

WFP Bangladesh
MGD
12/07/2018

USDA Comments on the Evaluation

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
<p>Overall comments: The baseline evaluation report was challenging to read. The way the findings were presented was often confusing and left the reader with the impression that the evaluator was unclear of the purpose of the baseline evaluation report. Not enough context was given regarding the treatment schools – it was unclear if some of them had already received USDA or GOB or WFP interventions. The overall presentation of the “control” schools was concerning. It’s puzzling that the “control” schools chosen for the sample were known to not fit the criteria of a “control group” (i.e. the schools had participated in a multi-year literacy intervention), and the reason for selecting to sample this “control” group of schools for the baseline is still unclear. The language used was at times ambiguous and led to seemingly contradictory statements throughout the evaluation, undermining the reader’s ability to interpret the findings and report. It was unclear which baseline indicators values were measured vs the indicator values that are always zero (because project activities have not begun). Clarification throughout would ease the readability of the report. USDA has extensive comments that need to be addressed before the report can be approved.</p>	<p>The report has been adjusted to clearly explain the findings of baseline evaluation for key indicators. Background information clarified SF assistance prior to the project. Other revisions have been made in the respective section.</p>
<p>Point 12 of Executive Summary– <i>USDA Comment: What was the reasoning behind selecting these schools as a “control” group when it was known beforehand that these schools participated in READ? The fact that the control schools had an early grade reading intervention for a few years makes them not valid as a “control.” Please clarify.</i></p>	<p>Selection of control schools to follow the quasi experimental design was critical as per the requirement of TOR. However, there was no Upazila (sub district) which we found entirely matched the background characteristic of treatment Upazilas. Of the eight Upazilas in Cox Bazar District, Ramu was identified as the closest or the most suitable Upazila for the characteristics matching with treatment Upazila. (The details have been given in Box 1 of the report). Another advantage was that the schools in Ramu have never had school feeding support while all the Upazilas with similar characteristics</p>

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
	<p>received school feeding support from WFP. We were aware that the schools in Ramu had literacy intervention under the READ programme, but these ended in 2018. We selected Ramu as control with the understanding that there will be no school feeding and literacy intervention during the project period. We propose to measure the change for the literacy indicators using the baseline numbers. (Point12 and 13)</p> <p>The survey findings have clearly established that the overall literacy status in control schools is better than the treatment school. Later in consultation with USDA and Office of Evaluation we finally concluded that the quasi-experimental design is not appropriate. Therefore, an activity evaluation is proposed that will still collect comparative monitoring data from non-programme schools.</p>
<p>Point 16 of Executive Summary – “The ToR for the study does not envisage developing a Theory of Change for the programme which would limit measuring and monitoring change during midterm and endline.” <i>USDA Comment: What does this mean? A Theory of Change was submitted with the proposal and is this not what the program is measuring against? Please clarify.</i></p>	<p>This point has been dropped (see point 17).</p>
<p>Point 25 of Executive Summary – “A higher portion of control schools had functional toilets but only 36 percent of these were found to be unlocked, maintained, and were supplied with water. In the case for control school, almost all of these were found to be operational.” <i>USDA Comment: These two sentences are contradicting – is one supposed to be discussing the treatment schools? Please clarify.</i></p>	<p>Correction incorporated (point 26)</p>
<p>Point 30 of Executive Summary – “The treatment schools have a higher proportion of functional toilets (93%) as compared to control schools (83%).” <i>USDA Comment: This is confusing when compared against point 25. Please clarify what the difference is between the two points and what the actual percent of operational toilet is.</i></p>	<p>(see point 26 of the Executive Summary)</p>

