



Evaluation of Oxfam Disaster Preparedness and Contingency Planning Project in Uganda

Full Report

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

August 2008

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB

Evaluators: Michael O’Riordan, Helen Bushell, Felix Omuu, Alyssa Boulares, Lydia Tinka

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.1. Background.....	3
2.2. Methodology.....	4
3. KEY FINDINGS.....	5
3.1. Achievements against expected results	5
3.1.1. Result 1 - Identification and prioritization of key vulnerable areas in Uganda through hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment to be used as a basis for ongoing contingency planning.	5
3.1.2. Result 2 - Capacity to respond is improved through the development of a contingency plan including details on pre-identified staff, partners and resources. ..	6
3.1.3. Result 3 - Increased capacity of Oxfam affiliates and partners to respond to humanitarian emergencies through skills development and increased awareness of humanitarian principles and practices and OI standard operating procedures.	8
3.1.4. Result 4 - Increased awareness of risks and hazards better preparedness and improved capacity to respond at government level.	9
3.1.5. Result 5 - Information networks with humanitarian stakeholders are developed and improved and form a basis for establishing improved early warning systems. 13	
3.2. Project management and Implementation	14
4. KEY CHALLENGES	15
5. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	16
5.1. Overall project focus and management	16
5.2. Recommendations for the next Phase of the DPCP project	17
5.2.1. The decision to move to a second phase	17
5.2.2. Goal and objectives of Phase II	17
5.2.3. Recommendations on Project Management and implementation	18

List of Abbreviations

ACAO:	Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
ACORD:	Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development
BUSIDEF:	Busiu Development Foundation
CAO:	Chief Administrative Officer
CBDRR:	Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction
CBOs:	Community Based Organizations
CD:	Country Director
CoU:	Church of Uganda
DDMC:	District Disaster Management Committee
DPCP:	Disaster Preparedness and Contingency Planning
DRC:	Democratic Republic of Congo
DRR:	Disaster Risk Reduction
DRRM:	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
FURA:	Foundation for Urban and Rural Advancement
HPC:	Humanitarian Programme Coordinator
HVRA:	Hazard, Vulnerability and Risk Assessment
ISDR:	International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
KOPEIN:	Kotido Peace Initiative
NGOs:	Non- Governmental Organizations
NOVIB:	Oxfam Netherlands
OGB:	Oxfam Great Britain
OI:	Oxfam International
OPM:	Office of the Prime Minister
PCVA:	Participatory Capacity and Vulnerability Assessment
PO:	Programme Officer
SJA:	St John Ambulance
ToR:	Terms of Reference
UN:	United Nations
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
UNOCHA:	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
URCS:	Uganda Red Cross Society

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The international community sees Uganda as a development success story. However Uganda faces a number of humanitarian challenges, both natural and conflict related. The 20-year conflict in the north of the country has resulted in the long-term displacement of up to 2 million people. Drought and unrest plagues the north-eastern Karamoja region, major flooding has affected up to 300,000 people in 2007 and the country plays frequent host to refugees from neighbours DRC, Sudan and Kenya.

In order to improve preparedness and response to these eventualities, Oxfam¹ in Uganda (Oxfam GB as the implementing affiliate, with Oxfam NOVIB and Oxfam Ireland) has developed a Disaster Preparedness and Contingency Planning (DPCP) project. Through this project, Oxfam aimed to improve the preparedness and increase effective and accountable humanitarian response by Oxfam and stakeholders. Thus, by doing so reduce the impact of natural and conflict related disasters in Uganda. The underlying principle being that good disaster preparedness lies in communication, consultation and coordination.

Recognising the importance of evaluating the effectiveness of this initiative, Oxfam built into the project a final review to assess the project achievements against expected results and advise the Oxfam International (OI) country team on an eventual follow-up phase.

One of the main overall finding was that from being initially focused on building the capacity of Oxfam as an organisation, the project ended up being much more outward looking than originally envisaged. According to Oxfam GB's Humanitarian Programme Coordinator this shift was deliberate and decided after the hazard, vulnerability and risk assessment conducted at the onset of the project revealed that one of the weakest element of the disaster preparedness and response mechanisms in place in Uganda were the District Disaster Management Committees. The second trigger for the shift was willingness and need for Oxfam to engage closely with the Office of the Prime Minister on developing a National Policy and strengthening existing systems in order to have a national-level impact.

The second positive overall point to note was that the project was widened during the course of its implementation to include more elements of Disaster risk Reduction (DRR) than just preparedness and contingency planning. Even though noted as a positive development by the review team, additional resources, particularly human resources, should have accompanied this shift as it diverted the attention of the Project Officer away from internal preparedness. As a result this aspect still requires significant investment, which will not be delivered as part of this project.

Overall the review team found that the project had delivered most of the results expected as per the project proposal approved by all affiliates. Some areas were more successful than others as detailed in the section on key findings per results mainly as a consequence of the two shifts mentioned above.

A significant achievement of this project was to widen the understanding of the hazards, risks and vulnerabilities affecting Uganda. The hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment conducted was found to be a good document, key to defining the focus Oxfam should have in terms of DRR programming and the review team found that the project had been well focused to address the key issues identified by the assessment. The assessment had however some key gaps, like for example not identifying flooding as a hazard, which the team found could have been avoided by getting feedback on the report from a wider range of actors than was done.

¹ The group of affiliates working on this joint Oxfam programme will be referred to as Oxfam throughout this document.

The project has been particularly successful in raising awareness with Oxfam GB in Uganda of disaster preparedness, of the importance of building effective response capacity² and more importantly of the need to integrate DRR within our programming. It was clear from the review that there was recognition that this is ‘everyone’s business’. Tangible steps towards better preparedness have however been limited. The contingency planning was not finalised at the time of the review and key activities to be implemented before the end of the project have been identified by the review team. There has however been substantial progress made from the contingency plan that was in place before the start of the project.

The project has also been very successful at establishing Oxfam as a key interlocutor on issues of DRR in Uganda. This was achieved thanks to substantial time spent by the Project Officer in networking and investing in building capacity of national and district level government structures. Training sessions at District level have been very well received by most participants, enlisting the participation of the OPM in the DDMC sensitisation sessions was a very good decision that reinforced the linkages between the national and district level structures in place. The review team found that they had a significant impact on the functionality of the DDMCs in the two regions where Oxfam has a long-term presence, denoting the need for regular follow-up, which wasn’t undertaken in the Elgon region where Oxfam does not work continuously.

These district-level activities also allowed Oxfam to establish key linkages with local organisations that could be instrumental in future humanitarian responses and in reducing disaster risks in their areas of operation. This is particularly important for regions where Oxfam doesn’t have long-term programmes.

