%20Crises_Review%20of%20Surge%20Practices.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.ifrc.org/Download.aspx?FileId=84169>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/11/06/lessons-from-dzud>

<sup>8</sup> <http://reliefweb.int/report/mongolia/mongolia-forges-ahead-sendai-framework>

It is unsustainable for MRCS to request DREF or appeals year after year with the primary focus of response and relief and where the secondary focus is on livelihoods, resilience building and DRR. The real challenge for MRCS will be to ensure that at the completion of this 2017 operation, there is strengthened organisational and community preparedness in the face of increasing climatological threats informed by clear policies and procedures. MRCS have an abundance of tools and support in this regard with OCAC, DRCE and VCA supported by partners being the most recent.

MRCS has the support of enduring partnerships both national and International, movement and non-movement which will see it through this particular important and defining period. Despite its obvious strengths and technical capability MRCS will need to be careful becoming a victim of its own success and trying to do too much. By developing a clearer sense of its direction and purpose in Disaster Risk Management this will in turn enable it to navigate its future demands especially in relation to managing slow onset hazards such as Dzud.

An evaluation of the current 2017 appeal and operation will also present an opportunity for MRCS and IFRC to look at the comparative findings in this evaluation in more depth and the relevant time and budgetary allocation should be made to ensure that this occurs. This is important if the learning by doing culture of MRCS is to be maintained and utilised whilst receiving international assistance.

The evaluation team wishes the Mongolian Red Cross Society and its partners every success for 2017 and for the future.

Ends.

## The Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement

**Humanity** The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, born of a desire to bring assistance without discrimination to the wounded on the battlefield, endeavors, in its international and national capacity, to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect life and health and to ensure respect for the human being. It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst all peoples.

**Impartiality** It makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavors to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.

**Neutrality** In order to enjoy the confidence of all, the Movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

**Independence** The Movement is independent. The National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the Movement.

**Voluntary service** It is a voluntary relief movement not prompted in any manner by desire for gain.

**Unity** There can be only one Red Cross or Red Crescent Society in any one country. It must be open to all. It must carry on its humanitarian work throughout its territory.

**Universality** The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in which all societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities and duties in helping each other, is worldwide.

## Appendix A.

### **Terms of Reference (TOR)**

#### **Evaluation of Mongolia Extreme Winter Emergency Appeal Operation**

##### **1. Summary.**

- 1.1. Purpose** – The purpose of this evaluation is to examine the validity of the programme design, the extent to which the goal, objectives and expected results of this emergency operation were achieved in terms of its relevance to the needs of the beneficiaries and its effectiveness and timeliness. The evaluation will highlight what worked well and what might have been done differently as lessons to be applied in future operations.
- 1.2. Audience** – Red Cross management and technical staff directly/indirectly involved in the operation or having an interest in Mongolia operations; stakeholders and Movement Partners.
- 1.3. Commissioners** – This evaluation is commissioned by the Deputy Director, Asia Pacific Regional Office, IFRC
- 1.4. Reports** – IFRC Beijing CCST head of office, IFRC APRO head of DCPRR will be responsible to decide on and formulate responses to the evaluation recommendations
- 1.5. Timeframe** – 28 January to 28 February 2017 (with approx. 10 days in-country)
- 1.6. Location** - Mongolia (Ulan Bator City with travel to selected field locations)

##### **2. Background.**

Dzud is a consequence of a summer drought and extreme overgrazing leading to insufficient hay for winter grazing. Parts of Mongolia experienced continuous heavy snowfall and snowstorms with average temperatures below 25 degrees Celsius during daytime and around -40 degrees during the night in the 2015 winter season. The effects of the bitter cold and insufficient hay fodder due to the previous summer's drought killed at least 850,000 starving livestock (camels, horses, cows, sheep and goats) across Mongolia, more than 80,000 herder families (around 400,000 people) in the northern and western parts of the country were affected.

A DREF allocation of CHF 158,459 was approved on 15 January 2016 to support 7,500 people (1,500 households) through the provision of food and unconditional cash grants. On 29 February 2016, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) launched an Emergency Appeal for CHF 833,945 to support the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) to scale up delivery of humanitarian assistance and support to 25,500 people (5,100 households) for 12 months, with a focus on detailed assessments, food security, nutrition and livelihoods, and community preparedness and risk reduction. The Appeal was revised on 25 July 2016 to increase the budget to CHF 979,346 and the target to 27,000 people (5,400 households) and refocused geographic scope from 20 to 17 provinces. The operation will close by end of February 2017. The plans and reports related to this operation can be found [here](#).

##### **3. Evaluation Purpose & Scope.**

- 3.1. Purpose** The purpose of this evaluation is to examine the validity of the programme design, the extent to which the goal, objectives and expected results of this emergency operation were achieved in terms of its relevance to the needs of the beneficiaries and its effectiveness and timeliness. The evaluation will highlight what worked well and what might have been done differently as lessons to be applied in future operations.

In addition, the evaluation will analyse how disaster and other related policies are used as guidance for the planning and implementation of emergency relief and recovery operations, and, to provide recommendations for improvement, and how to guide the operation of this year's severe winter conditions, where appropriate.

- 3.2. Scope** The review will cover the entire duration of the operation, including relief and recovery activities and in doing so will address the following key questions / focus areas: Quality, relevance and accountability; effectiveness and efficiency.

