

Global Programme Learning Report 2006

A review of evaluations and assessments of
Oxfam GB's programme work

August 2006

Oxfam Great Britain



This Programme Learning Report has been prepared by Janice Baker Lucas, an independent consultant. The executive summary was drafted by Margaret Newens, the Oxfam manager of the Programme Learning Report process, in collaboration with Janice Baker Lucas.

Adriana Schor, a volunteer researcher with Oxfam, selected the documents to be reviewed, using an agreed set of criteria, and provided other support during the review process.

Peter Wiles, an independent consultant, provided advice to Oxfam managers of the review process and to Janice Baker Lucas.

Contents

- Executive summary 1
- SECTION I: Introduction and methodology 8
 - 1. Introduction 8
 - 2. Methodology – materials and limitations 8
- SECTION II - Effectiveness of intervention strategies 10
 - 1. Introduction 10
 - 2. Humanitarian action 10
 - 2.1 Emergency and contingency planning 11
 - 2.2 Capacity and resources 11
 - 2.3 Innovation and risk taking 12
 - 2.4 Integration 12
 - 2.5 External standards 13
 - 2.6 Communication and partnership 13
 - 3. Long-term development programmes 14
 - 3.1 Long-term vision and integrated approach 14
 - 3.2 Expanding influence 15
 - 3.3 Linking policy work with grassroots evidence 15
 - 4. Campaigning/advocacy strategies 15
 - 4.1 Local campaigning within global campaigns 16
 - 4.2 Developing local campaigning effectiveness 18
- SECTION III – Implementing Oxfam’s principles through quality programming 22
 - 5. Strategy development and planning 22
 - 5.1 Coherent strategy 22
 - 5.2 Good assessment and analysis tools 23
 - 5.3 Regional support approaches 23
 - 6. Learning approaches 23
 - 6.1 Weaknesses in monitoring systems 24
 - 6.2 Effective approaches 25
 - 7. Principles of empowerment and equity 25
 - 7.1 Gender equality 26
 - 7.2 Other areas of inequality and discrimination 27
 - 7.3 Participation and voice 28
 - 8. Working in partnership and alliance 30
 - 8.1 Working with partners 31
 - 8.2 Supporting networks and coalitions 32
 - 8.3 Working in alliance 33
 - 8.4 Other relationships – government 34
 - 8.5 Other relationships – the private sector 35
 - 9. Management systems and support 35
 - 9.1 Organisational goals, approaches, and principles 35
 - 9.2 A short note on cost-effectiveness 36
 - 9.3 Human resources 37
- SECTION IV: Conclusion 40
- Annexes 41
 - Annex 1: Terms of Reference (Summary) 41
 - Annex 2: List of acronyms 42
 - Annex 3: Selection of evaluation documents, quality of material, and listing 43

Executive summary

What influences the quality of Oxfam's programmes? Are Oxfam's ways of working firmly based on its principles and stated programme approach? This Programme Learning Report was commissioned to help answer these questions. It focuses on identifying factors that help or hinder Oxfam's contribution to beneficial change for people experiencing poverty.

Sixty-one evaluation and other assessment documents, produced during the past three years, were reviewed in the preparation of this report.

The documents reviewed do not question Oxfam's programming framework and approach in any fundamental way. When programmes have a clear strategic direction, and the right capacities and support systems, Oxfam's approaches do appear to be effective in contributing to changing policies, practices, ideas, and beliefs that impact on the lives of poor people. The energy and enthusiasm of management and staff, and the willingness to explore ways of improving the quality of programming are clear.

However, implementation of a rights-based approach is complex and demanding, and requires a long timeframe and focused investment. With such ambitious goals as Oxfam's, there is always room for improvements in organisational systems and processes to promote better and more equitable outcomes and impact.

There have been significant changes and developments in Oxfam's programming since Oxfam GB's Fundamental Review of its Strategic Intent in 1998. However, the Fundamental Review's finding that Oxfam 'does not play to (its) strengths often enough, well enough' is still valid, as is the need to 'achieve greater consistency and coherence in its international programming'.

A number of recurrent themes emerged from the documents studied. These themes are familiar to many Oxfam staff, because they are consistent with the messages about Oxfam's programme performance that have emerged from other reviews and fora. A number of initiatives are under way to address some of the areas of weakness identified. Nevertheless, the themes continue to warrant discussion by programme managers, in order to check whether current initiatives are sufficient, to explore the main reasons for weaknesses in different programme contexts, and to identify the actions required to improve programme design and delivery. Three clusters of issues are abstracted from the main report and described in the Executive Summary: strengthening programme coherence; resourcing and supporting programmes; and working with others for high impact programmes. There are also some accompanying questions posed for Oxfam managers.

Strengthening programme coherence

Systems-thinking and analysis

Effective implementation of Oxfam's global 'one programme' approach requires the use of a number of conceptual frameworks (such as rights-based, livelihoods, and gender-analysis frameworks), as well as ongoing analysis about processes of social change.

The findings in the reviews suggest that analysis of inequalities and power relations often needs strengthening. Few programmes, for instance, took enough account of gender and other inequalities (e.g. linked to HIV or age). Stated more generally, programmes are not often based on analysis using a rights framework. Some emergency responses were stronger than others in protecting livelihoods at times of disaster; good livelihoods assessment is required in areas prone to, and experiencing, disasters. Some staff involved in campaigns commented that Oxfam is not always good at drawing out analysis from local programmes to support campaigning, and that local research capacity is weak.

A number of programme teams are investing in improving various areas of analysis, such as the teams engaged in the 'Vulnerable Livelihoods' initiative* and teams in the MEEECIS Region and the Philippines, who are strengthening their analysis for influencing policies, practices, ideas and beliefs. Oxfam can learn from these and other examples.

