

Management Response

Summary of Management Response

DFAT notes the review findings and agrees with the recommendations put forward by the independent evaluator, noting however the DFAT governance adviser will not be appointed as part of Post's oversight of Coalitions for Change Phase 2 (CfC2). The timing of the Independent Completion Report aligned with the design of CfC2, hence, most of the recommendations have been, or are being, actioned through the implementation of Phase 2. DFAT's response to each of the recommendations is detailed below.

Management response to the recommendations

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	If practical, please specify timeframe here
Investment in a further phase of CfC (which also takes into account the recommendations below) is warranted.	Agree	The Coalitions for Change (CfC) program is effective, efficient and continues to be relevant. A second phase of CfC (CfC2) will build on the success of the current program and will continue to support strengthening institutions in the Philippines through policy reforms.	DFAT requested The Asia Foundation (TAF) in November 2017 design a second phase of the program. Approval for phase two has now been provided and will commence in July 2018.	November 2017 to June 2018 (design and approval) July 2018 (start implementation CfC2)
The design for the new phase of CfC should be informed by, and be framed to deliver against, real clarity of purpose about the objectives (i.e. what success looks like for) the	Agree	CfC is a component of the bilateral aid program and utilised to contribute to the achievement of the country program's aid investment objectives. Phase two will continue to support	The Philippines Program Aid Investment Plan 2018 to 2023 is currently being developed and will provide further clarity on Australia's objectives in the Philippines in the	November 2017 to launch of the next AIP

presence and efforts of the Australian aid program in the Philippines.		Australia's objectives in the Philippines.	next 5 years. Decisions of reforms and activities to be pursued under CfC2 will be guided by the new AIP.	
Institutionalise a well-considered and appropriately-resourced approach to analysing and succinctly reporting against CfC's contribution to significant policy reform processes (as opposed to more questionably claiming causation at impact level).	Agree	Phase 2 requires a robust and sufficiently resourced M&E system that is able to respond to the complexity of the program and the approach it uses. It also has to satisfy both program M&E and DFAT performance and quality requirements.	DFAT requested TAF clearly articulate the M&E framework and system for Phase 2. The design will outline how CfC2 will operationalise <i>contribution analysis</i> . Noting the complexity of CfC2 performance quality requirements, TAF has allocated its Assistant Director for Monitoring and Evaluation based in San Francisco and Senior Program Officer for Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Gender based in Manila, to oversee its M&E processes.	November 2017 to May 2018 (design phase) July 2018 – onwards (implementation phase)
Allied to the above, program-in from the inception of any new phase the agreement, clear definition and robust implementation of 'who needs what information' for monitoring, evaluation and learning purposes. (Not least so that any future evaluation has appropriate data to work on.)	Agree			
Much more proactively seek to address gender inequality through CfC's analysis of, and support to, significant policy reform initiatives in this area (subject always to CfC's usual 'technically sound, politically feasible' filters).	Agree	CfC has to capitalise on its ability to identify binding constraints and apply thinking and working politically processes to gender and women empowerment issues.	The CfC2 design includes a program logic (and M&E framework) with specific considerations on gender and articulates a gender and women empowerment strategy for CfC2.	November 2017 to May 2018 (design phase) July 2018 – onwards (implementation phase)

<p>Design-in efforts to promote and institutionalise the replicability and scalability of CfC approaches beyond TAF.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Even prior to the ICR, DFAT has been exploring options and practical ways to ensure replicability and scalability of CfC approaches.</p> <p>TAF has also been seeking out opportunities to share information on CfC approaches such as by training specific partner organisations.</p>	<p>DFAT has requested TAF include a stronger focus on <i>leadership and coalition development</i> in the design for phase 2 with the aim to build the capacity of more government and civil society leaders to identify and act on potential reform opportunities.</p>	<p>November 2017 to May 2018 (design phase)</p> <p>July 2018 – onwards (implementation phase)</p>
<p>Recognise the importance of maintaining close and on-going engagement between DFAT and TAF in terms of executive-level strategic direction (including risk management) and in technical (governance) analysis and advice. This suggests a continued and significant role in CfC's governance and advisory structures for the DHOM and Counsellor, at post, as well as yet-to-be appointed DFAT governance adviser.</p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<p>Agree with these recommendations except on the engagement of the DFAT governance adviser as this role will not be filled in an ongoing capacity within the DFAT staffing structure at Post.</p> <p>DFAT is satisfied with the governance structure and arrangements.</p> <p>DFAT will continue to engage an independent governance expert to provide advice on CfC2 and draw on DFAT's own governance expertise to inform CfC2 strategic direction, provide technical advice, and ensure aid effectiveness.</p>	<p>The CfC1 governance arrangements, including the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), Partnership Strategic Panel (PSP) and Program Management Team (PMT) will be retained in CfC2.</p> <p>The PSP will continue to include members nominated by DFAT (from DFAT Canberra and an independent governance expert) and TAF (from TAF San Francisco and an independent governance expert).</p> <p>The DFAT – PMT will continue to be led by the Governance Team Portfolio Manager at Post.</p>	<p>November 2017 to May 2018 (design phase)</p> <p>July 2018 – onwards (implementation phase)</p>
<p>Better balance the solid political science analysis and advice that CfC enjoys (most formally at the level of the Partnership Strategic Panel, CfC's advisory group) with an equally important interrogation of wider</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p></p>	<p></p>	<p></p>

<p>technical, aid and development effectiveness considerations.</p>				
<p>As with CfC Phase 1, and given the substantive recommendations in this review with respect to a second phase, schedule an independent progress review relatively early in Phase 2 (say at about 18 months from inception) to reflect on direction and emphasis.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The timing proposed for the mid-term review will enable DFAT and TAF to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) assess direction of the program and performance against target outcomes b) revisit the design, program logic and M&E systems to ensure they remain fit for purpose c) timely address issues and gaps, if any, in the design and implementation 	<p>DFAT will initiate an independent mid-term review within the second year of CfC2.</p>	<p>Year 2 of CfC2 (CfC2 mid-term review)</p>