The main challenges identified through this review are:

- Long-term engagement with existing Oxfam counterparts proved difficult as not all existing partners were humanitarian actors or interested in the project.
- Limited follow-up actions taken after the capacity building sessions resulting in a risk that the learning be lost because of this lack of momentum
- Limited Oxfam affiliates and Oxfam GB Uganda field offices engagement with contingency planning delayed the process and means that in the last weeks of implementation the Project Officer will need to dedicate time to generating comments and embedding the plan.
- Limited skill development internally as a result of a wider external focus
- Limited leverage on government policies: the latest shift away from DRR in the policy developed by the OPM revealed the limitations in Oxfam and other actors’ influence on policy making and the need for more aggressive and regular advocacy
- Project staffing vs. activities to be implemented

Finally the review team recommends that Oxfam in Uganda follow up on this project with a second phase. The momentum of the DPCP project should be capitalised upon from an internal and external perspective. The project provides an excellent launching pad for the full integration of DRR within Oxfam programming at a strategic and operational level. The second phase will need to be inclusive of all aspects of DRR, from community-based disaster risk reduction initiatives to a strong advocacy component to influence policy making and implementation at national level. External funding will probably be needed for a successful second phase as the scope will need to be considerable widened with the related effect of staffing and therefore funding necessary for a successful project.

The support and commitment of Oxfam GB Uganda senior management and the OI country team, together with the allocation of a dedicated officer, alongside the investment in his skills and competences development, have been instrumental in the success of this project and are probably the greatest assets for a successful second phase of DRR programming.

² The fact that Oxfam GB has implemented a sizable humanitarian response during the implementation of this project also contributed to the increased awareness

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Background

Oxfam affiliates working in Uganda (Oxfam Ireland, Oxfam Novib and Oxfam GB) believe that reducing disaster risk comes not just from implementing a good humanitarian response to disasters, but more importantly, from good preparedness, mitigation and prevention. A comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) strategy is essential if vulnerability to disasters is to be decreased. Oxfam, globally, is looking at disasters in the long- as well as the short-term and will be aiming to include DRR in all plans and also develop specific work in order to prevent and mitigate disasters, as well as to prepare for them.

In the long term, Oxfam hopes to address issues of mitigation and prevention through mainstreaming DRR methodologies into its own programmes (particularly those of livelihoods) and looking more at community-based initiatives. In the short term however, we recognize the importance of good preparedness as a starting point.

In order to improve preparedness and response to these eventualities, Oxfam³ in Uganda (Oxfam GB as the implementing affiliate, with Oxfam NOVIB and Oxfam Ireland) has developed a Disaster Preparedness and Contingency Planning (DPCP) project. Not only did this include the development of Oxfam's own contingency plans, and capacity building of Oxfam GB staff in Uganda, government and partners, but it also endeavoured to improve co-ordination with relevant NGOs, UN, other agencies and government authorities. The project started in April 2007 and is ending in September 2008. Through this project, Oxfam aimed to improve the preparedness and increase effective and accountable humanitarian response by Oxfam and stakeholders. Thus, by doing so reduce the impact of natural and conflict related disasters in Uganda. The underlying principle being that good disaster preparedness lies in communication, consultation and coordination.

The DPCP project was a joint Oxfam initiative funded by Oxfam Ireland, Oxfam Novib and Oxfam GB.

Recognising the importance of evaluating the effectiveness of this initiative, Oxfam built into the project a final review to assess the project achievements against expected results and advise the Oxfam International (OI) country team on an eventual follow-up phase. Detailed terms of reference are annexed to this report.

³ The group of affiliates working on this joint Oxfam programme will be referred to as Oxfam in the rest of this document.

2.2. Methodology

A review team composed of Oxfam GB DPCP Project Officer (OGB Uganda), Oxfam GB Regional DRR Focal Point Person (OGB Nairobi Regional Centre), Oxfam Ireland Humanitarian Coordinator, a URCS Programme Officer and Oxfam GB Humanitarian Programme Coordinator (OGB Uganda). The team divided up to cover different regions as follows:

National Level, Kampala

Felix Omuu, DPCP Project Officer, Oxfam GB Uganda
Helen Bushell, Regional DRR Focal Point, Oxfam GB Nairobi
Lydia Tinka, Programme Officer, Uganda Red Cross Society

Rwenzori Region, Kasese District

Felix Omuu, DPCP Officer, Oxfam GB Uganda
Lydia Tinka, Programme Officer, Uganda Red Cross Society

Karamoja Region, Kotido District

Felix Omuu, DPCP Officer, Oxfam GB Uganda
Michael O’Riordan, Humanitarian Coordinator, Oxfam Ireland

Elgon Region, Sironko and M’bale District

Alyssa Boulares, Humanitarian Programme Coordinator, Oxfam GB Uganda
Michael O’Riordan, Humanitarian Coordinator, Oxfam Ireland

The following methodologies were applied:

- Desk review of project proposal, progress reports and to a lesser extent of the hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment, of the draft contingency plan and of feedback forms completed after training sessions
- Discussions with Oxfam GB staff in Uganda (Kampala, Kotido and Rwenzori)
- Interviews with key staff of the department of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM)
- Discussions with selected UN agencies, specifically UNOCHA and UNDP and NGOs at Kampala level
- Field interviews with local authorities (DDMCs) and partners in the project areas

The team developed and used three interview tools:

1. Key Informant interview guide for stakeholders who directly participated in the project. These included Oxfam GB staff, organizations and DDMC officials that participated in the training workshops
2. Interview guide for stakeholders who never participated in the training workshops but had an interest in the project. This was mainly to get their input for the next phase of the project
3. A self-administered capacity assessment questionnaire for partners and DDMC. This was meant to collect information related to capacity in Disaster preparedness and management. Results are presented in Annex 3.

3. **KEY FINDINGS**

3.1. Achievements against expected results

3.1.1. Result 1 - Identification and prioritization of key vulnerable areas in Uganda through hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment to be used as a basis for ongoing contingency planning.

Achieved

A hazard, vulnerability and risk assessment was successfully conducted. This study has identified and assessed the different hazards and vulnerabilities in the prioritised regions of Karamoja, Rwenzori and Elgon.

Due to budgetary constraints the fourth region identified as particularly vulnerable, Northern Uganda, was not included in the initial assessment. The DPCP Project Officer, using existing knowledge within Oxfam and particularly within Oxfam GB Kitgum office conducted the assessment. Northern Uganda was found to be very different in terms of operationality level of existing systems as a wide-scale humanitarian response has been underway for years and as such the DDMCs were fully functional and all stakeholders not only prepared for a response but implementing one. The review noted however that even if humanitarian actors present were geared up to respond the needs created by displacement, they were less prepared to respond to outbreaks outside of the camps (as demonstrated by the Hepatitis E outbreak on-going since November 07) and this region should probably have been given equal attention.