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
Point 39 of Executive Summary – “Lack of M&E Framework”? <i>USDA Comment: Please clarify who’s M&E Framework is missing? WFP, USDA, or the Government of Bangladesh?</i>	M&E framework of the GoB. Has been incorporated (point 35).
Point 40 of Executive Summary – “Distribution of biscuits and training of teachers in storage techniques are two activities that will continue from previous phase into the current one. The baseline values will therefore borrowed from the training that was imparted in the previous phase.” <i>USDA Comment: I remember there being an amendment to the FY14 award to expand biscuit distribution, however I do not remember it involving complementary activities. There needs to be a description of what took place under the FY14 award if this is truly the case.</i>	The point is well noted, hence dropped the point on training of teacher in storage technique from the paragraph. WFP generally organizes rollout sessions with the school teachers before the SF programme commences in an area. This session includes briefing on storage techniques. However, the FY17 has specific training activities on storage techniques which will be reported during the midterm and end-line evaluations.
Recommendations: “WFP may consider providing water bottles to students for carrying water form homes/alternate sources of safe drink water.” <i>USDA Comment: How is this sustainable?</i>	Availability of clean drinking water emerged as a felt need. The recommendation has been modified.
Point 1, Page 1: <i>USDA Comment: This whole paragraph is difficult to follow. Please consider re-wording in way that discusses the previous award and the new award.</i>	This has been done (Points 1 and 2).
Point 1, Page1: “The program aims to support WFP’s overall objectives in the Country Programme School Feeding component, and combines the provision of fortified biscuits with other activities to achieve McGovern-Dole Strategic Objectives.” <i>USDA Comment: This makes it seem like USDA is supposed to complement WFP.</i>	This has been rephrased.
Point 8, Page 2: “These values would also help in measuring the Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Impact of the program that would inform future programme design and dissemination of lessons learnt.” <i>USDA comment: Please add Relevance and Sustainability</i>	This has been done. (see point 10)

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
Point 13, page 3: "...an additional 19.6 percent (31,172 million people)." <i>USDA Comment: There appears to be a typo, please fix.</i>	Fixed (see point 15)
Point 41, page 7: "The baseline study used quantitative data to present the findings. There was no qualitative data collection and most evidences are anecdotal emerging from discussions with the stakeholders." <i>USDA Comment: Later (point 71, page 13) the evaluator mentions that there was some qualitative data analyzed. This seems contradictory, please clarify.</i>	Interactions with GoB's DPE officials, and a workshop comprising these officials and WFP staff was held. There were no semi-structured interviews or KIIs conducted. This point has been dropped (point 43)
Point 46, page 10: <i>USDA Comment: This is a succinct few sentences on the evaluation purpose. Consider moving it to page 2 where the study objectives are discussed.</i>	This has been done.
Point 55, page 11: <i>USDA Comment: The way this point is written implies that qualitative data was also collected. This seems to contradict point 41. Please clarify. USDA supports the use of multiple evaluation designs depending on the purpose of the evaluation. Mixed methods approaches should most often be used including both qualitative and quantitative methods to the extent possible and practicable. If qualitative data was also collected, this should be communicated and should be considered a strength.</i>	This has been revised and incorporated as point 42 of the report.
Point 57, page 11: "The advantage of this approach was that the intensity of the evaluation vis-à-vis community interactions increased, thereby adding value to the data. Moreover, the information gathered was more nuanced and retained the robustness of the quantitative design. This ensured that both WFP's mandate and the government's concerns were upheld." <i>USDA Comment: This entire point is unclear. More information/context is needed to understand the "advantage of the approach." What is meant by the "mandate"? Which mandate? The mandate for project monitoring and evaluation? And which government? Bangladesh or USG?</i>	The latter part has been deleted (point 57 of the report).
Point 69, page 13: <i>USDA Comment: The way this statement reads is that some of the treatment schools sampled had already received interventions. Did treatment schools receive interventions from the previous award? Please clarify. The</i>	The paragraph has been rephrased (points 63, 64, and 65).