* The Vulnerable Livelihoods initiative seeks better integration of long-term sustainable livelihoods work and emergency food security and livelihoods work.

Coherence of strategies and plans

Weaknesses and tensions occur at, and between, different levels of planning within Oxfam. Some local programme teams did not have access to a clear vision and strategy to guide their work. This can lead to a crisis of confidence among staff operating in difficult contexts. By contrast, a clear vision and long-term strategy, such as that developed by the HECA Region's pastoralist programme, can encourage integrated and innovative programming, and the 'glue' to link the work of different programme teams.

Oxfam's campaigning with others in the South is developing fast, and a range of tools and approaches are being used. However, some staff who contributed to this review process commented that global campaign plans may sit uneasily with country priorities, and global campaign activities in country may not link well with country plans and programmes. Staff recognise that a fast pace is required in some campaigns. However, they illustrated how campaign plans with short timescales can hamper the development of new skills locally, impede engagement with a strong, locally integrated approach, and reduce cost-effectiveness.

What are the essential requirements for effective implementation of the 'one programme' approach?

How can Oxfam support staff to use appropriate frameworks at the right time?

Should Oxfam bring in more skills from outside?

How can Oxfam improve country planning to provide programme teams with a clear vision and framework within which to operate and innovate?

In what ways can Oxfam improve its global campaign planning to optimise the effectiveness of campaign actions at all levels?

What planning issues arise from the differences in pace needed for different types of intervention, and how can these be addressed?

Communications, trust, and collaboration between teams

Often a variety of teams need to collaborate in a programme, as Oxfam and its partners seek to have an influence on institutions at different levels, and achieve better integration between humanitarian and long-term development action. There are examples in the documents reviewed of clear, complementary roles being established across teams in Oxfam, and how this has supported effective programme delivery. For example, Oxfam's lead for Make Trade Fair campaigning in the Philippines reported how the country team and partner agencies were supported in their campaigning by the intellectual capacity of Oxfam, including the global research reports produced at headquarters, and by the region facilitating access to people and resources. However, in some other instances, programme staff who were involved in global campaigns felt that collaboration with development programme teams in country was hampered by insufficient understanding about campaigning.

The documents reviewed identified other factors that can jeopardise communication and effective working relationships. For example, separate offices, different management structures, rushed hand-over plans, and separate operational programming plans contributed to weak links between humanitarian and development teams in countries in Southern Africa during the response to the 2002/03 food crisis, and resulted in poor integration of the emergency response with long-term development activities.**

** Country teams in Southern Africa are now part of the Vulnerable Livelihoods initiative.

What are the most important barriers to good collaboration between teams? What are the good entry points for promoting collaboration?

What support do managers in different positions need to promote collaborative working?

Resourcing and supporting programmes

Putting adequate resources in place

There are particular challenges in putting the necessary resources in place to match plans for rapid humanitarian responses. This can be difficult for all humanitarian agencies, but the reviewer of the initial stage of the Darfur humanitarian crisis commented that 'compared to many agencies, Oxfam habitually seems to under-resource the start of a programme... There is a lot to learn about how to inflate a programme with heavy logistics and strong support systems... to prevent the growth of bad habits that will provide negative momentum'.

The need for budgets that can be used flexibly in response to events was mentioned in several of the assessments of campaign work. There were examples of collaborative resourcing of campaign activities both across Oxfam International affiliates, and from central and regional budgets, with money being allocated from these budgets as needed. However, country teams did not always have a clear budget allocation up-front to develop their participation in global campaigning; it was felt that a budget in country would help in future. The need to allow partners to use budgets flexibly was also raised.

Will the Humanitarian Investment Plan and the expansion of the Catastrophe Fund facilitate quick, effective scale-up in humanitarian crises?

Where do country contingency plans need strengthening? Are phase-out plans being adequately resourced to ensure results are sustained?

Is there sufficient delegation of and flexibility in managing budgets?

Human resources for a programme clearly need to match its strategies, but in reality there may be an imbalance. Newer areas of work may not be resourced sufficiently. For example, the Strategic Evaluation of Education, among other evaluations, recommended that Oxfam invest more in staff capacity in relation to advocacy, coalition building, and campaigning in particular, to achieve a better fit with expectations of programmes.

Is there the right allocation of resources and workloads across strategies? Are plans for staff development sufficient in relation to advocacy, campaigning, and coalition building?

Putting the necessary competencies in place

Inevitably the evaluations and other review documents identified weaknesses in a variety of competencies within different Oxfam and partner teams. Support for individuals to acquire the competencies necessary for their role, and to understand the broader frameworks and approaches that form the basis of Oxfam's programmes, is of course important. Weaknesses were frequently found in some basic areas of programme management, such as monitoring, as well as in the areas of broader conceptual understanding, including inequalities and power analysis.

What ways of implementing the new Aim 5, gender equity, Strategic Framework will ensure long-standing weaknesses are addressed?

However, putting together teams that contain the necessary range and balance of experience and competencies, and ensuring respectful and collaborative ways of working within teams and with others, is also critical for effective programming. In complex programmes, a combination of local staff and partners, and international staff, can sometimes provide the balance of skills, experience, and local knowledge needed. In some humanitarian programmes, though, it was found that international staff did not listen sufficiently to those with local knowledge and skills.

When programme plans are in place, is there adequate assessment of the competencies needed to ensure the right staff – and external resources – are put in place? Does Oxfam then do enough to develop and retain these staff?

Internal and external advisers can assist a team to acquire the competencies it requires, but a few evaluations found that external advice was sometimes overused, provided confusing guidance, or added little to local capacities.