According to the DPCP Officer, the assessment was important in the following ways:

- The information generated from this study was used for developing the contingency plan. The scenarios in the plan were developed from the hazard and vulnerability assessment findings from the study. Equally important was the identification and mapping of organizations and potential partners in the regions which is a key section in the contingency plan
- The study identified capacity gaps of partners and local authorities in the regions. Subsequent trainings were based on the training needs generated during the assessment.
- The process of conducting the assessment raised awareness of the project amongst stakeholders and within Oxfam. The assessment was used in many cases as an entry point and opportunity to create awareness among external stakeholders at national and district level about the DPCP project.
- The prioritization of the regions helped to give the project a geographical focus. Subsequent activities were thus concentrated in the three regions

It is worth noting that some organisations like URCS have afterwards conducted PCVA assessments at regional level, information from which can be used in the second phase of the project to improve on and update the initial HVRA report produced as part of this project.

Oxfam GB in Uganda received very little feedback on the content and analysis done as part of this assessment, both from other affiliates, internally from the region or Oxford and from other actors in Uganda. Had feedback been sought more aggressively weak points in the report, like the non-identification of floods as a hazard, might have been noted.

Interviews with OPM showed that the assessment findings are being used within the department of Disaster preparedness and Refugees. Findings were also shared with other national level stakeholders like UN OCHA, UNDP, World Vision, Cordaid and Uganda Red Cross Society. At the district level, findings were shared with FURA in Kasese, URCS Bundibugyo, Kasese DDMC, Oxfam Kotido field office, BUSIDEF and Bududa DDMC . Some of the respondents during the interviews felt that the report needed to be distributed as widely as possible to build a common understanding of key vulnerable areas in Uganda. In Kasese, FURA felt that the report needed to be launched nationally, regionally and discussed with key stakeholders in the respective regions.

Generally, a significant number of respondents internally within Oxfam and externally felt that greater use can be made of the assessment findings as an advocacy tool for the project with key partners and stakeholders at all levels. At district and national level the assessment can help to focus development planning and foster the integration of DRR and in particular preparedness and response capacity. Greater promotion of the assessment is needed. The assessment itself generated a working reference document that should not sit on a shelf.

3.1.2. Result 2 - Capacity to respond is improved through the development of a contingency plan including details on pre-identified staff, partners and resources.

Partially achieved

This activity was still in progress at the time of the review. The plan has not been finalised nor tested through the planned simulation exercise.


At the time of the review a draft enhanced Oxfam International contingency plan for Uganda had been developed and reviewed internally, at Oxfam GB regional level and by a member of the global Adaptation and Risk Reduction team from Oxfam GB headquarters during a project review and planning meeting held in Nairobi in June 2008.

To date comprehensive comments have not been received by affiliates nor from Oxfam GB field offices in Uganda (Kotido, Kitgum and to a lesser extent Kampala). The level of engagement with the planning process has been minimal. Very few staff members participated fully in developing process and are able to articulate the plan and their role within its implementation.

Good use has been made of the hazard, risk and vulnerability assessment in developing the contingency plan's scenario. The plan in its current form includes details of human, financial and logistical resources available in Oxfam and with partners, it has allocated responsibilities to different officers within and without Oxfam and mapped out key actors in the three key regions for collaboration and partnership with Oxfam in the event of a

disaster. In the context of Uganda such a plan is essential and forms a key component of our disaster preparedness efforts. This plan once finalised and disseminated internally should help Oxfam to deliver a timely and accountable humanitarian response in future.

The quality of the contingency plan was assessed at two points in its development. During the preparedness-monitoring workshop in November 2007, participants were given different sections of the plan to assess its quality and relevance. Participants in teams gave a total of 15.4 points out of a maximum of 34 to that version of the plan. Most of the workshop participants did not know the plan and its usefulness. By then, the plan was still in a very first draft form, with some sections still incomplete. Several elements were missing- as expected in a draft- and teams made several suggestions on missing points or areas that needed improvements. These were later incorporated.

In June 2008, the plan was reviewed at the regional office in a meeting between the Regional DRR Focal point, Oxfam Global DRR Learning Advisor, OGB Uganda Humanitarian Programme Coordinator and Oxfam GB Uganda DPCP Project Officer. The main issues raised for further improvement were its user-friendliness, its length, its strong focus on Oxfam GB due to the fact that no other affiliate had contributed with comments or input, the need for more practical information like key principles adhered to by all affiliates, gap analysis, indication of scale for each scenario or coverage map of actors identified. All the comments were later incorporated. All these reflect the continued refinement process the plan has gone through. Before being rolled comments need to be generated from Kitgum and Kotido offices as none have come in so far, denoting a disconnect that needs to be addressed. 

Although key staff in Oxfam GB Kampala Office showed a good understanding of the contingency plan during the review, their counterparts in the field office did not express a good knowledge of the plan beyond just hearing about it. In Kotido, senior staff members told the review team that they received the draft plan but are yet to internalise it. The two new Project Officers who closely work with DDMCs and partners have not seen the plan. Part of the reason for this lack of awareness about the plan in Kotido office is the fact that the officers who were involved in the process of developing the plan left Oxfam shortly before the two new officers were recruited. It looks like they never took time to share with the rest of the team about the process and content of the plan and its relevance to Oxfam.

Only through gaining a working knowledge of the plan and with clear buy-in from all affiliates will optimum capacity to respond be achieved. At a minimum comprehensive feedback on plan from Oxfam Ireland and Oxfam Novib should be sought and incorporated. It is also essential that input be received from Oxfam GB field offices. To this end the review team recommends that the Project Officer travel to each field office to actively seek feedback and input.

Once finalised the plan will need to be presented, explained and/or tested through a simulation exercise in all Oxfam GB offices. The plan also needs to be taken forward by all affiliates with their local counterparts in order to be better integrated with district level programmes, particularly in regions identified as focus regions for response in the contingency plan.

Oxfam does not respond in isolation and other members of the institutional structure for disaster response at national level in particular need to be aware of the contingency plan and the role Oxfam will play in any response efforts. Wider dissemination and promotion of the plan should take place once it is finalised.

3.1.3. Result 3 - Increased capacity of Oxfam affiliates and partners to respond to humanitarian emergencies through skills development and increased awareness of humanitarian principles and practices and OI standard operating procedures.

Not fully achieved

To say that the project increased the capacity of Oxfam affiliates in Uganda to respond to humanitarian emergencies would be an over statement.