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
<p><i>baseline information for indicators must be measured and established prior to the start of project activities. Having a valid baseline is critical as a foundation for quality monitoring and evaluation throughout a project's life cycle. We want to measure the impact of the current project/interventions.</i></p>	
<p>Point 70, page 13: <i>USDA Comment: Are KIIs different than the semi-structured interviews? KIIs can be considered qualitative data. This seems to contradict the claim that the evaluation was purely quantitative. Triangulating evidence using both quantitative and qualitative data is considered a strength. If this was an approach used by the evaluation, this should be clear. Please clarify.</i></p>	<p>As clarified above, discussions were held with DPE officials followed by a consultative workshop comprising these officials and WFP staff. This point has been revised and incorporated under point 42 of the report.</p>
<p>Point 78, page 14: – “The ToR for the study does not envisage developing a Theory of Change for the programme which would limit measuring and monitoring change during midterm and endline.” <i>USDA Comment: What does this mean? A Theory of Change was submitted with the proposal and is this not what the program is measuring against? Please clarify.</i></p>	<p>The results framework is to be used for monitoring change. This point has therefore been dropped under limitations.</p>
<p>Point 105, page 18: “...the indicators linked to these activities that are to be repeated in the current award are presented as actuals in order to measure the change during the midterm and end-line evaluations...” <i>USDA Comment: This point needs clarifying. Does this mean that it was impossible to collect valid baseline numbers for the current award because the schools had already received interventions? The reader needs to have more context regarding the sampled schools and beneficiaries in order to understand how to interpret the evaluator's analysis.</i></p>	<p>This paragraph has been deleted as it is for an output indicator.</p>
<p>Point 105, Page 19: “It must however be noted that no activity under the current FY17 award have commenced and the baseline values therefore are nil.” <i>USDA Comment: It seems that there is a lack of understanding what this report is for and what a baseline evaluation is. Not all of the indicator values for an evaluation will be zero at the start of the project.</i></p>	<p>As noted above, this paragraph has been deleted.</p>
<p>Point 106, page 19: “As set out in Annex C, there are 46 USDA standard performance indicators that have been applied to this baseline evaluation.” <i>USDA Comment: Please correct,</i></p>	<p>This has been done (point 104 of the report)</p>

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
<i>USDA only has 28 Standard Indicators. Not all of them necessarily apply to this project. The remainder are custom indicators (but not USDA standard performance indicators)</i>	
Point 106: Page 19: "There are a set of indicators whose values stands at zero as the project activities are yet to commence and will be measured during the midterm and end-line evaluations." <i>USDA Comment: The way this is written leads the reader to think that baseline values were not collected and that the evaluator does not understand the purpose of the baseline report. This is concerning considering that values are supposed to be set from this report, specifically for some of the Outcome indicators (like attendance). Annex T: Baseline Values of Key Indicators, is not referenced anywhere in the body of the report and arguably should be. Recommend adding language to the last sentence of point 106 saying "...and also in Annex T."</i>	The paragraph has been dropped. Reference to Annex T has been added under point 104.
Point 107, Page 19: "Distribution of fortified biscuits was continuing from the FY14 grant..." <i>USDA Comment: Suggested to include a timeline of the activities around school feeding and when they started because school feeding in Cox's Bazar did not commence in FY14 rather it started at the end of the FY14 award due to excess commodities.</i>	The point has been revised (point 105). The footnote presents the timelines.
Point 114, page 22: "Till date, no textbooks and other teaching and learning materials have been provided under the current grant." <i>USDA Comment: Please correct the grammar, and the evaluator again does not seem to understand what the intent of this evaluation is for. Please consider removing this point or rewording. This comment can extend to a large portion of the report (point 137, 138, etc.).</i>	The GoB distributes textbooks and reading materials to all schools. Under the FY17 grant, WFP proposes to distribute a different set of teaching and learning aids which is in addition to what GoB distributes. Points 114, 115, and 116 have therefore been deleted.
Point 115, page 22: <i>USDA comment: the purpose of this evaluation is to set baseline values for some of the Standard and Custom indicators. While some of the additional information collected can help provide context of the environment (for example, information on previously received training materials), the way the evaluation is written leaves a lot of ambiguity. Please be clear about which baseline values are zero for this project. The indicator Number of textbooks</i>	As noted above, the paragraph has been deleted.