What are the keys to effective team-work among staff who bring complementary skills and experiences?

Does Oxfam plan for, and manage, the contribution of advisers and external consultants well? Are external advisers supported sufficiently to listen and deliver?

Use of existing systems, tools, and standards

A number of evaluations recommended better use of international standards, and Oxfam tools and systems. This was especially the case in evaluations of humanitarian programmes, where standards and tools are well developed. Better use of Sphere standards and the Red Cross Code of Conduct, contingency planning for humanitarian response, and the Emergency Response Manual were all mentioned. It was suggested that promotion of rights-based approaches to others including better use of International Human Rights conventions and laws (e.g. the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

Is there sufficient clarity about levels of responsibility in relation to the use of standards?

Are senior and programme managers clear about which standards and tools to use, and where to find them? Are they

(CEDAW), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)), could strengthen Oxfam's own practice. Better use of locally developed tools (such as standards for partner relationships developed by the UK Poverty Programme) was also suggested.

Some good practices were also identified, and suggestions were made as to how to replicate them. Translation of materials, such as Sphere standards, is necessary to promote their use by Oxfam staff and others. Materials need to be available where front-line staff are working, not just in a country office. It was suggested that reporting obligations (e.g. in relation to sexual harassment) could promote the implementation of codes of conduct, as well as strengthen Oxfam's accountability. Support for staff to ensure familiarity with, and an understanding of, standards and tools is also essential.

Learning and accountability

The documents reviewed identified a number of good examples of consistent investment in solid systems of monitoring, evaluation, and learning, and the establishment of national or regional support processes. Improvements in the quality of programming appeared where the monitoring processes were integrated within a strategic approach to planning, policy development, and operational planning, and when training for staff was undertaken.

The difficulty of assessing Oxfam's contribution to change, for instance through influencing ideas and beliefs, was recognised, as was the complexity of analysis because Oxfam works with and through others. However, the documents reviewed also identified a frequent lack of basic, systematic data collection, and adequate monitoring systems. There were weaknesses in initial analysis, baseline measures, and conceptual frameworks in plans, which would have provided the basis for monitoring. Indicators were sometimes too numerous or difficult to measure, and seldom considered changes in power relations, including gender relations. Poor documentation sometimes hampered continuity of monitoring when staff changed, and reporting was frequently found to be descriptive rather than analytical.

The evaluations reviewed for this study varied in quality – for example analysis of gender and other equality issues was often weak. This perhaps reflects how areas of staff weakness can influence the commissioning of evaluations and evaluators.

A few evaluations and other assessments commented on cost-effectiveness, providing some useful perspectives on this subject. However, Oxfam still has considerable work to do to ensure that basic data is routinely in place as a basis for judging cost-effectiveness, and to ensure that other necessary measures are consistently applied to strengthen its accountability and practice.

accessible to those who need them? Who 'owns' tools and standards?

Is there a proliferation of tools?

How should Oxfam manage multiple expectations?

How will the lessons from the Programme Learning Report be incorporated in the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Project?

Do we know where good practice examples of monitoring and evaluation exist, and could others learn from these?

Sustained management capacity and support

The documents reviewed identified the critical role that programme managers play in relation to the points above. Managers need to support staff in understanding basic conceptual frameworks; engage staff in planning processes that encourage strong, integrated programming; and facilitate communication and supportive relationships between and within teams. They need to ensure that programmes are adequately resourced and the necessary competencies are in place, and that staff have the support they need to innovate and take calculated risks, learn, and meet obligations.

A number of reviews suggested that the willingness to devolve responsibilities was important for effective programming; this was recommended in relation to human-resource planning for humanitarian response. Ensuring that there is consistent support for staff across different levels of management is also crucial, as illustrated by the problems local campaign staff experience when the priority given to a campaign differs between the country and either the regional or global team.

Are there particular areas of support that programme managers at different levels require to take Oxfam's programming to the next level?

How can Oxfam facilitate better communication between managers?

Working with others for high impact programmes

Learning about different relationships

The documents reviewed covered programmes that involved relationships with a wide range of organisations, and different types of collaboration. A number of lessons for developing good relationships, that have fairly wide applicability, emerged from some of the reviews of programmes that involve working in alliance with others. These reviews suggested that good relationships are promoted by:

- factoring in time for agencies to understand each other
- being realistic about expectations, goals, and objectives
- clarifying ground rules and processes in a document (including budgets and exit strategies)
- discussing ways of dealing with conflict
- using a flexible management model and leadership style that suits the partnership type
- not relying on a small number of individuals
- being honest about levels of resources, commitment, and capacity

Are commitments to partners long enough in relation to agreed change objectives?

Does Oxfam know what it knows about partnership? Can it identify what is effective, and share and develop understanding about working with partners?

What do partners think of Oxfam?

Oxfam has many strong, trusting relationships with partners and allies, built up over time. However, when new working relationships have to be built within a relatively short timescale, especially between organisations with different mandates and ways of working, and of different size, the individual staff involved can be put under considerable strain.

The range of different relationships being forged as a result of

Does Oxfam need to bring together the lessons being learned

various advocacy and campaigning strategies in programme countries is evident from the documents reviewed. Experience is being gained about ways to collaborate with organisations holding different policy positions on some issues. Supportive relationships are being developed with journalists to promote their understanding of campaign issues. There are lessons about different approaches to influencing governments through collaborative relationships as well as through advocacy. The *We Can* campaign to end violence against women in South Asia for example is exploring how alliances and large-scale movements can be built from a basis of personal empowerment.

from the growth of campaigning – especially in the South – and its experiences of different forms of relationships and influencing strategies?