The review team found that this result had been de-prioritised when the focus was shifted after the hazard, vulnerability and risk assessment revealed that one of the weakest element of the disaster preparedness and response mechanisms in place in Uganda were the District Disaster Management Committees. Even though the shift was justified and essential for Oxfam to have a wider impact, additional resources should have been allocated to this project in order to ensure that internal activities could be implemented.

Discussions with the CD and HPC during the review revealed that increasing capacity of Oxfam GB staff in Uganda was one of the main gaps of this project and should be key in the next phase of the project.

From the interviews with some selected staff in Oxfam GB Kampala office, the project seems to have however set a basis upon which future capacity enhancement could be based.

Apart from the preparedness monitoring tool workshop conducted in November 2007 that established a baseline for Oxfam GB's own preparedness capacity, very little was done in terms of building internal staff capacity in disaster preparedness. The workshop had however generated a clear state of play and identified areas that required improvement.

Results were as follows and action points and responsible were agreed for the fields in orange (needs some improvement) and red (priority improvement needed):

- **Knowledge of Procedures**
- **Knowledge of Standards**
- **Knowledge of Tools (in between red and orange colour)**

- Knowledge of Policy and Principles
- Geography, content and budget allocation
- Humanitarian track record
- Additional resources (HR)
- Additional resources
- Security

While the following fields were marked in green as the workshop had demonstrated preparedness levels in those were satisfying:

- Internal coordination (OGB and OI)
- External coordination
- Partnerships
- Administration
- Logistics
- Finances
- Funding

The review team picked randomly knowledge of procedures to assess progress since November 2007 and apart from the Country Director, Humanitarian Programme Coordinator and the Finance and Logistics Manager, the rest of the staff members are not familiar with the OI emergency procedures.

During the review Oxfam GB staff in Kotido and Kaabong offices felt that they were not confident filling their roles. The original staff members who had been trained had left and two new staff recruited to replace them. However these new staff members had not as yet received the DRR training and felt this lack when attending DDMC meetings.

It is important that internal preparedness be re-prioritised in the second phase of the project. The review team acknowledges the lack of time for the PO to invest in this part of the project but recommends that the action plan agreed to by Oxfam GB Uganda Senior Management Team be followed upon and implemented as soon as possible to increase Oxfam's preparedness capacity. If not all the efforts placed in developing the contingency plan might not generate the expected impact. Preparedness can't wait until a response is needed and knowledge of key procedures, standards and tools are an essential pre-requisite to an effective response.

3.1.4. Result 4 - Increased awareness of risks and hazards better preparedness and improved capacity to respond at government level.

Achieved

One of the main overall finding was that from being initially focused on building the capacity of Oxfam as an organisation, the project ended up being much more outward looking than originally envisaged. According to Oxfam GB's Humanitarian Programme Coordinator this shift was deliberate and decided after the hazard, vulnerability and risk assessment conducted at the onset of the project revealed that one of the weakest element of the disaster preparedness and response mechanisms in place in Uganda were the District Disaster Management Committees. The second trigger for the shift was willingness and need for Oxfam to engage closely with the Office of the Prime Minister on developing a National Policy and strengthening existing systems in order to have a national-level impact.

The first activity that contributed to meeting this result was the regular engagement with the Office of the Prime Minister on the development of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy and on setting up the National Platform. This engagement was during

the first half of the project very promising and Oxfam's influence was key in ensuring a good first draft of the policy, inclusive of all aspects of DRR and of all actors, with clear implementation mechanisms in line with the ISDR guidelines. Unfortunately as mentioned by Oxfam GB's HPC and PO in the month of June 08, while Oxfam, OCHA and URCS were finalising with the OPM the launch of the National Platform, the OPM unofficially released a second draft that had taken the policy backwards to being focused on disaster preparedness and response and very government-centred. The review team didn't study the policy in details and the week before the review the OPM had made some steps back in the right direction by calling the first meeting of the National Platform, but the lack of understanding by Oxfam of why the changes took place and of what space was still available to influence the final document that would be presented to the Cabinet for endorsement reveals that the focus on influencing policy and on advocacy should be even greater than it had been. The understanding of decision-making processes is good and the relationships with the OPM were found to be very cordial but a more political approach to advocacy was found to be necessary.

The good collaboration with the OPM was found to have been established at the very onset of the project and strengthened when Oxfam involved the OPM in the sensitisation sessions on the roles and responsibilities of DDMCs that were conducted for 16 DDMCs on terms of reference, information management, coordination, working with NGOs and resource mobilization.

The other activity that was successfully conducted and contributed to achieving this result was a training on various aspects of Disaster Risk Reduction that targeted 20 members of the District Disaster Management Committees (DDMCs) in 10 districts and 58 members from 29 partner organizations in the 3 regions of Rwenzori, Elgon and Karamoja. The sessions included hazard, vulnerability and risk assessment, contingency planning, emergency response planning and needs assessment in emergencies. The objective was to increase knowledge in Disaster preparedness among stakeholders and for participants to be able to undertake emergency planning and know how to develop and implement a contingency plan, a very vital preparedness tool.

To assess the impact of both these training sessions the review team interviewed participants in three regions, Kasese, Kotido and M'bale focusing on the relevance and usefulness of the trainings and on the actions taken by participants as a result.

Relevance and usefulness of the capacity building initiatives

At a technical level the capacity building focus of the project exceeded expectations. A wider knowledge of DRR, rather than DP was built amongst members of DDMCs and this has created many positive outcomes and a desire for greater engagement with and support from Oxfam. Findings in the districts revealed that the capacity building initiatives conducted were very relevant to stakeholders.

The Country Director of ACORD reported that following the training; their staff members now have the confidence to engage in planning meetings of the DDMC in Kitgum for example.

In Kasese, the DDMC Chairman and Secretary testified that the sensitization meetings that they participated in helped them to learn about the structures of disaster management

in Uganda from central government to local levels. They agreed that since the DDMC inception in early 2000s, they had never been taken through the ToR for DDMC and the way it should relate with other structures and organizations in the district. This has given them the confidence to engage with other stakeholders at the DDMC.

In Kotido, according to the head of OCHA- Kotido field office, training of sub-county and DDMC staff was a good idea⁴. She continued, “*what we found about DDMC when we opened our field office in March 2008 was much more than we had expected. There was some bit of functionality. This could be attributed to the trainings of Oxfam (sensitisation of DDMC and DRR training)*”.

In terms of coordination, much as the respondents agreed that the training imparted some good skills and information in disaster preparedness, there is still very poor engagement between the district and non-governmental actors. The DDMCs in Kasese and Mbale do not meet regularly. One of the respondents informed the review team that the Kasese DDMC last met in April 2008 during the last meeting for Ebola response. This was attributed to lack of resources, lack of prioritization of disasters and the absence of policy guidelines to clarify on roles.