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
and other teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance <i>should in fact, be zero. We are trying to set the baseline values to measure the impact of this specific project.</i>	
Point 122, Page 24: "...the sample in treatment schools is 45 and 268 respectively. In control schools... pre-primary is 38 while primary it is 364." <i>USDA Comment: The numbers in that paragraph do not make sense, please fix or provide a foot note how they were generated.</i>	These are average number of students enrolled in the treatment schools. The absolute numbers of enrolment as reported by GoB in February 2018 have been added (point 115; table 6).
Point 124, page 24: "Since the implementation of activities had not commenced by the time the baseline survey was conducted..." <i>USDA Comment: Again, the evaluator again does not seem to understand what the intent of this evaluation is for. Please consider removing this point or rewording.</i>	Output indicator, hence dropped
Point 132, page 26: <i>USDA Comment: fix footnote</i>	Fixed (Point 123)
Point 139, page 27: <i>USDA Comment: fix footnote</i>	Fixed (Point 129)
Point 141, page 28: <i>USDA Comment: fix footnote</i>	Fixed (Point 131)
Building Capacity, page 27: <i>USDA Comment: There is a lack of clarity as to what this section is about. Please provide more context here as to what this – is this from the needs assessment? How was the needs assessment done? It does mention a reference to Annex X, but we recommend adding some more information here as well. Current</i>	Context added (Point 135)
Point 151, page 29: "The project adopts the mainstream financial management system of the government, managed at the national level by DPE." <i>USDA Comment: What is meant here? Does this apply to the McGovern-Dole project or some other project?</i>	This refers to the GoB's SFP. Clarified (Point 141).
Point 155, page 29: "Regarding monitoring and evaluation, it was reported that no dedicated M&E framework exists to track all the outcomes of SFP. Also, the existing M&E framework of SF project is not aligned with the DPE's mainstream M&E framework." <i>USDA Comment: These sentences seem contradictory. Also, what is the meaning? Is the</i>	While the McGovern-Dole project has an M&E framework, the same does not exist at the national level for the GoB's SFP. This has been clarified under point 162)

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
<i>evaluator saying that the McGovern-Dole project-level results framework does not align with the DPE mainstream M&E framework? Please clarify.</i>	
<i>Conclusions, Page 30: USDA Comment: The “Conclusion” section of the report was mostly a summary of “findings”. In general, we would define findings, conclusions, and recommendations like USAID’s definition of these terms as laid out in their <u>Evaluation template</u>. Specifically: we define findings as “...empirical facts based on data collected during the evaluation. Conclusions synthesize and interpret findings and make judgements supported by one or more specific findings. Recommendations are specific actions the evaluation team proposes be taken by program management that are based on findings and conclusions. The reader should be able to discern what evidence supports the conclusions and the recommendations.”</i>	The section has been revised.
<p>Point 162, Page 30: “School Feeding Programme has been implemented in Ukhiya since 2009...” <i>USDA Comment: Please update that while school feeding has been operational in Ukhiya since 2009, this has not been funded by USDA. USDA funding started... (please provide when).</i></p> <p>Point 163, page 30: “Distribution of biscuits and training of teachers in storage techniques are two activities that will continue from the previous phase into the current one. The baseline values for storage techniques is therefore borrowed from the training that was imparted in the previous phase.” <i>USDA Comment: Are you using endline values from the previous phase project for the baseline values? Are there new schools that are being reached in the FY17 project? Please clarify.</i></p>	<p>Clarified under point 151.</p> <p>Output indicator, hence dropped.</p>
<i>Point 177, page 32: USDA Comment: The way this point reads, it seems like the McGovern-Dole project does not have any M&E. Is the evaluator trying to say that the current M&E system that WFP has in place for the McGovern-Dole project is inadequate? Please clarify.</i>	While the McGovern-Dole project has an M&E system, it feeds into the GoB’s larger SFP which does not have a nuanced M&E framework. This has been clarified under point 162 of the report.

