HARP-F APPROACH TO REMOTE PARTNERSHIP IN MYANMAR
Final evaluation report

Conclusions

- HARP-F was designed to be flexible and adaptive without placing any specific limitations on how partners should be flexible or adaptive or under what circumstances. There is good evidence that this approach has been helpful to partners and, by association, end recipients of aid. The close contact between HARP-F's grant management and technical team, and the local and international partners facilitated the flexibility and adaptability partners needed, and their support was widely appreciated.

- HARP-F provided capacity enhancement and financing to national partners broadly in-line with Grand Bargain goals. Many local partner organisations reported that the typically larger grant size and the multi-year duration of funding received from HARP-F already placed them in a position to exercise greater flexibility and adaptability of programming than other donor funds allowed.

- The more localised the response the better able to deliver assistance despite the many challenges experienced in the past two years, independently of whether they were being delivered by national or international grantees. Flexibility and adaptiveness were mostly reliant upon local staff, including those based in camps and other beneficiary settings, and local partners. This fact reinforces the need to maintain momentum towards localisation of humanitarian assistance in Myanmar.

- HARP-F itself and their various partners were all employing several approaches / typologies simultaneously but that this varied across specific geographical locations and times. Partners used a wide range of terminology to describe their approach to remote management, including having no specific terminology at all, or creating new terminology.

- The most likely issues to be adapted for remote management programming were monitoring and evaluation, programme design, risk management, line management, technical support, financial authorisation limits, needs assessment, procurement, and supply chain management.

- HARP-F's approach to remote management was well-intentioned and demonstrated many, if not all, of the practices recommended in the literature. Its operations covered the six core competencies recommended for intermediaries to support locally led humanitarian action.

- Despite being well documented the Remote Management Toolkit was not widely applied by partners. Capacity to manage projects in high-risk, hard-to-reach areas is more effectively addressed through the funding of core capacity, better achieved through enabling grants, than high level lists of "things to think about", regardless of how

- relevant the headings appear. Partner feedback overwhelmingly supported the idea that real-time support through mentoring, discussing and finding solutions to the day-to-day and sector-wide problems that frequently arose was a valuable type of support.

- Training typically focused on core organisational domains such as project management or M & E, while technical training addressed issues such as PSEA, protection and safeguarding. None of the training provided focused on remote management, the RMP toolkit or the remote partnership approach in general.

- Greater appreciation of donor information needs and a more open dialogue on those needs before the most critical phases of crises occurred could have been helpful in maintaining a more constructive relationship between HARP-F and FCDO. Since intermediaries will still be needed