On the other hand in Kotido, there seemed to be a lot of progress in disaster management especially at DDMC. Many respondents the review team spoke to agreed that government and non-governmental actors are having good engagement at DDMC, which now meets monthly. By the time of the review in Kotido, the DDMC was developing a disaster action plan. The CAO Kotido hinted that the district is having the confidence to lead this process because of the skills that some of his staffs have acquired from the training.

However, this success cannot be attributed to the project alone. The NKPDP has also been supporting the DDMCs of Kotido and Kaabong through its district program. In addition, the opening of OCHA field office has also boosted the functionality of DDMCs in the two districts.

The Sironko ACAO and the chairman of the DDMC both stated that they now viewed the role of different district department within the DMMC as more crucial than before the training. The whole district management has now adopted a multi-sectoral approach to disaster management. For example each department is now required to integrate disaster management within their own planning, to report on related issues during management meetings and as part of their standard written reporting. The focus in Sironko as a result of the DDMC sensitisation session seems to have been internal to district administrative structure. Very little mention of improved functioning of the DDMC as a coordination mechanism for all actors was made during the interview.

The impact of the sensitisation sessions on the functioning of the DDMC in M’bale was found to be minimal according to the three local NGOs interviewed (no interview was done with district officials). The DDMC still doesn’t meet on a regular basis, no

⁴ The DPCP project only trained DDMCs. In Kotido and Kaabong, the North Karamoja Pastoral Development Project trained Sub-county staffs. This was a good linkage between the two projects.

contingency plan seems to be in place or if there is one the three organisations interview didn't know of its existence.

All the respondents found the DRR training relevant and informative.

It was quite clear from the organizations that participated in this training that it triggered a shift in thinking from response to risk reduction or preparedness.

The CAO of Kotido for instance was quite appreciative of Oxfam for building the capacity of his officials (at district and sub-county) and local organizations in disaster preparedness and also for supporting DDMC activities. He felt that *“training has instilled concepts of disaster preparedness in the district officers which is helping them to move away from a response oriented approach of disaster management”*.

Furthermore, some organisations in M'bale mentioned that after the training what they previously considered as a “normal fact of life” should in fact have been considered as a disaster that requires preparedness and a response. BUSIDEF for example mentioned that it's as a result of the training that they decided to respond to the cholera outbreak to minimise its impact. Whereas minor landslides that displace a small number of families occur regularly in the District, the Sironko DDMC chairman said that he now realises that these families should be considered as displaced and that small landslides could potentially be avoided with improved farming methods and tree planting for example.

Most organisations also stated that the training made them look at their programmes differently.

The Country Director of ACCORD reported that following the training staff recognised the need to develop a contingency plan and integrate DRR and this was taken to management who want to see it happen. ACORD reported that continued engagement with Oxfam is desirable to support this process.

As a purely development organisation CCF without a humanitarian mandate recognised as a result of the DRR training their “normal” programmes could and should include aspects of DRR.

Action planning and taking forward the training

During the DRR training, participants were tasked with coming up with action plans to take forward the knowledge they acquired in their individual organizations. The review team had discussions with some of the organizations that participated in the training. In Kasese, FURA told the assessment team that the participants from their organization went back and discussed with their management how to take forward the skills acquired from the training. Using the knowledge, skills and information from the training; they were able to develop two proposals, which they later submitted to Care and Oxfam. The Care proposal focuses on peace building through providing alternative livelihoods to conflicting tribes (pastoralists and cultivators). The proposal submitted to Oxfam focuses on livelihoods development through DRR. Further, the organization has an Officer who is in charge of Disaster Management. To a large extent, there was evidence that FURA is taking forward the knowledge acquired during the training and incorporating DRR into its program.

However, most agencies interviewed had not implemented action plans based on the DRR training. Many cited lack of resources, funding or time as main impediments to this. Many had, however, incorporated elements of DRR into existing work at individual level, and into upcoming projects. Some also indicated that they have integrated elements into regular management of projects.

Some organizations have begun to apply the skills and knowledge they learnt to incorporate disaster preparedness into their programs. For instance, KOPEIN informed the team that they are already incorporating disaster preparedness and even mitigation into their programming. The skills acquired from the training are also helping them in analysing the potential for conflict in a given situation and devising mechanisms to mitigate the impact. Currently they are in discussion with some of their funding partners to support preparedness activities within the organization.

However, it is clear that initial training sessions do not amount to a comprehensive process of capacity building (of which training is but one element). It was perhaps unrealistic to think this could be achieved in the 18 months of the project. This will require greater attention and follow-up in the second phase. Some respondents in all regions visited attested to the fact that the training needed to have been followed up to ensure that the skills and knowledge acquired were put to use. This was echoed in M'bale with some respondents feeling that a follow-up training with each organisation that took part in the initial training would be needed to enable them to apply the general principles learned to the specifics of their own working environments. Others like FURA in Kasese felt that Oxfam needed to back up the training with small grants to partners to implement DRR related projects. This could be a focus for the next phase of the project.

3.1.5. Result 5 - Information networks with humanitarian stakeholders are developed and improved and form a basis for establishing improved early warning systems.

Partly achieved

The project has identified potential partners that Oxfam could work with in future DRR initiatives. Some of them participated in the DRR training and they now have a good basis for implementing some DRR activities. In addition, through the implementation of this project, Oxfam has positioned itself as a key DRR actor among the humanitarian community and government.

The project has also managed to engage government on the need to establish a National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. Discussions are still underway to operationalise this platform.

It is worth noting that neither Kotido nor M'bale appeared to have functioning mechanisms for any form of inter-agency coordination outside of the DDMCs. Although an NGO Forum existed in each place, these reportedly did not operate as coordination bodies to ensure optimum delivery of aid and response. In Kotido, the DDMC meetings had become unwieldy and over-long as they were the only point for sharing information on ongoing activities. This, the assessment team was told, is a result of the fact that all

the sector working groups are not yet operational. All the issues are therefore discussed at the DDMC making meetings to be unusually long. Sector working groups need to be operationalized so that fewer and only bigger picture issues are brought to the DDMC.

The link between the establishment of networks and the existence or development of early warning systems was not at all evident to the review team and if Oxfam aims to contribute to such systems more focused activities are needed.

Working with partners

The project was very well received by key partners for whom DRR and specifically preparedness capacity are key areas of concern. This enthusiasm and commitment was evident by the willingness to participate in training sessions, engage with the project and involve Oxfam in internal processes of developing DRR capacity (see for example the relationship with the URCS). This said more could have been done to promote the project and achieve greater connectivity and coordination with external partners at national level.