USDA Comments	Evaluator or WFP response
Annex C, Page 39: <i>USDA Comments: Please consider adding a column in Annex C of the baseline values measured. Also, it is unclear if the targets in this table were from the Proposal stage of the project, or if these are proposed targets now that the baseline data has been collected. Please clarify.</i>	The targets are from the proposal.
Annex T; page 102: <i>USDA Comment: Please mention Annex T somewhere in the body of the text (for example, in Point 106). Also, be explicit about which Indicators should have zero values vs non-zero values. The indicator Number of students enrolled in school receiving USDA assistance should be the total number of students enrolled in the project schools (not an average per sample school)</i>	Reference provided under point 104. Total enrolment figures added in point 115; Table 6.
Annex V, page 112: Recommendations for Capacity Building. <i>USDA Comment: What are these? Are these recommendations based on the needs assessment? These should be given more context. These recommendations should be referenced somewhere in the body of the report. This gets lost in the end.</i>	These have been brought into the main body of the report.

Implementer Response to Evaluation Recommendations

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
<i>Please include all evaluation recommendations identified in the evaluation report. USDA and the Program Participant/Grantee may include additional findings, conclusions, and recommendations listed throughout the narrative of the report, as appropriate.</i>	<i>Please include the Program Participant's/Grantee's response to each of the evaluation recommendations. This should include a discussion of the key actions the project intends to take to address the evaluation findings.</i>	<i>Please include the relevant time frame necessary to address and implement the various actions described in the Management Response. Multiple time frames may be given.</i>
Recommendation 1: [page 33] [Improving access to safe water in schools: Under the SFP-FY17 award, WFP may consider providing water bottles to students for carrying water from homes/alternate sources of safe drinking water.]	WFP has provided water bottles to students to carry water to school from home.	Completed, but will continue in year 2 & 3 of the grant as needed

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
Recommendation 2:		
<p>[page 33] [Improving access to water in the toilets - WFP should also work with DPE, DPHE, and UNICEF for repair and maintenance of water supply in the toilets in schools.]</p>	<p>WFP continues to advocate with DPE, DPHE, and UNICEF to ensure students have access to functioning toilets and through setting up WASH blocks.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
Recommendation 3:		
<p>[page 33] [Promoting gender balance in SMC - WFP ought to consider enhancing the number of women in SMCs for improving the gender balance. Further, the capacity building component for mothers should include aspects that build leadership capacities of the female SMC members.]</p>	<p>WFP ensures that the Government's requirement of female SMC members is followed and promotes the empowerment of female SMC members in all fora. WFP builds the capacity of women through "women's empowerment" sessions delivered by our CPs.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
Recommendation 4:		
<p>[page 33] [Support in designing strategy for community engagement and deepening stakeholders understanding around community led school feeding programme - WFP can support MoPME in designing a community engagement strategy that articulates the need and outlines the contours for community engagement to support SFP.</p> <p>WFP may also consider devising a social audit mechanism in schools whereby accountability of all stakeholders is ensured through increased participation of communities. This can also be used to generate evidence on the performance of the programme. Both DPE and WFP officials are interested to attempt integrating it in the project design.]</p>	<p>WFP will support MoPME in designing a community engagement strategy for community engagement with school meals.</p> <p>A social audit mechanism will be explored in consultation with MoPME and DPE.</p>	<p>December 2020</p> <p>December 2019</p>
Recommendation 5:		
<p>[page 34] [WFP should engage to convene the different ministries which have a stake in the MGD SFP to design a joint action plan and transition strategy for so that the GoB can implement the programme independently once WFP's support is withdrawn. The support would include designing appropriate institutional architecture and delivery mechanisms, creating manuals on public procurement, financial management, and an M&E framework. This</p>	<p>WFP recognizes the need for designing appropriate institutional architecture and delivery mechanisms, creating manuals on public procurement, financial management, and an M&E framework. This work is ongoing and has become increasingly complex considering the Government's move to school meals from biscuits.</p>	<p>Ongoing, completion beyond 2020.</p>