The long-term commitments that are necessary to work with partners towards changes in policies, practices, ideas and beliefs, as well as for strong, independent networks and coalitions to emerge, is recognised in reviews. Often partner agencies require support to develop capacities in the same areas as Oxfam staff. The reviews show the importance of clarity about the purpose of a partnership, a good assessment of capacities in order to select partners, and then support to strengthen or develop new competencies, whether planning for future humanitarian responses, or development and campaigning work.

The way that Oxfam works in partnership with others offers opportunities to ‘walk the talk’ of participation and equality – and to demonstrate its commitment to empowerment and accountability at all levels. Striving to live this out in all relationships requires a long-term commitment across the organisation.

SECTION I: Introduction and methodology

1. Introduction

This Programme Learning Report has been commissioned to support learning and accountability both within and outside Oxfam. It forms part of Oxfam's reporting process for 2006, and also contributes to Oxfam Great Britain's¹ current review of its monitoring and impact assessment processes, which is being undertaken to meet demands for greater accountability and learning, and to explore improved ways of assessing programme impact.

The purpose of the Programme Learning Report is to explore the key factors helping or hindering positive programme impact, by drawing together findings and lessons from a range of evaluations and other assessment documents produced during the past three years.² The aim of the report is to support management and programme efforts to improve or challenge current ways of working and thereby to achieve 'better quality' programming.³

Oxfam's approach to realising positive change in poor people's lives is set out in a rights-based conceptual framework. High-impact and effective programming are sought through using strategies that aim to bring about changes in policy and practice, ideas and beliefs. The framework commits Oxfam to goals of equality, participation and empowerment, sustainability, cost-effectiveness, and accountability to all stakeholders.⁴

Oxfam's strategy for achieving change based on its five rights-based aims (sustainable livelihoods, basic social services, life and security, voice, and equity) and nine strategic change objectives (SCOs), is set out in Oxfam International's Strategic Plan, 'Towards Global Equity' (2000–2006), and in the plans of Oxfam International affiliates. The strategy involves an integrated approach to humanitarian, long-term development, and campaigning actions. A Guide to Mandatory Procedures and Good Practice has also been produced by Oxfam GB to promote good quality programming.

2. Methodology – materials and limitations

Sixty-one documents were reviewed in the production of the Programme Learning Report. These included 33 programme evaluations and eight strategic reviews. Three inter-agency evaluation reports on the Asian tsunami response were included in the sample in order to provide information about current lessons in the humanitarian sector. The other documents reviewed were internal assessments relating to campaigning (particularly the recently expanding work on Southern campaigning), requested by staff to extend the analysis available in this growing area of Oxfam's work.⁵ This broadened the scope of the materials reviewed beyond that anticipated in the Terms of Reference. The 33 programme evaluations were carried out during the past three years, and were selected from 97 available from that period, using the criteria listed below. They were selected from across Oxfam's programmes, excluding areas covered by recent strategic reviews.

The author of this report was asked to identify patterns and trends in Oxfam's work, and lessons learned, and to aggregate the findings. The report is primarily for Oxfam Trustees and senior managers, but will also be shared with other internal and external audiences. A Communication/Learning Plan will also be developed to facilitate learning and action within Oxfam.

¹ Oxfam Great Britain or Oxfam GB, later referred to just as 'Oxfam'.

² See Annex 1 for a summary of the Terms of Reference.

³ The Terms of Reference defined 'quality' programming for the purpose of this report as: achieving desired results; working in ways that uphold Oxfam's principles and programme approach; and being cost-effective.

⁴ See Oxfam's Rough Guide to Rights-based Approaches to Development.

⁵ See list of documents reviewed and their categorisation in Annex 3.

The main criteria used for selection of the programme evaluations in the sample were that they must:

- cover areas pertinent to the Terms of Reference (management, gender, participation, strategies, partners, impact analysis)
- be robust and of good quality
- represent a balanced sample (by regions and approach – humanitarian, development, campaigns)
- be recent
- avoid overlap with recent strategic reviews, which were also included in the sample

Some comments about the limitations of this type of synthesis report, and of the materials studied:

- A review of such a wide and disparate range of evaluations and reports means that the report will inevitably not cover every issue. However, it can highlight the most common or significant.
- The evaluations did not use a standard framework. This meant issues were not covered consistently, which made quantitative comparison difficult. However, where similar issues were found in a number of reviews, a general conclusion of priority can be made.
- The evaluations (development and humanitarian) were carried out over the past three years, and programmes may have developed significantly. They were also selected from all regions, and as strategies and approaches differ depending on context, capacity, and resources, it is hard to make global assessments. However, findings on certain issues can be noted as positive or challenging, and it is up to relevant management teams to assess whether it is an issue for them or not.
- The Terms of Reference for this Report (see Annex 1) stressed the role of external evaluations this year, as opposed to Programme Impact Reports of previous years, which were based largely on internal assessments. Although external consultants had been involved in less of the assessments selected for study than envisaged (see Annex 3, Table 2), it is felt that the overall mix of documents provided a good range of analysis. Bringing together external consultants with Oxfam or partner-agency staff can provide a good mix of skills and experience in an evaluation team. When Oxfam advisers or other staff from outside the programme area lead evaluations, they also can bring new perspectives, skills, and experience. However, Oxfam does need to ensure that it seeks sufficient external assessment and validation of its work within its total portfolio of evaluations, for both learning and accountability. Some areas of work (e.g. campaigning) also warrant more research and evaluation in future.
- The timeframe of evaluations was felt to be too short by many evaluators. It was noted in a number of evaluations, especially of humanitarian programmes, that the involvement of stakeholders, including staff on some occasions, had been constrained as a result.