## **4. Evaluation Objectives and Criteria.**

### **4.1 Objectives.**

1. Examine the validity of the intervention design, in terms of timeliness of delivery, scope and scale incorporating an assessment of decision-making
  - Was the intervention the right 'fit' given the needs of the affected communities, context of Mongolia and the scope of the objectives?
  - Did the response factor the nature of disaster i.e. slow onset, its impact on and emerging needs of the population?
2. Examine the extent to which the operation has achieved its goal, objectives and expected results.
  - Was the assistance relevant and appropriate relevant to meet the needs of targeted population?
  - Was the assistance provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of targeted population?
  - What are the key achievements of this operation?
  - What major challenges or constraints were faced during the operation?
  - Are there any areas of the operation that could have been done differently?
  - How has the operation contributed to enhancing the capacity of MRCS in disaster preparedness and response planning?
3. Examine the coordination and cooperation mechanisms among key implementing partners.
  - To what extent is MRCS and Movement Partners satisfied with the support provided by IFRC with regard to the mobilisation of external assistance and coordination mechanisms?
4. Examine whether IFRC disaster and other related policies are used effectively as guidance for the planning and implementation of emergency relief and recovery operations
  - Do MRCS staff and volunteers understand IFRC policies in implementing IFRC supported emergency and recovery operations?

### **4.2 Evaluation criteria.**

- 1) adherence to Fundamental Principles and Code of Conduct, 2) relevance and appropriateness, 3) efficiency, 4) effectiveness, 5) coverage, 6) impact, 7) coherence, 8) sustainability and coherence.

## **5. Evaluation Methodology.**

1. **Desk Review.** As part of the preparation process, the IFRC Mongolia Office will gather key background documents including appeal documentation, operations updates, plans, assessment reports plus other relevant programme documentation and forward documents to the evaluators. Briefings will be held with the IFRC Beijing Office, prior to travelling to Mongolia.
2. **Field visits.** The evaluation team will meet with relevant staff members of the MRCS, IFRC Mongolia Office, key national, provincial and district authorities/partners, end-beneficiaries, which are deemed important for the tasks of the review team. Briefings, interviews and field visits will be arranged in consultation with and through the MRCS/IFRC. An end of evaluation debrief will be undertaken to share the broad findings of the evaluation team with MRCS and IFRC representatives. The debriefing meeting will also constitute a formalized opportunity for summarizing the consultation process as well as an opportunity for the key stakeholders to raise relevant questions. A draft report on key findings will be presented before the departure of the review team.
3. **Development of methodology and work plan:** the team will develop detailed methodology and work plan guides for meeting the objectives of this review. The methodology will incorporate desk research, interviews with stakeholders, small group discussions, direct or indirect discussions with beneficiaries, documentation, and reflection and feedback (*refer inception report below*).
4. An IFRC evaluation management team (EMT) will oversee the evaluation, and with the evaluators, ensure that it upholds the [IFRC Framework for Evaluations](#). The EMT will comprise three people not directly involved with the operation: one from DCPRR unit in APRO, one from PMER unit in APRO, and one from the IFRC CCST Mongolia office.

## 6. Deliverables (or Outputs).

The following outputs are expected to be delivered by the evaluation team:

- Preliminary verbal debriefing: The initial results of the evaluation will be presented in a verbal debriefing to MRCS prior to the departure of the evaluation team.
- Inception report: By 4 February 2017, a written draft report will be submitted to the Evaluation Management Team. This report shall reflect a realistic plan of work for the evaluation, including proposed methodology, data collection, timelines and reporting. The recommendations must be realistic within the context and the MRCS's and the IFRC's constitution and modus operandi.
- Final report will be submitted latest on 28 February 2017 based on the initial feedback provided in the debriefing provided by MRCS and IFRC. This report should be of no more than 15 pages not inclusive of annexes, and will follow the format outlined in Annex 1. All information and analysis should be gender disaggregated to the extent possible.
- The evaluation report will be shared with participants and key stakeholders. It will also be made available to a wider audience through the IFRC's standard communication channels such as FedNet. Management response by IFRC and MRCS will also be formulated based on the final report endorsed. Management from the MRCS and IFRC commits to ensuring that the findings and in particular the lessons learned will then be shared with key departments across the IFRC, and will feed into wider lesson learning linked to other major disaster response and recovery operations.

## 7. Proposed Timeline

Key evaluation event	Time	Remarks
Formation of the Evaluation Team	By 27 January 2017 (Fri)	
Finalization of ToR, Design of Evaluation Tools & Literature Review	28 Jan to 3 Feb 2017	
Inception Report is submitted	4 Feb 2017	
Feedback to Inception Report	6 Feb 2017	
Briefing at CCST Beijing & Key informant Interview at CCST	8 Feb 2017	(optional / can be Skype interview too)
Field visit in Mongolia	8 Feb – 17 Feb 2017	Incl. visits to selected branches, to be finalized with MRCS
Initial finding/ recommendations presentation, debriefing with MRCS	Last day of the Field visit	Evaluation team to MRCS/IFRC in-country
Debriefing with Evaluation Management Team (TBC)	One day after the Field Visit	
Draft Evaluation Report is submitted	22 Feb 2017 (Wed)	For feedback and comments
Feedback to Draft Report	24 Feb 2017 (Fri)	
Debriefing/presentation at APRO (tentative)	TBC	
Final report is submitted	28 February 2017 (Tue)	
Management response is formulated	(Date TBC)	

## **8. Evaluation Quality & Ethical Standards.**

*The evaluators should take all reasonable steps to ensure that the evaluation is designed and conducted to respect and protect the rights and welfare of people and the communities of which they are members, and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate, reliable, and legitimate, conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. Therefore, the evaluation team should adhere to the evaluation standards and specific, applicable practices outlined in the IFRC Evaluation Framework. The IFRC Evaluation Standards are:*

1. **Utility:** Evaluations must be useful and used.
2. **Feasibility:** Evaluations must be realistic, diplomatic, and managed in a sensible, cost effective manner.
3. **Ethics & Legality:** Evaluations must be conducted in an ethical and legal manner, with particular regard for the welfare of those involved in and affected by the evaluation.
4. **Impartiality & Independence:** Evaluations should be impartial, providing a comprehensive and unbiased assessment that takes into account the views of all stakeholders.
5. **Transparency:** Evaluation activities should reflect an attitude of openness and transparency.
6. **Accuracy:** Evaluations should be technically accurate, providing sufficient information about the data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods so that its worth or merit can be determined.
7. **Participation:** Stakeholders should be consulted and meaningfully involved in the evaluation process when feasible and appropriate.
8. **Collaboration:** Collaboration between key operating partners in the evaluation process improves the legitimacy and utility of the evaluation.