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
<p>framework should include and address all indicators, including complementary activities aimed at improving the quality of education.</p> <p>Further, support should be provided in documenting case studies, best practices and lessons learnt for wider dissemination. It should also be used to provide inputs to improve the programme implementation and modify the strategy to inform better decision-making.]</p>	<p>WFP will document case studies, best practices, and lessons learnt. These will be shared with our development counterparts and Government stakeholders and discussed in PIC and PSC meetings.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
Recommendation 6:		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 112, point 86: There is a need for policy endorsement/pushing a common agenda that is the inclusion of SFP in the policy framework to improve the quality of education by multiple stakeholders. Therefore, multi-stakeholder coalitions need to be strengthened and evidence generation on various aspects of SFP, especially establishing the need for complimentary activities, needs to be focused on.</p>	<p>WFP agrees that the policy endorsement is of the utmost importance. WFP is engaging with multiple stakeholders and is working with Government to create additional evidence generation on the school meal programme.</p>	<p>Passage of the National School Meal Policy is ongoing, inclusion of school meals in multiple Government policies and strategies has already happened.</p> <p>Study to be completed in 2021 by Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies</p>
Recommendation 7:		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 112, point 87: For this, capacities to document processes and learnings across WFP led SFP need to be developed so that there is an uptake of programme learnings to influence policies and programmes.</p>	<p>WFP is facilitating additional guidelines and manuals to ensure that the school meal programme process is thoroughly documented to support Government handover.</p>	<p>Ongoing, HGSF manual will be finalized by December 2020, rough draft completed and being field tested.</p>
Recommendation 8:		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 112, point 88: From the consultative workshop with the key stakeholders, it emerged that there is a need for advocacy to agree on the funding commitment for school feeding from the government. It was suggested that an alternative way of getting funding for SFP would be to use the revenue collected from the local unions in the form of taxation. Creating enabling guidelines on collection and</p>	<p>Local communities have been encouraged to support the school meal programme and some local budget for school meals has been allocated. WFP believes the main source of funding for school meals should be the revenue budget. At this point in time, WFP will not pursue increased taxation of the most vulnerable communities.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
disbursement of corporate (CSR), individual donations/ monetary contributions from other sources could also be considered.		
Recommendation 9:		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 112, point 89: Adequate implementation manuals on public procurement, financial management, and implementation guidelines need to be developed so that DPE can take over the roles fulfilled by WFP in order to ensure that the SFP continues post withdrawal of WFP support. This also includes capacity building of DPE in terms of institutionalizing procurement process, financial management process, and a Project Management Guideline/ Manual. Further, guidelines for local fund raising and its management need to be developed so that DPE officials have clarity on modalities of collection of funds from local sources. For this, the capacity of the responsible officials on fund disbursement and utilisation needs to be developed along with the monitoring framework of these activities to increase efficiency.</p>	<p>WFP agrees that implementation manuals on public procurement, financial management, and implementation guidelines need to be developed. WFP envisions working with the Government to strengthen their manuals based on their existing guidelines.</p> <p>WFP will not develop guidelines on fundraising.</p>	TBD, after finalization of the HGSF modality to better understand the needs of the programme.
Recommendation 10:		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 112, point 90: There needs to be a review of the purpose of the specific individuals in the committee so that they are able to contribute more effectively. Everyone's role needs to be defined and inputs required from each of the representatives needs to be clearly outlined and communicated to facilitate effective engagement-It is recommended that a joint action plan is developed to create more accountability.</p>	WFP will work with the Government to ensure the Project Steering Committee roles are well-defined and supportive of the goals of the committee. WFP will use the PSC platform to define the roles of other agencies to further refine their roles within the PSC.	December 2020
Recommendation 11:		