SECTION II - Effectiveness of intervention strategies

1. Introduction

Based on the evidence reviewed for these reports, it is clear that across the range of programmes analysed, there are examples of how the approaches chosen have resulted in significant positive outcomes. Programmes have had appreciable impact, or are starting to set up a good basis for changing the lives of those who are vulnerable and living in poverty. When there has been clarity in setting a strategic direction, and investment in appropriate capacity and support systems, many of the approaches have achieved changes both at policy and practice level (supported by the Oxfam International Strategic Evaluation and a range of meta-evaluations⁶). There is no question that the overall direction of Oxfam's approach to programming is making a difference for many vulnerable people. The energy and enthusiasm of management and staff, the willingness to explore how to improve the way programmes are delivered, and the achievement of concrete outcomes, are all clear.

However, implementation of a rights-based approach is complex and demanding, and needs to go on for a long time before it can be evaluated. The reviews show that no programme is yet as fully 'rights-based' or as effective as could be wished. With ambitious goals, there is always room to improve organisational systems and processes to ensure the best and most equitable outcomes. The report will therefore consider the key processes and strategies affecting the quality of programming through a programmatic lens (humanitarian, development, and campaigns –Section II) and will then go on to address specific challenges of systems and ways of working (Section III). Issues concerning the integration of approaches are considered in Section II from the perspectives of humanitarian, development, and campaigning work, and then commented on further in Section III.

2. Humanitarian action

Nineteen reports were categorised as primarily humanitarian (see Annex 3) – although as expected, some of the long-term development programmes also mentioned emergency responses as part of their programming. The humanitarian programmes ranged from immediate responses to crises such as earthquake (Iran), floods (Bangladesh), and the Asian tsunami (DEC and TEC reports), to droughts (Afghanistan, Cambodia, Mauritania, Southern Africa) and conflict situations (such as Darfur and Chad, Uganda and the West Bank). Some longer-term programmes were being implemented in areas of chronic food insecurity (Afghanistan) or in transition from conflict (Angola). Some humanitarian programmes were in areas where there were already existing long-term development programmes, but in other instances there was no pre-existing Oxfam involvement. Sometimes, Oxfam GB was part of an Oxfam International response. The situations and needs certainly differ widely, and responses and strategies are considered according to the specific context.

There were certain commonalities of approach across all programmes, but there are difficulties in assessing long-term impact. There are good examples in many reports of how the quality of life for large numbers of people in emergency situations did improve in the immediate term as a result of Oxfam's work. Certain strategies and activities were particularly effective, such as infrastructure work (e.g. roads), building up community assets (e.g. micro credit and community-management skills), providing access to food and clean water, improving community safety, and providing the potential for access to future benefits (e.g. to services and markets). Financial activities, in particular the provision of cash for work, appear to have had immediate and appreciable effects.

Given Oxfam's mission to overcome poverty and suffering, and the humanitarian imperative to save lives, humanitarian programmes have a particular challenge in reaching as many people as possible within a short timeframe and with limited resources. There can be a tension between 'scaling up' effectively in a timely manner, and pursuing sustainability and quality objectives. Sustainability appears to be assisted where it is possible to work with communities and civil society organisations, and link emergency interventions into longer-term programming and advocacy.

⁶ See Annex 3 for listing.

As supported by other meta-reviews of emergency programmes (S6,7), the main areas that were seen to be critical for an effective and sustainable response were:

- Effective planning systems – contingency planning, assessment, and analysis
- Ability to balance size of response with funds and resources
- Integration with long-term development and advocacy work, and having exit strategies
- Ability to take risks and provide innovative, appropriate responses
- Consideration of external standards
- Effective management systems (human resources, monitoring and evaluation, learning)
- Capacity of local staff in particular
- Working with others – having effective partnerships and alliances

The next sections look briefly at some of these areas.

2.1 Emergency and contingency planning

For emergency programmes to achieve the greatest impact possible, preparedness is critical. In Bangladesh, the team saw how preparedness ‘dovetails’ into an emergency approach, and moreover enables lessons from earlier responses to be built into and refine disaster responses. The review of the Bangladesh Emergency Flood Response found that in the areas where Oxfam had worked with partners and communities on preparedness activities, local women and men were confident in their own abilities to respond at times of crisis (H10).

Early-warning systems contribute significantly to preparedness, as does good monitoring of key indicators, rapid communication of needs and effective media management (S7). A clear understanding of emergency procedures and their application is important – otherwise effectiveness will be hampered, as was identified in the review of the public health response in Liberia (H11). Better use of the Emergency Response Manual was found to be necessary here to help improve planning and management systems (such as assessment of staff capacity, needs assessment, contractual relationships with partners, and security procedures). The manual also needs to be accessible, to local staff in particular.

In the case of the Asian tsunami the vast scale of immediate funding may have allowed Oxfam to expand support systems quickly (H13, 18, 19), but in most cases, funding is not equal to the need. Having an accurate contingency or scenario plan, therefore, can mean that funding sources and media support can be better prioritised and mobilised. The Bangladesh Emergency Flood Response review (H10) recommended developing a framework and guidelines to allow management to assess when extra funding and capacity was needed.

2.2 Capacity and resources

One of the challenges for Oxfam (and the whole NGO sector) in rapid response appears to be matching capacity and systems to need, and accurate assessment of both. Strong and continuous leadership, institutional memory, as well as an experienced team appear to be key factors in getting the right balance. It was said in the Chad review (H3) that ‘compared to many agencies, Oxfam habitually seems to under-resource the start of the programme... There is a lot to learn about how to inflate a programme with heavy logistics and strong supporting systems... to prevent growth of bad habits that will provide negative momentum’.