*It is also expected that the evaluation will respect the seven Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent: 1) humanity, 2) impartiality, 3) neutrality, 4) independence, 5) voluntary service, 6) unity, and 7) universality. Further information can be obtained about these principles at:*

[www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp](http://www.ifrc.org/what/values/principles/index.asp)

**9. Evaluation Team:** Due to the consecutively implemented DREF operation and developing Emergency appeal operation in response to imminent Dzud crisis in Mongolia this evaluation is considered an institutional (internal self-evaluation) one.

*Team will be composed of the following members:*

1. Team leader (from a PNS or an IFRC CO or CCST not directly involved in the response) – with previous experience of leading an evaluation
2. 1<sup>st</sup> Team Member (from an MRCS Department of Branch not directly involved in the response) – preferably with Branch Management or Head of Department experience
3. 2<sup>nd</sup> Team Member (from a PNS or an IFRC CO or CCST not directly involved in the response) – preferably with DRM, M&E and/or Programme Management experience
4. 3<sup>rd</sup> Team Member (from a PNS or an IFRC CO or CCST not directly involved in the response) – with experience of CTP and livelihoods programming

## **10. Appendices**

Report Template

## Appendix B.

# Inception Report

Evaluation of Mongolia Extreme Winter Emergency Appeal  
2016

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	20
2. Background.....	20
3. Scope and evaluation objectives .....	21
4. Methodology.....	21
5. Team composition and work plan.....	22
6. Key Considerations.....	23

## Introduction

This evaluation was commissioned by the deputy director of the Asia Pacific Regional Office and follows the Mongolia Extreme Winter Emergency Appeal which was launched on 29 February 2016. Its purpose is to examine the validity of the programme design, the extent to which the goal, objectives and expected results of this emergency operation were achieved in terms of its relevance to the needs of the beneficiaries and its effectiveness and timeliness.

This evaluation is considered by the evaluation management team as institutional thereby internal in nature. This inception report will summarise the key considerations, methodologies, restrictions and work plan for the evaluation team in order to achieve the desired evaluation objectives as stated in the TOR.

## 1. Background

### 2.1 The Event

Dzud is a meteorological phenomenon unique to Mongolia. It is the result of many factors including drought, overgrazing and heavy snowfall. Its effects during 2015/2016 killed at least 850,000 livestock (camels, horses, cows, sheep and goats) across Mongolia, more than 80,000 herder families (around 400,000 people) in the northern and western parts of the country were affected. Dzud has been confirmed again in 2016/2017. The last serious occurrence was in 2010.

### 2.2 The Appeal

A DREF allocation of CHF 158,459 was approved on 15 January 2016 for the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) to support 7,500 people (1,500 households) through the provision of food and unconditional cash grants. On 29 February 2016, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) launched an Emergency Appeal for CHF 833,945 to support the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) to scale up delivery of humanitarian assistance and support to 25,500 people (5,100 households) for 12 months, with a focus on detailed assessments, food security, nutrition and livelihoods, and community preparedness and risk reduction.

The Appeal was revised on 25 July 2016 to increase the budget to CHF 979,346 and the target to 27,000 people (5,400 households) and refocused geographic scope from 20 to 17 provinces. The operation will close by end of February 2017.

On 4 January 2017 a DREF operation was launched to enable MRCS to respond to 1,000 households that have been affected by a second harsh winter in a row. This operation is expected to be scaled up into an appeal in February 2017.

### 2.3 The National Society

MRCS was established in 1939 and today has Mongolian Red Cross Society: (MRCS) has 33 midlevel branches and over 800 primary level branches working all over Mongolia, it has 12,500 volunteers and 70,000 youth members. MRCS has 7 established regional disaster preparedness centers. MRCS holds the IFRC and its partners British Red Cross, Finnish Red Cross and Australian Red Cross in high regard and is regarded as a warm, open and friendly National Society. Since 2008 it has conducted six DREF operations, three of which relate to Dzud. The appeal launched in 2016 for extreme winter was the second undertaken by MRCS. MRCS has previously undergoing evaluations and capacity assessments and open to learning and development in this regard.

## 2. Scope and evaluation objectives

**3.3. Purpose** The purpose of this evaluation is to examine the validity of the programme design, the extent to which the goal, objectives and expected results of this emergency operation were achieved in terms of its relevance to the needs of the beneficiaries and its effectiveness and timeliness. The evaluation will highlight what worked well and what might have been done differently as lessons to be applied in future operations.

In addition, the evaluation will analyze how disaster and other related policies are used as guidance for the planning and implementation of emergency relief and recovery operations that are slow onset and cyclical as in the Dzud occurrence. Recommendations are to be made for improvement, and how to guide the operation of this year's severe winter conditions, specifically addressing what IFRC support structures will be required to ensure the desired outcomes are achieved and maximum support is provided to the MRCS.

**3.4. Scope** The review will cover the entire duration of the operation, including relief and recovery activities and in doing so will address the following key questions / focus areas: Quality, relevance and accountability; effectiveness and efficiency.