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 112, point 91: Further, the Joint Monitoring framework needs to be developed so that it may be institutionalized. Each ministry is required to take responsibility of the SFP (not just MoPME); Technical specialists may be required to provide specific inputs and assistance on different aspects of SFP and dedicated personnel need to be assigned to carry out the regular activities under SFP functions. Therefore, an institutional set up that is adequately staffed needs to be created for the effective management of SFP.</p>	<p>WFP is advocating with the Government for increased staff within the SFPPPA.</p> <p>Additional ministries have been convened under the Cabinet Division to provide additional resources and expertise to the school meal programme.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
Recommendation 12:		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 112, point 92: It is advised that preparatory activities are planned and conducted at this stage and in the meanwhile, the first draft of guidelines/programme strategy can be prepared to get the processes rolling. A transitional strategy can be prepared to facilitate this process that would help the government take up the programme independently. Assigning tasks to the local level officials would yield better results in the programme beyond the project phase.</p>	<p>WFP is engaged in preparatory activities and drafting guidelines. A phased implementation plan will be developed with government after formal adoption of the NSMP.</p> <p>WFP will work to encourage the Government to assign tasks to local Government officials.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
Recommendation 13:		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 113, point 93: It is recommended that implementation guidelines and manuals on public procurement are developed so that DPE can take over the roles fulfilled by WFP in order to ensure that the SFP continues post withdrawal of WFP support. Capacity building activities for the DPE need to be conducted to institutionalize the procurement process and project management guidelines.</p>	<p>WFP agrees that implementation manuals on public procurement, financial management, and implementation guidelines exist. WFP will work with Government to ensure these guidelines are utilized to take on the roles currently filled by WFP beyond 2020. The current Revised Project Proposal Document clearly mentions that WFP will provide this technical guidance through 2020.</p> <p>WFP agrees that capacity building activities need to take place and is actively doing that.</p>	<p>January 2021</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
Recommendation 14:		

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 113, point 94: Further, the M&E framework should be revised to address all indicators, especially regarding complementary activities (Revamped the SF MIS for effective and real time reporting) aimed at improving the quality of education. A programming strategy would help streamline the operations wherein the government would be capacitated to take SFP forward independently. Hence, a road map should be prepared for school meals programme evolving gradually in a phased manner including institutional architecture/ arrangements/ delivery mechanisms.</p>	<p>A phased implementation plan will be developed after the formal adoption of the NSMP</p>	<p>TBD/December 2020</p>
<p>Recommendation 15:</p>		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 113, point 95: Case studies, best practices, and lessons learnt should be documented for wider dissemination and to provide inputs for improving the programme implementation and modify the strategy to inform better decision-making.</p>	<p>WFP will document case studies, best practices, and lessons learnt. These will be shared with our development counterparts and Government stakeholders.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>Recommendation 16:</p>		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 113, point 96: It is recommended that potential areas for community participation are identified and tested for feasibility. To increase involvement, a community engagement strategy should be created that outlines the specific modalities of engagement. It is suggested that a social audit mechanism is created in schools to increase accountability of all stakeholders and generate evidence on the programme.</p>	<p>WFP will support MoPME in designing a community engagement strategy for community engagement with school meals.</p> <p>A social audit mechanism will be explored in consultation with MoPME and DPE.</p>	<p>December 2020</p> <p>December 2020</p>
<p>Recommendation 17:</p>		