One of the problems of estimating the capacity required for an emergency response is that scaling up is not ‘just’ a question of implementing another project. For example, the response may be twice the size of the original country programme (Bangladesh Flood response, H10) and require an intervention almost ‘military in scale’. In such a case management will need to plan for increased investment in all areas, including, for example, systems, monitoring, and technical support.

- In the Southern Africa Public Health response in 2002/03 (H7), initial over-ambitious planning and weak management meant that plans had to be scaled down significantly.
- After the Bam earthquake in Iran (H5), the decision not to go for early funding meant that the programme was funded mainly by Oxfam International, and the review felt this factor could have resulted in fewer linkages and bridges with other agencies (H5).

A structured framework for staff recruitment and management is essential. The Digest of observations and recommendations (S6) and Summary of lessons (S7) from evaluations of humanitarian responses concluded that a comprehensive staffing plan can help if implemented well. It was suggested in a number of reviews (H3, 7, 11) that devolving responsibility to local level and empowering local managers and technical staff to manage the process may help.

2.3 Innovation and risk taking

Effective scaling-up requires staff to be able to take risks and be innovative – which means they need experience, the ability to be flexible, and a calculated confidence to make decisions. For example, in an early review of response to the Darfur crisis (H3), the reviewer felt that the scale of need demanded more radical and riskier approaches than those being taken – such as extending outside government-controlled areas, and delegating in remote situations. The Summary of lessons from previous large-scale disasters (S7) concluded that taking risk requires not only high-quality personal judgement but also confidence that the risks will be accepted as a necessary step towards effective and timely humanitarian action. Adequate management support on this is key.

2.4 Integration

The integration of long-term development and campaigning strategies often appears to be a challenge in emergency situations. In Mauritania, for example, there were two decades of experience in long-term programming, but the emergency intervention in 2002/03 still took a classic food supply approach rather than looking at the protection of livelihoods (H12). The inclusion of cross-cutting issues (gender, diversity, HIV) into programming is not consistently evident (this observation is supported by the Oxfam International Evaluation, S1) and conflict reduction and protection work could also be strengthened by a more inclusive approach (S3).

The Southern Africa Public Health Response review (H7, 2003) felt that the possible limiting factors to ‘one programme’ integration for humanitarian work there at that time were:

- lack of defined long-term strategy for the public health sector
- lack of clarity on expectations within and between teams (emergency and long-term)
- poor links between teams – separate offices, different management structures, rushed hand-over (to country team), separate operational programming plans
- lack of knowledge of ‘the other’ [sector or approach]

In Afghanistan (H8) it was recognised that a simple food-based focus did not adequately address livelihood or protection issues and could even have a negative impact on traditional agriculture practices. It was acknowledged that an increased focus on emergency response was at the expense of country long-term structural goals. This was one reason for promoting cash for work initiatives that linked to local livelihood strategies. The programme also developed a successful and coherent approach to advocacy at local level.

Planning for integration

Many of the reports supported the view that it is difficult to balance or connect emergency programming with development and advocacy activities without an explicit strategy for engagement and ways of working (H3a,b,H6,7,8,9,10). The report on the response to the Darfur crisis (H3) showed that co-ordination between emergency and advocacy teams is critical for good assessment and planning, along with documentation and sharing strategies for engagement with local authorities. This can be helped by local contingency planning, and use of good communications strategies horizontally and vertically. Ensuring rehabilitation activities are linked into development work is also important.

The Southern Africa review (H7) highlighted the importance of building team capacity and institutional understanding, and making the purpose of integration clear through multi-sectoral assessments and strategising.

Exit strategies

A number of reviews (H3b, H6,7,8,10,17) supported the belief that exit or phase-out strategies are important for strengthening links between approaches and reinforcing sustainable outcomes. It is helpful if all programmes have coherent strategy documents that can be shared, including transition strategies and handover plans, and a specific agenda for organisational learning and evaluation (S3). Building staff capacity and management support for this is also a priority, requiring an understanding of planning for and management of risk, the use of analytic and impact assessment tools, and knowledge about competencies of partners.

Understanding of development concepts

Another key for strengthening a ‘one programme’ approach was seen to be staff understanding of developmental concepts such as sustainable livelihoods or systems approaches, as well as issues of change in ideas and beliefs (core concepts in development and campaigning). The programme needs to be able to analyse issues of equality, social power, and ownership of assets, to have tools to understand the needs of the community, and enough flexibility to include relevant activities (H12).

- In the review of the response to drought in Mauritania (H12), it was recommended that the development programme should build capacity for drought response, build in skills for livelihoods assessments, and be able to carry out strategic needs assessments, contingency planning and scaling-up of interventions.
- In the review of drought responses in Cambodia (H17), it was concluded that impact could be best achieved through cross-team planning and design for future drought response strategies, such as livelihoods diversification, water irrigation and maintenance, and the promotion of self-help groups.

2.5 External standards

A number of the humanitarian reviews mention the importance of being able to assess performance against external standards, and some programmes are planning to reference Sphere progressively (but the Red Cross code is not generally referenced much). A response may be considered appropriate in terms of area and scale *internally*, but until compared with robust *external* standards this is not seen as adequate in terms of external accountability both to beneficiaries and donors (Liberia, H11). This supported the DEC finding that few agencies consistently meet external standards (H13).

One reason for this may be that standards are not consistently included in planning systems. Another reason could be that there is a lack of monitoring capacity. A number of reports mentioned weak understanding of external standards, especially when translations are not always available. For example, in the Afghanistan Hazarajat response (H8), the only copies of documents were in Kabul, and not accessible to local staff. If documents had been available and understood it was felt that this might have assisted in work with partners. In addition, it could be that standards are not being proactively promoted – which could be rectified through staff training, working with NGOs and government partners, translation into local languages, and development of discussion fora (H10). In terms of implementing standards and strengthening accountability, several reviews suggested requiring codes of conduct for national and international staff and setting up reporting obligations (e.g. in relation to sexual harassment (H3)).