### 3.5. Key questions.

- a) What triggers if any led to the DREF request? and subsequent appeal?
- b) Does the slow onset nature of the hazard create any difficulties for MRCS or IFRC?
- c) What key lessons or success stories can be assimilated into the 2017 operation?
- d) How were the initial activities identified? What was the rationale and process behind selection?
- e) Did the MRCS have existing capacity in these areas?
- f) How was this capacity measured?
- g) To what degree was timeliness of implementation an issue?
- h) How effective was IFRC in country support? What improvements if any can be made?
- i) What were the MRCS success stories from the activities? What contributed to this success?
- j) Were the IFRC support roles and responsibilities of the CCST and APRO clear to all including MRCS?
- k) How effective was the operation monitoring? What quantitative activity data is available?
- l) How effective were community feedback mechanisms? Were beneficiaries engaged in program selection?

## 3. Methodology

### 4.1 Literature and document review.

All Team members and MRCS key staff will source any relevant documentation including reports, previous evaluations, secondary data, maps, plans and academic research relating to Dzud phenomena and previous extreme winters. Specific effort will be made to source data that will inform the pending appeal and operation including existing relevant IFRC policies, procedures and SOPs.

### 4.2 Key informant interviews.

Key informants (KI) will be pre identified and team members assigned to ensure a broad range of viewpoints and input are captured. Key informant interviews (KII) will be conducted with senior members of MRCS HQ and branches, IFRC (CCST APRO), partner NS representatives Government officials, representatives of humanitarian agencies. A sample of volunteers and operation recipients should also be identified for KII to provide a more detailed and targeted feedback. Summaries of KII will be documented and key word coded for later theme identification and analysis. Key questions will be structured according to the sample provided in the TOR.

The evaluation team will meet with relevant staff members of the MRCS, IFRC Mongolia Office, key national, provincial and district authorities/partners, end-beneficiaries, which are deemed important for the tasks of the review team. Briefings, interviews and field visits will be arranged in consultation with and through the MRCS/IFRC.

#### 4.3 Field visits – direct observation

Observation serve to better understand the nature, problems and successes of activities and processes. Due to time and resources constraints, observation will be selective looking at a few activities when feasible and paying special attention to management processes that are central to the evaluation objectives.

Visits to affected areas have been organized requiring two teams. Where practical focus groups with operation recipients are to be conducted. Questions will be standardised and uncomplicated to ensure consistency between teams for later analysis.

#### 4.4. Debriefing and discussion

Sharing conclusions before they are final as often as possible with the people who have provided the information is a critical part of the analysis process.

An end of evaluation debrief will be undertaken to share the broad findings of the evaluation team with MRCS and IFRC representatives. The debriefing meeting will also constitute a formalized opportunity for summarizing the consultation process as well as an opportunity for the key stakeholders to raise relevant questions. A draft report on key findings will be presented before the departure of the review team.

## 4. Team composition and work plan

Team	Members	Designation	Key Responsibilities
One	Glenn Rose	IFRC Operations Manager Timor Leste	Leadership, logistics, liaison MRCS, EMT.
	Sandra Romero	IFRC DRM Coordinator CSST	IFRC structure and function, Desk Review, Lit review
	Comms TBC		
Two	Heather Fehr	British Red Cross	Data Management, Lit review
	MRCS tbc		

Date (Feb)	Task	Method/Notes	Responsible
Weds 1st	Inception discussion	Skype call with eval team	All
Tues 7th	Briefing with EMT APRO	Confirm inception	Glenn
Tues 8th	Meet with PNS	KII	Glenn
Weds 8th	Literature and document review Logistics and security/health	Team Discussion (Dinner)	All
Thurs 9th	Team muster & meeting	Confirm inception & arrangements with MRCS	All
Thurs 9 <sup>th</sup>	Coordinate with Comms Team		Glenn
Thurs 9th	Meeting with MRCS	Introduction Key informant interviews	Team 1 – x 2 MRCS Team 2 – x 2 MRCS
Fri 10 <sup>th</sup> – Mon 13 <sup>th</sup>	Field visit to Arvaikheer and Uvurkhangai	KEI & FGD to be confirmed. As per schedule	Team one
Fri 10 <sup>th</sup> -Weds 15th	Field visit to Murun soum, Khuvsgul and Uvurkhangai province	KEI & FGD to be confirmed. As per schedule. Key data to be transmitted prior to dept.	Team Two
Tues 14th	Skype interview with CCST Data consolidation and identification of key themes		Team one
Weds 15th	Data consolidation and preparation of final report		All
Thurs 16th	Meeting with key agencies	KII split between two teams	All
Fri 17th	Report to MRCS	Presentation design required	Led by Sandra
Mon 20th	Presentation to EMT APRO		Glenn

## 5. Key Considerations

- Provision of necessary documentation from IFRC and the National Society
- The evaluator teams expect availability of the key informants to interact for rapid triangulation of data collection.
- Short time frames have not allowed for a fuller consultation in relation to the inception process so this report and the approach described is lite and will require some adjustment as more information is obtained.
- The proposed field trips require the team to split into two on different schedules and timings. Close cooperation will be required to ensure methodology is consistent.
- The selection criteria for field visits will need to be established to ensure an adequate and realistic sample that is representative of the operation.
- Due to the potential of weather impact flexibility will be required in travel including the identification and provision of alternatives.
- Consideration will need to be given to the potential impact of the accompanying communications team so that it does not impede or influence behaviors of informants or communities that may adversely affect data collection.
- The proposed itinerary and short timeframes will require prioritization of data collection to key themes only as well as workload management to ensure the teams remain fresh and focused.
- The proposed travel for team two is quite lengthy and may have to be revised.
- Some team members may have to depart earlier than scheduled. (TBC)
- Interpreter support and translation will be required for both teams requiring two MRCS team members.

## The Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement

**Humanity** The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, born of a desire to bring assistance without discrimination to the wounded on the battlefield, endeavors, in its international and national capacity, to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect life and health and to ensure respect for the human being. It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst all peoples.