Government, and in particular the Office of the Prime Minister are a key partner. While they are aware of the project and had received outputs of the project in terms of reports these had not been read or utilised. OPM also assigned an Officer that worked with Oxfam to carry out sensitization sessions in the districts. However, after the sessions, OPM was not actively involved in subsequent activities of the project.

In this respect the project was too passive in its methods of seeking to foster engagement, build capacity and influence the OPM. To an extent the project missed an opportunity to capitalise on the long-term engagement OGB has had with the OPM in support of disaster management in Uganda. A much closer working relationship through genuine partnership could have resulted in greater success in meeting the objective of ‘better preparedness and improved capacity to respond at government level’.

3.2. Project management and Implementation

The DPCP project commenced at a time when the knowledge, capacity and focus on DRR was in its infancy within Oxfam globally. From this perspective the project can be seen as pioneering within the region and reflective of our strategic thinking and direction.

The review team was hampered when attempting to assess the achievements of this project by the lack of a project logframe, the lack of clear indicators as a measure of project success and ultimate impact and the lack of a project monitoring system (beyond the progress reports)⁵. This raises an important question around project quality and minimum standards, particularly from OI funded projects. Our quality and rigour should not be compromised because the funding source is internal. This is a two-way issue. Oxfam Ireland and Oxfam Novib should demand this rigour while from the Oxfam GB side it should be a matter of course to meet minimum quality project standards around Monitoring Evaluation and Learning.

⁵ The stakeholder and partner capacity assessment contained in the Hazard, Vulnerability and Risk Assessment Report does however constitute a basic baseline for capacity assessment allowing for clearer review.

The project was generally implemented in a timely and effective manner by Oxfam GB. Regular progress reports were delivered, workplans were developed and adhered to as much as possible and outstanding activities are in progress and scheduled to take place during these final weeks of the project.

Given the fact that a single officer essentially implemented the project the results have been impressive. All major outputs have been achieved in a timely manner and to a good quality. On the whole the level of human resource input to achieve such an ambitious set of results in over 18-month period was too low. The ideal staffing structure would have allowed for greater strategic management, advocacy, networking and representation capacity at national level together with a staff member focusing on district level technical capacity and structures and the contingency plan formulation.

4. KEY CHALLENGES

The main challenges identified through this review are:

- Long-term engagement with existing Oxfam counterparts proved difficult as not all existing partners were humanitarian actors or interested in the project.
 - Disconnect between humanitarian and development community with relation to preparedness
 - Development organisations feel it is a humanitarian activity
 - Some regions (Eg Elgon) have a very thin coverage of NGOs and CBOs for partnership.
- Limited follow-up actions taken after the capacity building sessions resulting in a risk that the learning be lost because of this lack of momentum

There is significant enthusiasm in the district at all levels for the work being undertaken in the area of disaster risk reduction. However, there is a lack of resources and capacity to fully realise the potential of the training already given or envisaged.

The review team found that local authorities and organisations don't prioritise disaster preparedness; it is a new concept for district leaders and all key stakeholders that will require time and regular engagement before it becomes a common practise. Furthermore, organisations have competing demands and see preparedness as an extra activity, sometimes outside of their remit.

- Lack of commitment at all level of government to disaster risk reduction
Poor commitment of district officials lead to DDMC being dominated by non-governmental actors. According to a number of non-state actors interviewed the “problem is not that they don't have money but that they don't have commitment”
There is a widespread perception that district departments feel it is the responsibility of NGOs to respond – not the district. A similar attitude can be observed at central government level where officials do not feel disaster preparedness is important and rely on UN agencies and NGOs.

Responding to a disaster brings some political credit whereas averting disasters doesn't generate as much political credit. As a result all tiers of government are response orientated. The OPM is still reactive in its approach, even though they are supposed to lead on preparedness.

- Limited Oxfam affiliates and Oxfam GB Uganda field offices engagement with contingency planning delayed the process and mean that in the last weeks of implementation the Project Officer will need to dedicate time to generating comments and embedding the plan. Oxfam Novib and Oxfam Ireland delayed in sending their comments and inputs on the draft contingency plan. This also contributed in delaying the finalization of the plan.
- Limited skill development internally as a result of a wider external focus
- Limited leverage on government policies: the latest shift away from DRR in the policy developed by the OPM revealed the limitations in Oxfam and other actors' influence on policy making and the need for more aggressive and regular advocacy
 - Lack of policy guidelines on disaster preparedness and management.
 - Policy guidelines for DRRM not yet out
 - There is general apathy of stakeholders in the district about the management of DDMCs.
 - Although Oxfam and OPM carried out sensitization of selected members of DDMC, other district officials who did not participate in this are still ignorant.
- Project staffing v. activities to be implemented
 - The added focus on external capacity building
 - It was a challenge sourcing for trainers within Oxfam who could commit to long periods and having knowledge on all areas of training. This delayed implementation of training yet other activities could not be done before training.
 - The August- December 2007 floods also diverted attention and efforts of project staff away from the project. Project activities had to be suspended for some time to allow staff to give support to the floods response.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Overall project focus and management

- There is need for greater coordination and linkage with partners and stakeholders, recognising that the institutional structure for disaster management needs to be strengthened. This requires effort on many fronts – team work is key. This will involve strengthening relationships with for example, World Vision, URCS, UN OCHA, UNDP, and other key agencies moving in this direction.
- There is also need for greater emphasis on internal capacity building and recognising the need to promote this to achieve external influence. There was an impression that the capacity building element of the phase 1 of the project focussed externally on the capacities of partners and not sufficiently internally on that of staff. This has meant a disconnect in the perceived ability of staff to perform effectively in their role within Oxfam. The second phase should

incorporate an internal training programme for all project staff on DRR work to supplement external capacity building

- Need for greater emphasis on the advocacy within the project. DRR does have a ground swell of support and this could be harnessed by for example working to ensure that government policy is operationalised. Oxfam has been involved in formulation of Uganda's disaster management policy since inception and is well respected and within government circles. Utilise this advocacy space and Oxfam's position.
- In relation to the above, the next phase should seek to play a more active role and influence in the planned National platform for DRR

5.2. Recommendations for the next Phase of the DPCP project

The momentum of the DPCP project should be capitalised upon from an internal and external perspective. The project provides an excellent launching pad for the full integration of DRR within Oxfam programming at a strategic and operational level.

A concept note for the next phase of DRR work in Uganda has been drafted and has been through a process of consultation and refinement with Oxfam GB global and regional DRR teams⁶. A further review of this concept note, together with the overall findings of the end of phase assessment led to the generation of the following recommendations.

5.2.1. The decision to move to a second phase

This is fully supported based on the review findings namely: commitment within Oxfam GB at all levels and vision to fully integrate DRR within programming; enthusiasm and demand from partners all of whom unanimously called for greater integration, further collaboration and a desire for continued capacity building support from Oxfam and, in recognition of the importance of DRR work in a multi-hazard prone country such as Uganda.