2.6 Communication and partnership

Good communication within and between teams, across the Oxfam International family as well as externally with partners and allies, is critical for working to scale. In the Angola public health programme (H15), for example, a lack of communication and planning between logistics and the development programme caused delays in assessment and implementation (H15). Weak communication downwards from the region (Afghanistan H8) meant that key lessons and experience were lost to the country team involved in the Hazarajat programme. During the flood response in

Bangladesh (H10) changes in management expectations caused tensions when they were not communicated effectively.

A number of reports reinforced how important it is that Oxfam be clear with partners from the outset exactly *how* it is going to focus its response geographically and sectorally – by working where it has experience or by filling gaps in other agencies’ work. This commitment has to be made locally, but needs to be supported by regional and international technical support and advice. Working within a clear country and regional framework and with well-developed contingency plans can help (H10).

Strong partnerships and local knowledge are helpful – in the Afghanistan Cash for Work programme for example (H9), the long-established and close relationships with the population and positive reputation Oxfam had (as the ‘Mother of NGOs’) contributed greatly to successful implementation.

3. Long-term development programmes

Sixteen reports looked primarily at issues of long-term development (although of course several programmes clearly incorporated advocacy/campaigning strategies, and some also included emergency response). In terms of longer-term strategies, these programmes demonstrated specific strengths through their solid community base developed from years of fieldwork and partnering, and the focus on support for partners through local technical and organisational capacity building (D13, 14, 15). A number of programmes focused on gender issues (D9, D12), one was a joint Oxfam programme (i.e. involving several Oxfam affiliates (D15)), one was based in the UK (D10), and one represented the regional components of a programme that extends across six countries (D5).

The need for good strategy development, planning, and effective communication applies across all the programmes reviewed, and will be discussed more in Section III. More generally, it was found that the wide range of development programmes reviewed in the selection made it hard to aggregate lessons. However, some common themes stood out:

- having a long-term vision and integrated approach
- expanding influence through capacity development and work with networks
- linking policy work with grassroots evidence

3.1 Long-term vision and integrated approach

Essential to implementing effective long-term development is the ability to set a long timeframe and vision for change and to be able to work at a number of levels. This requires a clear strategy, and a good analysis of stakeholders and ways in which change might be brought about. Programmes appear to be more effective when developmental work is linked with broader advocacy/campaigning strategies. Skills in this area are not intuitive and many reports discussed the need for investment in staff and management capacity (see Section III).

A number of programmes demonstrate that an integrated approach is most effective when achieved through joint strategising and planning between teams, whether within Oxfam or with partners (D5, 8,10,12,13,14,15).

The Malawi Integrated Rural Development Programme (D15) is a good example of commitment to an integrated approach and a long-term vision. It brings together programmes of livelihoods, partner support and advocacy, mainstreams HIV and gender issues throughout, and has an operational humanitarian programme. The advocacy programme supports networks. It demonstrates an effective integrated local campaigning capacity, which has been a useful example for local partners as well as achieving impact in itself. This is not to say that there are no tensions, as it is managed by four Oxfam affiliates, and works at a wide range of levels – from grassroots up to national government. Links between the humanitarian programme (albeit effective in itself) and the longer-term development work have not been smooth, due to some lack of consensus about aims and ways of working. The main friction has been the overlap between rehabilitation and development work. The joint management model also does not always work smoothly. This demonstrates some of the challenges of a complex and ambitious approach, and the need for clear and shared operational planning.

3.2 Expanding influence

Being ‘operational’ is not the only approach to scaling-up and large-scale impact. Developmental work appears to be most consistently effective and sustainable when it is comprised of *influencing*, by building up the capacity of local staff, partners, and networks. The partnership model, when it goes beyond capacity building of individuals and partner organisations to strengthening networks and coalitions, is particularly powerful, and more so when linked with campaigning and advocacy.

The Community-Based Coastal Resource Management Programme in the Philippines (D14) plans to expand and replicate its influence through providing ongoing support and capacity development for long-term partners and local NGOs engaged with the programme issues. The programme supports advocacy work at local and national level. The challenge for the team is to ensure that actions for managing local resources are undertaken within a broader framework of intervention for poverty alleviation. It therefore has a long-term goal for local advocacy, taking into account the challenges of local capacities, context and risk, and recognising that communities need to build self-reliance through strengthening local capacities and community-organising strategies.

3.3 Linking policy work with grassroots evidence

It can be a weakness if policy work does not have a strong grassroots base, either through partner or operational work. Policy work in turn will support developmental economic and social goals (Aims 1 and 2) as well as upholding broader rights to a voice and equity (Aims 4 and 5).

- The UK Poverty Programme (D10) uses a solid structural analysis of poverty and gender relations across all programme approaches, but the team has realised that evidence from practice is required in order to be able to bring about change at the policy level. It found that poor people’s participation in policy-making needs to be demonstrated in practice, and advocacy alone is not sufficient.
- The Human Rights programme in Peru (D8) has struggled with how to ensure that public policy decision-making at national and regional level has a grassroots reality. The review of the programme concluded that this could best be done in two ways – by support for local partners through core programming on participatory planning and budgeting, and by support for national-level NGO advocacy.

4. Campaigning/advocacy strategies

The reports in this area focused mainly on *local* or *national* implementation of either global or local campaigns (as opposed to international campaigning), in accordance with the priority stated in the Terms of Reference. Most of the documents reviewed were internal because campaigning in the South is generally a relatively new, but expanding, area of work. Only two assessments were undertaken by external evaluators. International campaigning is not considered specifically, because it has been well covered in the recent Oxfam International Evaluation (S1). As would be expected, this section also draws on analysis from some evaluations categorised as development or humanitarian.