**Impartiality** It makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavors to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.

**Neutrality** In order to enjoy the confidence of all, the Movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

**Independence** The Movement is independent. The National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the Movement.

**Voluntary service** It is a voluntary relief movement not prompted in any manner by desire for gain.

**Unity** There can be only one Red Cross or Red Crescent Society in any one country. It must be open to all. It must carry on its humanitarian work throughout its territory.

**Universality** The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in which all societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities and duties in helping each other, is worldwide.

## Appendix C

### Evaluation Schedule of activity

Date (Feb)	Team One Glenn Rose	Team Two Sandra Ruiz Heather Fehr
<b>Thurs 9<sup>th</sup></b> 0800 - 0900 0900 - 1000 1000 - 1200 1300 - 1800	<p style="text-align: center;">1<sup>st</sup> team meeting Field visit planning with IFRC country team. Meeting and briefing with MRCS senior management KII with MRCS DM staff and IFRC Country Team</p>	
<b>Fri 10<sup>th</sup></b> 1600 -1800	Travel to Uvurkhangaï province Meeting with branch	Travel to Kuhvsgul Province
<b>Sat 11<sup>th</sup></b> 0900- 2000	Visit to Narinteel Soum KII beneficiaries KII with local officials	Travel to Muru Soum KII beneficiaries KII with local officials
<b>Sun 12<sup>th</sup></b> 0800 - 2000	Visit to Yuyanga Soum KII beneficiaries KII with local officials	Travel to Soum Chandmani KII beneficiaries KII with local officials and branch
<b>Mon 13<sup>th</sup></b>	Visit with Uvurkhangaï branch response presentation Travel to Ulaanbataar	Travel to Soum Tsagan KII beneficiaries KII with local officials
<b>Tues 14<sup>th</sup></b> 0900-1500	KII with INGO reps	Travel to Ulaanbataar
<b>Weds 15<sup>th</sup></b> 0800- 2000	<p style="text-align: center;">Coalition and triangulation of data. Review of key points from literature review Identification of initial key themes</p>	
<b>Thurs 16<sup>th</sup></b>	<p style="text-align: center;">Heather Fehr departs Confirmation of key themes. Preparation of PPT presentation for MRCS Fact check of initial findings with MRCS</p>	
<b>Fri 17<sup>th</sup></b>	Presentation of key findings and discussion with MRCS senior management	
<b>Sat 18<sup>th</sup></b>	Depart Mongolia	
<b>Mon 20<sup>th</sup></b>	Presentation of key findings to evaluation Management Team in Kuala Lumpur (IFRC Beijing and Ulaanbataar via skype)	
<b>Mon 4<sup>th</sup> March</b>	1st draft report submitted and circulated for feedback ( Some delays due to leave)	
<b>Fri 24<sup>th</sup> March</b>	Final Report submitted	

## Appendix D.

Interview Log							
no	Name	Sex	Informant Group	Position	Type	Date	Location
1	Neslon Castano	m	IFRC RPO	Head of DMCU (APRO)	Briefing	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
2	Necephor	m	IFRC RPO	IFRC Ops Coord	Briefing	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
3	Timothy Lam	m	IFRC RPO	IFRC Ops Coord	KII	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
4	Mathieu Leonard	m	IFRC RPO	IFRC Ops Coord	KII	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
5	Peter Ophoff	m	IFRC RPO	Head of PMER (APRO)	KII	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
6	Alice Ho	M	Ops coordinator	IFRC	KII	15-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
7	Joy Singhal	m	PNS BRC	British RC	FG	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
8	Michelle Yeo	f	PNS BRC	British RC	FG	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
9	Sonja Bjorklund	f	PNS FRC	Finish RC	FG	8-Feb	Kualar Lumpur
10	Enkhjin Garid	m	IFRC Mongolia/ CCST	National Coordinator	KII	10-Feb	Mongolia
11	Baktair Mambetov	m	IFRC CCST	DM Livelihoods Coordinator	KII	10-Feb	Beijing
12	Gwen Pang	f	IFRC CCST	Head of CCST	KII (skype)	10-Feb	Beijing
13	Madame Balorama	f	MRCS	Secretary General	KII	12-Feb	Mongolia
14	Davaajargal B.	m	MRCS	DM Team Leader	KII	12-Feb	Mongolia
15	Davaajargal B.	f	MRCS	Head of Programs and Cooperation	KII	13-Feb	Mongolia
16	Munktuul A.	f	MRCS	DM Officer	KII	13-Feb	Mongolia
17	Sugarmaa G.	f	MRCS	DM Officer	KII	13-Feb	Mongolia
18		f	MRCS	MLB Secretary- Huvsgul	KII	11-Feb	Mongolia- Muru
19		m	Government	NEMA - Local Representative	FG	13-Feb	Mongolia- Muru
20		m	Government	Civil Representative- Social Development	FG	13-Feb	Mongolia- Muru
21		m	MRCS	Primary Branch Member	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
22		f	MRCS	Primary Branch Member	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
23		m	MRCS	Primary Branch Member	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
24		m	Govt Ministry of Agriculture	Soum Livelihoods Officer	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
25		m	Govt	Representative of Emergency Commission		11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
26		f	MRCS	Volunteer- CTP	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
27		f	MRCS	Volunteer- CTP	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
28		m	Community	Bagh Leader 1	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
29		m	Community	BaghLeader 2	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
30		m	Community	Bagh Leader3	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
31		m	Community	Bagh Leader 4	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
32		m	Community	Bagh Leader 5	FG	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
33		f	Beneficiary 1- ger		KII	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
34		m	Beneficiary 2- ger		KII	11-Feb	Mongolia- Chandmani Ondor
35		f	Beneficiary 3- wood house		KII	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
36		f	Beneficiary 4- wood house		KII	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
37		m	Beneficiary 5- wood house		KII	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
38		m	MRCS	Primary Branch Member	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
39		m	MRCS	Primary Branch Member	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
40		m	Community	Civil Representative- Social Development	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
41		m	Govt	Representative of Emergency Commission	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
42		f	Community	Social worker- soum	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
43		f	Community	Social worker- soum	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
44		m	Community	School Nurse- soum	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
45		f	Community	school teacher- soum	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
46		m	Community	Member of Ben Selection	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
47		m	Community	Member of Ben Selection	FG	12-Feb	Mongolia-Tsagaan
48		M	Govt	Secretary Emergency Commission NEM	KII	15-Feb	Ulaanbataar
49		m	INGO	Rep Save the Children Mongolia	FG	15-Feb	Ulaanbataar
50		f	INGO	Rep Save the Children Mongolia	FG	15-Feb	Ulaanbataar
51		M	INGO	Rep World Vision	KII	15-Feb	Ulaanbataar
52		F	MRCS	Branch Coordinator	KII	12-Feb	Uvurkhangai
53		M	MRCS	Branch staff x 5	FG	13-Feb	Uvurkhangai
54		M	Government	Rep	KII	13-Feb	Uvurkhangai
55		M	Beneficiary 6	beneficiary	KII	11-Feb	Narinteel
56		F	Beneficiary 7	beneficiary	KII	11-Feb	Narinteel
57		M	Herder group 5 x m 5x F	beneficiary	FG	11-Feb	Narinteel
58		F	Beneficiary 8	beneficiary	KII	11-Feb	Uyanaga
59		M	Beneficiary 9	beneficiary	KII	11-Feb	Uyanaga
60		F	Govt	Local Rep	FG	11-Feb	Narinteel
61		M	MRCS	Primary Branch Member	FG	11-Feb	Narinteel
62		M	Govt	Loal Rep	FG	11-Feb	Uyanaga
63		M	MRCS	Primary Branch Member	FG	11-Feb	Uyanaga
64		M	Community	Bagh Leader	KII	11-Feb	Uyanaga