It is well recognised within Oxfam that the effectiveness of both adaptation and DRR are limited if they are not viewed within the broader context of sustainable development and the project is well placed to promote such integration and linkage between livelihoods and risk reduction work based on a consolidation of the achievements of Phase I.

5.2.2. Goal and objectives of Phase II

The concept note specifies 4 aims:

1. Integrate DRR in current Oxfam programmes and externally
2. Reinforce government capacity for prevention, mitigation and preparedness
3. Reduce vulnerabilities of communities through partner implemented CBDRR initiatives in prioritised regions
4. Integrate climate change adaptation into DRR strategy

Is it recommended that the emphasis be placed on objectives 1, 2 and to a lesser extent number 4. The argument being that getting the necessary capacity built and this means policy, structure, management systems, technical skills and knowledge is a precursor to more detailed programming efforts. Oxfam is well placed to address objective 4 and this

⁶ Find attached the concept note for Phase II

reflects our belief that climate change adaptation and risk reduction work should be integrated and mutually reinforced.

Work related to CBDM should be through support to existing programmes and not a direct component of the project at this stage.

The review team also recommends that a fifth objective of internal preparedness be added in order to make up for the external focus of the first phase.


5.2.3. Recommendations on Project Management and implementation



- Increase human resource to cover this project. Two people needed with a skill mix to cover strategic support, representation, advocacy, capacity building planning and institutional aspects of DRR integration plus technical DRR skills.
- A new model of working that doesn't see the project officer directly implementing training that takes him out of the office for significant periods of time. This will involve time to develop a relationship with a local training institute that is able to build capacity within the country in DRR beyond the lifetime of the project.
- Ensure a full project baseline, logframe and monitoring plan is developed for phase II. This is likely to require a more in-depth capacity assessment than exists at present. Observing minimum standards in project cycle management to be a key focus of phase II.

Annex 1 – Review Terms of Reference

Introduction

Oxfam globally is looking at disasters in the long- as well as the short-term and will be aiming to include DRR in all plans and also develop specific work in order to prevent and mitigate disasters, as well as to prepare for them. Oxfam in Uganda believes that reducing disaster risk comes not just from implementing a good response, but more importantly, from good preparedness, mitigation and prevention. A comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) strategy is essential if vulnerability to disasters is to be decreased.

In the long term, Oxfam hopes to address issues of mitigation and prevention through mainstreaming DRR methodologies into its own programmes (particularly those of livelihoods) and look more at community-based initiatives. In the short term however, we recognize the importance of good preparedness  starting point.

In light to the above, Oxfam undertook a project  Uganda dedicated to disaster preparedness and contingency planning, with the aim of  reducing the impact of disasters through better preparedness and response. Not only did this include the development of Oxfam's own contingency plans, and capacity building of Oxfam affiliates, government and partners, but it also endeavored to improve co-ordination with relevant NGOs, UN, other agencies and government authorities. The project started in April 2007 and is ending in September 2008, a period of 18 months

Purpose of the review

The overall objective of the review is to assess the project against expected results and use the lessons learned as a basis for developing the next phase of the project.

Methodology

A review team composed of Oxfam GB DRR Officer, Regional DRR Focal point, and a representative each from Oxfam Novib and Oxfam Ireland conduct the review.

It is proposed that the team splits in two for field visits and stakeholder consultations. One team focusing on Kampala level consultations and field visits in the Rwenzori region. The second team will at the same time take responsibility for consultations in the Elgon and Karamoja regions.

OGB regional DRR lead will lead the team and be responsible for report writing.

They will use the following methodologies:

- Review of project proposal to have a good picture of the intention of the project
- Discussions with Oxfam staff (at country office, Kotido and Rwenzori) and OI counterparts to have their perspective of the project
- Interviews with key staff of the department of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM)
- Discussions with selected UN agencies, specifically UNOCHA and UNDP
- Field interviews with local authorities (DDMCs) and partners in the project areas

Presentation of the key findings and proposed concept for next phase for discussions in the OI team meeting in Kampala.

First draft report should be completed by 10th August 2008 for presentation to the OI Country Team at their meeting in Kampala on 11th August 2008.

Key areas of focus /questions of inquiry for the review

- Do the Oxfam affiliates, government and partners now know clearly the major hazards that Uganda is prone to and the areas that are considered highly vulnerable?
- As a preparedness tool, how useful is the draft contingency plan in improving humanitarian response by the affiliates? What is the quality of the draft contingency plan?
- Apart from the contingency plan, how else has the project increased level of preparedness for OI affiliates, local authorities and partners (existing and potential)?
- To what extent has the project improved Oxfam's preparedness to respond to humanitarian crises in Uganda in terms of speed, appropriateness and effectiveness?
- What is the level of awareness of Oxfam DRR approaches, humanitarian principles and Hyogo Frame work of Action (HFA) among OI affiliates, partners and local authorities (DDMC)? How is this awareness reflected in change in policy or practice or ways of working at various levels?
- How has the project contributed to the effectiveness of DDMCs in project areas in providing leadership to humanitarian response in their respective districts?
- What were the strengths and weaknesses of the project in cultivating relationship between Oxfam, OPM, other humanitarian actors, DDMCs and potential partners in the prioritised areas and Uganda?
- What were the key obstacles that hindered the achievement of project results?
- What opportunities existed that contributed to the project success? What opportunities were missed or are there for the future success of the project
- How effective was the management of the project in terms of timely and quality delivery of planned activities? Were there any capacity issues of the project team
- Based on the findings and the existing needs on the ground, what are the key recommendations and proposed strategy for the next phase of the project?

Presentation and documentation of findings and recommendations

The review team will debrief with the OI members in the planned OI team meeting in Kampala- Uganda on 11-12 August 2008. Their comments will be incorporated, after which a final report will be compiled and distributed to affiliates within one week.

Management, Administration and Logistics

The Humanitarian Program Coordinator (HPC) of OGB Uganda will provide over all management and technical backstopping for the review team. Oxfam GB Uganda office will provide the logistical and administrative support to the review team, including cars for field trips and stationery.

Timeline

		w/c	w/c	w/c	w/c	w/c	w/c
		7-Jul	14-Jul	21-Jul	28-Jul	4-Aug	11-Aug
Consultation on ToRs							
Document review	1 day						
Kampala consultations	2 days						
Field visits	1 week/team						
Report writing	3 days						
OI country team meeting							

Budget

		UGX	EUR
International travel	NBO	540,000	211.27
In-country travel			
	Elgon	350,000	136.93
	Kotido	900,000	352.11
	Rwenzori	600,000	234.74
Accommodation and subsistence			
	Kampala	1,000,000	391.24
	Elgon	690,000	269.95
	Kotido	570,000	223.00
	Rwenzori	760,000	297.34
TOTAL		5,410,000	2,117

Costs will be covered from the Disaster Preparedness and Contingency Planning Project.