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 113, point 97: Further, draft guidelines to improve the functioning and involvement of SMCs and PTAs should be developed based on lessons learnt from the best practices and pilots.</p>	<p>This is beyond the scope of WFP, although we do support DPE as needed.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Recommendation 18:</p>		
<p>Annex V: Recommendations for Capacity Building, page 113, point 98: Finally, a programming strategy that outlines the role of the community would help in transitioning from project to programme mode and for the government to take over the SFP, independent of WFP.</p>	<p>WFP will support MoPME in designing a community engagement strategy for community engagement with school meals.</p>	<p>January 2020</p>
<p>Recommendation 19: Additional Findings or Recommendations in the Body of the Report</p>		
<p>Point 21 of Executive Summary – “...Analysis of the sex disaggregated data indicated that attendance of the female teachers was much lower than their male counterparts.” <i>USDA Comment: Does WFP have any ideas on how to mitigate against this during project implementation (i.e. boost female teacher attendance)?</i></p>	<p>WFP will discuss measures with MoPME to improve attendance of female teachers through creating an enabling environment.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>Recommendation 20: Additional Findings/Recommendations in the Body of the Report</p>		
<p>Point 39 of Executive Summary – “...Also, given limited staffing in the DPE, there is a very high level of dependence on WFP for several aspects of the project. This has implications on the ultimate handover of the programme to the GoB.”</p>	<p>WFP recognizes this issue and is working with Government to allocate additional staff. Once the policy is approved, we hope that DPE will mainstream school feeding. Therefore, school feeding would not be managed only by the project office, but rather by the department as a whole with necessary reinforcement in staffing as needed.</p>	<p>December 2021</p>
<p>Recommendation 21: Additional Findings/Recommendations in the Body of the Report</p>		
<p>Page 8, Box 1: Quasi Experimental Design – “...Therefore, an activity evaluation is proposed that will collect comparative monitoring data from non-programme schools. The focus can then be more upon identifying qualitatively how the non-programme schools perform. This will be a stronger evaluation design and still very useful - it just will not be a quasi-experimental design.” <i>USDA Comment: given the lack of</i></p>	<p>As the reference to the quasi experimental design with control groups in the Evaluation plan is one of the aspects of the evaluation that is left open-ended until the inception phase, WFP presumes that the Evaluation plan will not have to be amended. WFP has nevertheless adjusted the scope of the mid-term and final evaluations in the technical and budget proposal with NRMCM to reflect the change in the methodology.</p>	<p>April 2019</p>

Evaluation Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame
<i>control schools, how does WFP propose adjusting the Evaluation Plan for future evaluations?</i>		
Recommendation 22: Additional Findings/Recommendations in the Body of the Report		
<p>Point 76, page 14: “In the EGRA tool, questions on oral fluency and comprehension were asked as advised by WFP Bangladesh. Based on this suggestion, in case the child cleared the comprehension test, it was assumed that s/he possessed letter differentiating and recognition abilities.”</p> <p><i>USDA Comment: As the evaluation team points out, this is a limitation. What steps will WFP take to ensure that the EGRA is administered properly?</i></p>	<p>WFP will follow-up with its field monitors and NRMC to make sure that when EGRA is administered, teachers will follow the EGRA process precisely as laid out in the toolkit.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
Recommendation 23: Additional Findings/Recommendations in the Body of the Report		
<p>Point 133, page 26: “It emerged during discussions with the school headmasters that the island of Kutubdia faces a major water crisis due to the incursion of saline sea water in the underground aquifers. Despite having deep tube wells, people are unable to access clean drinking water. This was further corroborated by the primary data that indicates that Kutubdia has a much lower proportion (42%) of schools with drinking water facilities within their premises as compared to 83 per cent schools in Ukhiya. Though not statistically significant, this difference indicates a drinking water shortage in the treatment schools of Kutubdia”</p> <p><i>USDA Comment: This is a risk to project implementation.</i></p>	<p>WFP recognizes the importance of water issues in Kutubdia. WFP will work with MoPME to prioritize Kutubdia for improved water sanitation facilities under PEDP-4.</p>	<p>December 2020</p>