## IFRC-PED Evaluation Management Response Template

### IFRC Management Response to Recommendations for the Mongolia Extreme Winter Emergency Appeal 2016 Evaluation

#### **Background information:**

The evaluation took place in February 2017, commencing on 1<sup>st</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> – with a total of nine days in country.

The evaluation team comprised - an IFRC operations manager (Glenn Rose – evaluation team leader), an IFRC DRM delegate (Sandra Romero), a British Red Cross DRR advisor (Heather Fehr), with support from representatives of the Mongolian Red Cross. The evaluation was supported by an evaluation management team of the Secretariat comprised of APRO operations coordinator (Timothy Lam), CCST national programme advisor based in Mongolia (Enkhjin Garid), and APRO PMER senior office (Kit Roche).

The Evaluation Management Response Team comprises of the following people:

- **Nordov Bolormaa**, Secretary General of Mongolian Red Cross Society
- **Gwendolyn Pang**, Head of IFRC Country Cluster Support Team in Beijing
- **Nelson Castano**, Head of Disaster and Crises Unit, IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office
- **Thomaz Carlzon**, DRM Coordinator, IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office
- **Jeong Park**, DRR Coordinator, IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office
- **Oyungerel Amгаа**, Regional Health Coordinator, IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office
- **Isidro Navarro**, Livelihoods & Cash Preparedness Coordinator, IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office
- **Clarence Sim**, PMER Coordinator, IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office

#### **Background Information:**

Dzud is meteorological hazard unique to Mongolia. It is caused by successive seasons of drought followed by heavy snowfall, low temperature -40C which impacts the country's livestock and subsequent livelihoods of herders in large numbers. An international appeal was launched by the IFRC in 2016 to support the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) in providing assistance to 25,500 affected by Dzud. Due to the expected continuation of Dzud conditions in 2017 and as a result of a request for assistance by the Government of Mongolia, a further international appeal has been launched in February 2017. This evaluation

was commissioned by the IFRC APRO deputy director, primarily to establish the lessons learnt from 2016 in an effort to inform the planning and implementation of this latest operation currently underway.

This evaluation has identified 19 recommendations to MRCS and IFRC to be considered for their current and future operations. The real time nature of some of these recommendations means that implementation will be time critical in some instances. As a result, a real time briefing was provided to MRCS and IFRC at the completion of the field component of this evaluation which will be followed up with the submission of the final report.

A verification of key findings and fact check presentation and consultation took place with MRCS on Thursday, February 16, before a final presentation of the 19 key findings took place with MRCS leadership in the following day. These initial key findings were also presented by the team leader to the evaluation management team in Kuala Lumpur on February 20. A draft report was due to be presented by February 22 but due to other commitments, this was not possible and was deferred. The draft report was received on March 4, and subsequently shared with stakeholders for feedback, which was coordinated by the EMT and discussed with the evaluation team leader, resulting the final version of the evaluation report on March 27, 2017.