*Drafted by Felix Omuu
Disaster Risk Reduction Officer
Oxfam GB, Uganda
June 2008.*

Annex 2 – Review schedule and list of organisations met

Date	Activity	Location	Participants
28/7/08	Planning and review of documents	Kampala	Felix, Helen, URCS
	Interviews with key Kampala Oxfam staff - Savio, Joseph, Bernard, + randomly chosen participants in training sessions to include programme and support services staff		Felix, Helen, URCS
29/7/08	Interviews with other organizations: - OPM dept of Dprep - UN OCHA - URCS - UNDP, Jose Bong Manzano - World Vision - ACORD	Kampala	Felix, Helen, URCS
30/7/08	Travel to Rwenzori Interviews with selected organizations: - DDMC Officials - FURA - CoU/ South Rwenzori diocese, Bwambale - St John Ambulance - URCS - SciU - Care		Felix, URCS
31/7/08	Interviews with district authorities DDMC Focal point, CAO	Kasese (Rwenzori)	Felix, URCS
	Travel back to Kampala afternoon or next morning		Felix, URCS
4/8/08	Travel to Kotido		Felix, Michael
	Interview with key Oxfam Kotido staff: PM, POs (Livelihoods and Partner)	Kotido	Felix, Michael
5/8/08	Interviews with selected partner organizations - ADRA, - URCS, - CoU - KOPEIN	Kotido	Felix, Michael
	Interviews with District Officials: - DDMC Chairman (CAO), - Secretary and Production Coordinator	Kotido	Felix, Michael
	Debrief with key Oxfam Kotido staff	Kotido	Felix, Michael
6/8/08	Travel back to Kampala		Felix

7&8/8/08	Draft Report Compilation	Kampala	Felix, Alyssa from Michael and Helen input
11/8/08	OI team meeting – Presentation of initial review conclusions	Kampala	OI team
12/8/08	Travel to M'bale Interviews with selected partner organisations: - URCS	Mbale	Alyssa, Michael
13/8/08	Interviews with Sironko District Officials: - DDMC Chairman and Secretary Interviews with selected partner organisations - BUSIDEF - CCF	Sironko Mbale	Alyssa, Michael
14/8/08	Travel back to Kampala		Alyssa, Michael
16&17/8/08	Report Compilation	Kampala	Alyssa

Annex 3 – List of respondents who participated in the review

[Annex Removed]

Annex 4: SELF-ASSESSMENT CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FOR PARTNERS AND STAKEHOLDERS (Summary)

6. INDICATORS (On a scale of 0-4)	KASESE (RWENZORI)			KOTIDIO (KARAMOJA)					SIRONKO (ELGON)	
	FURA	CoU	SJA	URCS	Oxfam	CoU	KOPEIN	ADRA	URCS	CCF
<i>DISASTER PREPAREDNESS KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS</i>										
(i) Approach	2.6	3.4	2.8	3.2	2.6	2.4	0.8	2.6	3.4	1
(ii) Information management	3.3	3.3	2.3	3	2.6	1.6	1.3	3	3.3	0.6
(iii) Supporting organizational structures	3.2	3.7	2.5	3.2	2	3.5	1	2.7	3.5	1.5
<i>ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES & PRACTICES</i>										
(i) Management Practice	3.5	3.5	1	3	3.5	3.5	2	3	3	1.5
(ii) Capacity	3	4	1.5	3.5	1	3.5	1.5	3	3.5	1
(ii) Regional management	3	3	1	3.3	3	2.7	1.3	3.3	3	2
<i>POLICY, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT & MANAGEMENT</i>										
(i) Program Development	2.7	3.5	2.7	3.2	2.5	2.5	2	1.2	3	0.7
(ii) Program Management & Implementation	2.8	4	2.6	2.5	4	3.3	1.5	3.2	3.2	2.7
(iii) Policy	3	3	2.5	3.5	2	1	0.5	0.5	3.5	0.5
<i>ENGAGEMENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE</i>										
(i) Networking	4	3.7	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.2	2.7	3.5	2
(ii) Advocacy	3	3.3	3.6	2	2.6	2.3	2.6	2	3.3	1.6

Key:

0= No/Not at all

1= Minimal/limited

2= Somewhat/ fair

3= Good

4= Very good/very well

Annex 5: Summary of DRR Training workshop evaluation

Mbale evaluation

Content	Yes	Partly	No
Knowledge and skills adequate	16		
Time spent on topics adequate	11	5	
Course respondent to expectation	16		
Course materials were adequate	13	3	
Course relevant to your work	14	2	

Methodology	Very good	Good	Fair
Methodology use was appropriate	14	2	

Facilitators	Very good	Good	Fair
Knowledge on content and methodology	13	2	
Attitude toward participants	12	4	
Ability and skill to stimulate	11	5	
Skills in responding to questions	15	1	

Administrative	Very good	Good	Fair
Food	4	10	1
Accommodation	6	7	2
Training venue	5	9	1
Logistics	2	8	5

Kasese Evaluation

Content	Yes	Partly	No
Knowledge and skills adequate	17		
Time spent on topics adequate	12	5	

Course respondent to expectation	15	2	
Course relevant to your work	15	2	
Course materials were adequate	16	1	

Methodology	Very good	Good	Fair
Methodology use was appropriate	10	6	

Facilitators	Very good	Good	Fair
Knowledge on content and methodology	13	3	
Attitude toward participants	12	4	
Ability and skill to stimulate	14	2	
Skills in responding to questions	14	2	
Administrative	Very good	Good	Fair
Food	6	8	2
Accommodation	4	11	1
Training venue	5	7	4
Logistics	2	8	6

Kotido evaluation

Content	Yes	Partly	No
Knowledge and skills adequate	18		
Time spent on topics adequate	14	3	1
Course respondent to expectation	13	5	
Course materials were adequate	17	1	
Course relevant to your work	16	2	

Methodology	Very good	Good	Fair
Methodology use was appropriate	9	9	

Facilitators	Very good	Good	Fair
Knowledge on content and methodology	9	9	

Attitude toward participants	17	1	
Ability and skill to stimulate	13	3	2
Skills in responding to questions	15	3	

Administrative	Very good	Good	Fair
Food	7	11	
Accommodation	4	11	3
Training venue	8	10	
Logistics	5	9	4

© Oxfam GB 2008

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email publish@oxfam.org.uk

For further information on the issues raised in this document email phd@oxfam.org.uk

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

www.oxfam.org.uk