### **Summary of Management Response:**

*As necessary, provide a summary of the Management Response to the overall evaluation and its recommendations*

### **SECTION 1: LIVELIHOODS, NUTRITION AND FOOD SECURITY**

**Recommendation 1: MRCS HQ to improve the monitoring of the workload and capacity of mid-level branches when planning and implementing emergency operations especially in relation to budget allocations.**

<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	Branch development was an essential component of recent DRCE and OCAC assessments.	<u>For MRCS:</u> Future planning and implementing of emergency operations will be done after carefully monitoring the workload and capacity of mid-level branches. MRCS will do mapping exercises on mid-level branch capacities and project implementation.  <u>For IFRC:</u>	(MRCS) By Dec 2017   (IFRC)	MRCS ( <i>Programs and Cooperation department, Administration and coordination department</i> ),

		Working closely with the MRCS leadership and headquarters, implement the recommendations of DRCE and OCAC to improve the overall capacity of branches.	On-going	IFRC Beijing CCST & APRO
<p><b>Comments:</b> All the recommendations and proposed actions should be integrated in the on-going work of revising the MRCS Institutional Disaster Preparedness Plan linked to the Strategy 2017-2020 following the DRCE exercise 2016 and write shop in May-17. The time frame of the actions to be taken as a response to this report should be aligned with the implementation plan of the Institution DP plan.</p>				
<p><b>Recommendation 2: MRCS to roll out Branch Disaster Response Teams (BDRT) training to strengthen its primary level branch visibility and capability.</b></p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	Same as above.	<p>MRCS will organize BDRT trainings at mid-level branches, and strengthen capacities of primary level branches.</p> <p>IFRC will provide technical support if necessary.</p>	<p>By 2020, all mid-level branches will have fully operational BDRT teams</p> <p>Each soum/khoroo will have Primary level branches</p>	<p>MRCS (<i>Disaster management team Administration and coordination department</i>), IFRC Beijing CCST &amp; APRO</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>				
<p><b>Recommendation 3. Mid-level branches responsible for the delivery of cash transfers should also carry out the relevant data validation and PDM activities using mobile data collection and communication tools.</b></p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b>	In the MDRMN006 operation, Magpi is used as a Mobile Data Collection (MDC) tool for	One MRCS staff has been trained in Mobile Data Collection (MDC) in November 2016. This person	<i>Ongoing</i>	MRCS ( <i>IT engineer</i> ,

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p>relevant data collection and PDM activities by the mid-level branch staffs and volunteers.</p>	<p>can approach to support any MDC training planned by MRCS, particularly for the use of needs assessment and PDM. Roadmap to PMER development is being initiated in 2017 in which this process will be covered.</p>		<p><i>Disaster management team, PMER, mid-level branches), IFRC Beijing CCST &amp; APRO</i></p>
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 4: MRCS to strengthen its community engagement activities during emergencies to improve beneficiary consultation practice and exchange of information.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p>MRCS has already been selected for the global pilot of rolling out the Roadmap to Community Resilience (R2R). As such a MRCS staff had participated in the first global ToT on the R2R, hosted by the Asia Pacific Disaster Resilience Centre (APDRC) on 15-17 March 2017 in Seoul, Korea. While designed for resilience planning, the steps elaborated in the R2R will help strengthen the MRCS community engagement (and beneficiary communication) activities during emergencies.</p>	<p>With a small funding allocated by Geneva, the MRCS will be closely supported to design and implement a R2R pilot within next 12 months (as per Geneva funding instructions).</p>	<p>Until June 2018</p>	<p>MRCS, Beijing CCST, IFRC APRO DCPRR &amp; Asia Pacific Disaster Resilience Centre (APDRC)</p>
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 5: MRCS/IFRC to ensure that future preparedness and relief activities are better aligned with known seasonal risks and vulnerabilities. (e.g. spring thaw)</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p>MRCS is working to better address the seasonal risks, and APRO is promoting a pre-disaster meeting to ensure the readiness of IFRC offices as well as other NSs.</p> <p>IFRC is working on the recruitment of a DRM delegate to be based in Mongolia to provide technical support in all DM related matters, especially strengthening the institution disaster preparedness.</p>	<p>MRCS headquarters and branches are to align their disaster planning cycle to meet with seasonal risks and vulnerabilities.</p> <p>MRCS/ IFRC will revisit the plan of action of the MDRMN006 operation, to ensure the preparedness activities are aligned with potential risk.</p>	On-going	MRCS ( <i>Programs and Cooperation department</i> ) & IFRC APRO DCPRR
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 6: MRCS to develop more expertise in livelihoods and slow onset DRR at the mid-branch level consistent with its pending national DRM strategy.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p>Livelihood is a comparatively new sector to MRCS. Currently there is no ongoing Livelihood programs despite some minimal parts included in implemented projects.</p> <p>As stated in the evaluation report, DRR “sits at the heart of resilience at the community level especially in relation to slow onset Dzud”. The R2R, underpinned by the IFRC’s Framework on Community Resilience, help promote slow onset DRR expertise.</p>	<p>The livelihood expertise capacity needs to be built in both HQ and mid-level branches</p> <p>Promote the R2R by implementing a pilot.</p>	<p>By 2020</p> <p>Until June 2018</p>	MRCS, IFRC Beijing CCST, APRO DCPRR & APDRC
<b>Comments:</b>				

<b>Recommendation 7: MRCS to further evaluate the impact and sustainability of the livelihoods market training activity prior to undertaking future similar initiatives.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		<p>In the MDRMN006 operation, this evaluation is being planned and budgeted for.</p> <p>And for future operations, M&amp;E framework will be developed and will be followed closely.</p>	Nov 2017	MRCS ( <i>Disaster management team, PMER</i> ), IFRC Beijing CCST & APRO DCPRR
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>SECTION 2: HEALTH</b>				
<b>Recommendation 8: Subject to a positive evidence based review, MRCS is to consider the expansion of child focussed PSS/FA in future operations.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	PSS/FA training received very positive feedback from the participants through focus group discussions, interviews and questionnaires. This activity is to be expanded and used in future operations.	The PSS/FA for children is included in the MDRMN006 operation.	Ongoing	MRCS ( <i>Programs and Cooperation, Disaster management team</i> )
<b>Comments:</b> PSS and FA are two distinctly different things, it should be distinguished clearly if it is PSS or FA or PFA. According to the evaluation, it should refer to PFA mentioned by the evaluation team. If It is PFA, which could be considered in any operation by the NS. In addition, it is recommended that health staff to be included in future reviews so they can be consulted and contribute to the recommendations and evidences above.				
<b>Recommendation 9: MRCS to also train its future BDRT volunteers in PSS/FA to be delivered during assessment/monitoring and relief activities with adult beneficiaries.</b>				

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		BDRT teams will be trained in PSS in emergencies. This will be included in the training curriculum of the BDRTs.	By 2020	MRCS ( <i>Programs and cooperation</i> )
<b>Comments:</b> It is not clear why this recommendation will be focus on adult, given that the appeal was focused on children PSS				
<b>SECTION 3: DISASTER RISK REDUCTION</b>				
<b>Recommendation 10: MRCS with its partners to further develop its early warning / early action systems at national, provincial and Soum levels with government and non-government counterparts including forecast based financing for future Dzud preparedness and response.</b>				
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	<p>Early warning and early action is highly compatible in the case of slow onset disasters, especially dzud.</p> <p>MRCS is working to better address seasonal risks, it is necessary to improve early warning and early action for slow onset events.</p>	With the British Red Cross (BRC) funded Resilience building project 2017-2018, MRCS is planned to test the FBF mechanism in Mongolia.	By 2018	MRCS ( <i>Disaster Management team</i> ), IFRC Beijing CCST APRO & BRC
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 11: MRCS to closely monitor the use and review the validity and sustainability of hay harvesters prior to the procurement for further units in 2017</b>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		The use and monitoring of the hay harvesters distributed in 2016 will be conducted in 2017 before integrating it into the 2017 EPoA	By Aug 2017	MRCS ( <i>PMER, EA officer, Disaster management team</i> )
<b>Comments:</b> IFRC would suggest partially accept the comments of the report. Agree that the delay of the procurement of the hay harvesters resulted in the missed harvesting window for the 2016 dzud but that it should also be recognised that this could be one (of other additional) ways to support risk reduction. The Ops update No 4 24 <sup>th</sup> jan-17 report herder satisfaction with the activity.				
<b>Recommendation 12: MRCS to review and clearly define the purpose of charging a fee for the use of hay harvesters to beneficiaries and to seek additional external policy advice as to the ethics of such an undertaking where required.</b>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		<p>MRCS will analyse feedback from the beneficiaries, and reconsider the charging of maintenance cost for the hay harvesters.</p> <p>A guideline of using the hay harvesters will be developed and disseminate to MLBs.</p>	By Aug 2017	MRCS ( <i>PMER, EA officer, Disaster management team</i> )
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>SECTION 4: QUALITY PROGRAMMING</b>				
<b>Recommendation 13: Appeal revisions and operations updates in 2017 should promote and reflect the strong community and development day to day activities and expertise of MRCS and its national and international partners which also contribute to the operation.</b>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b>	Could not find where this recommendation is being triggered from the findings in the report.		On-going	IFRC APRO

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p>All emergency appeals and operational updates in 2017 have already articulated, in many forms, the operational and managerial expertise of MRCS. The Operational Update no 1. (issued on 13 April 2017) even highlighted the improved working relationship of MRCS with the Mongolian Government by saying “MRCS is selected as a humanitarian actor to be included in the NEMA internal working group assigned by the Deputy Prime Minister of Mongolia working closely with NEMA and other relevant ministries and governmental organizations to coordinate overall response efforts in the country.”</p>			
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 14: MRCS to incorporate the results of the recent IFRC PMER Capacity Self-Assessment findings where relevant into PMER support for future emergencies.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p>Could not find where this recommendation is being triggered from the findings in the report. However, IFRC is working closely with MRCS in 2017 to initiate the Roadmap to PMER development.</p>	<p>PMER CSAT findings have been used in developing discussion on the Roadmap to PMER development.</p>	<p>July 2017 - 2020</p>	<p>MRCS (<i>PMER officer, Programs and cooperation department</i>) &amp; IFRC APRO PMER</p>
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 15: MRCS with IFRC assistance to develop a monitoring and reporting framework, with tracking table with measurable indicators specifically for the 2017 plan of action.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	This has been taken into consideration for the MDRMN006 operation.	Ms. Elzat, Operations manager for MDRMN006 operation, together with the DM team and PMER officer have developed an M&E plan for the current Appeal. ITT for MDRMN006 operation need to be revisited.	Ongoing	MRCS ( <i>EA officer, DM team, PMER officer</i> )
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 16: MRCS to develop some policy guidance informed by the recent DRCE and OCAC and VCA findings in relation to preparing for and responding to slow onset events such as Dzud.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		Policy guiding document/recommendation informed by the relevant evaluations will be developed and disseminated.	By Dec 2017	MRCS ( <i>Administration and coordination department, DM team</i> )
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 17: IFRC with MRCS agreement to place the 2017 appeal budget holder responsibilities within an IFRC position at the country level in Mongolia.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		IFRC is working on the recruitment of a DRM delegate to be based in Mongolia to provide technical support.  Separately a Regional Disaster Response Team (RDRT) member from the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society was already deployed to support	On-going	IFRC Beijing CCST & APRO

		the cash transfer component of the operation in February 2017.		
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 18: IFRC to review and update the Asia Pacific Response SOPs to focus on more clearly identifying technical and operational decision making responsibilities between the regional and country IFRC cluster offices.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		APRO DCPRR is working on the revision of the regional SOP, aligning with the Emergency Response Framework.	On-going	IFRC APRO DCPRR
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Recommendation 19: IFRC to invest in refreshing its POA toolbox and checklist so that it is fit for purpose and better reflects modern project management technology, principles and processes.</b>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	IFRC is aware of the need for refreshing the current EPOA tools. The tools are to be used as standard template with room for adaptability to the operational context, which can be advised by the IFRC Ops Coordinator and PMER.		On-going	IFRC APRO PMER & DCPRR
<b>Comments:</b>				