‘Local’, or ‘national’ campaigns here mean campaigns that are identified, planned, and budgeted for locally. They focus on locally relevant issues, although they may still link to other regional and international rights-based advocacy priorities (e.g. gender, human rights, livelihoods). Some of the reports reviewed (C3, 11a/c,17,19) focused on this form of local or national campaigning or advocacy work, which was *independent of global campaigns*. Sometimes there may be a number of linked programmes within a region, such as the *We Can* regional campaign to end violence against women in South Asia (C3), or institutional accountability work in the MEEECIS region (C2), or it may be continental (e.g. the pan-Africa work, 11a/c). There may be regional activities complementing and supporting national-level work (e.g. the HECA regional pastoral programme, D5). Two reports focused particularly on *process* and were from country-learning initiatives (C2,12).

However, many of the 19 reports concerning campaigning and advocacy looked at campaigning in the South *as part of global campaigns* such as Make Trade Fair, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (G-CAP) (4a/b, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11b, 13, 14, 15, 15

16, 18). Most concentrated on relationships within Oxfam both globally and locally, but a number looked at ways of improving relations with partners and allies.

Most lessons learned were about issues related to campaigning in the South – either the way that global campaigns were implemented locally, or the need for institutional capacity and support for local programmes. Most of the concerns about achieving greater impact were therefore around the local/regional/international communications interface, local allocation of resources, and focused support. It was difficult to assess and compare overall impact of the campaign strategies, but some reports did discuss where strategies appeared to be successful, and how they could be made more effective. There is perhaps also need for more analysis on Southern campaigning work in the future.

In some ways, local campaigns may have more potential to exploit a ‘one programme’ approach, because they are strategically owned at a local level; although global campaigns can also be extremely relevant if well integrated. Much of the experience gained through involvement in global campaigning was also useful for locally initiated work, but local skills and knowledge were felt to be important. Issues relevant to local actions as part of global campaigns are discussed below, followed by issues relevant to any form of campaigning in the South (whether part of a global campaign or not).

The main issues emerging from these two perspectives were:

Local campaigning within global campaigns

- Communicating, and sharing strategies
- Ensuring relevance to local stakeholders and interests
- Valuing regional mechanisms
- Resourcing

Developing local campaigning effectiveness

- Linking with development approaches
- Considering local capacity and competencies
- Using appropriate mechanisms, tools, and approaches
- Ensuring management support
- Ensuring effective and timely resourcing

These issues are covered in more detail in the following pages.

4.1 Local campaigning within global campaigns

Communicating, and sharing strategies

Communication downwards from the global programme, upwards from the country level, and also between partners and allies, is critical. Communicating about strategies and timing at global level can make local campaigns more effective, particularly when they link into local interests. Linkages have to be explicitly explored and understood through the development of a shared campaign plan. As was found in the interview on Southern campaigning in India and South Asia (C13), partners may have different interests, and developing a shared understanding may take time.

Local experiences in sectoral areas (such as the MDGs or trade work) and local research (such as that in education (S4)) can contribute to influencing global and regional public policies. Supportive ‘grassroots communities of practice’ can reinforce the credibility of national and even regional and global campaigns (D10). To achieve this, investment has to be made in focused strategy and stakeholder planning at country level (C11b), as well as relevant policy analysis at global level. The HECA Trade Programme Impact Report (C16) suggested that Oxfam could strengthen its skills in capturing local information and packaging it. The Africa G-CAP review (C11b) also concluded that there was a need for more long-term overall resourcing at national level, strengthening of skills in information collation and internal monitoring, and an increased focus on media capacity.

In the Philippines Advocacy Workshop (C12), as well as the HECA Trade Programme Impact Report (C16), it was suggested that there can be insufficient internal understanding of advocacy. This can arise when there is no advocacy ‘plan’, or there is weak leadership, and it can be unclear who ‘does’

advocacy (for example on issues such as protection or gender). It can mean that teams miss out on maximising opportunities, and it can affect the stance and position a programme adopts on political issues and alliance relationships. The HECA Trade Programme Impact Report (C16) called for 'greater appreciation within programmes of what campaigning is' and concludes 'that one cannot do campaigns half-heartedly; campaigns have to be designed at a very different pace from programmes'.

If ways of working and goals are not clarified, and the costs to the organisations involved are not outlined, the relationship between Oxfam affiliates or with international/local partners or allies can become divisive. Nevertheless, there is usually a recognised added value of working in alliance, despite the efforts/costs involved. The issue is how to reduce the cost burden to staff and partners.

During Oxfam International's involvement in G-CAP in South America (C18), information flowed down from headquarters (Oxfam GB and Oxfam Novib) to counterparts, but local Oxfam teams only found out about alliance strategies and initiatives from partners. This was felt to be a clear failure to respect agreed working structures and decision-making processes, and more significantly, it undermined the work of local alliances. It also affected opportunities for complementarity across campaigns. In another example, a country team was challenging a multinational organisation that Oxfam was working with globally – thus jeopardising both initiatives (C18). To prevent this type of occurrence in future, the South American campaign team has proposed that Oxfam International in the region agrees a policy on private sector work.

Recommendations for ways to strengthen global–local communications within Oxfam were:

- Strengthen regional-level leadership for national campaign strategies (C15, 18)
- Share planning and evaluation processes between region and country levels (C12, C8)
- Understand and agree on roles and inputs from Oxfam affiliates and allies (C6, 18)
- Appoint regional co-ordinators (but also ensure capacity at national level) (C16)
- Have lighter, flexible global working structures, and steering committees (C11b)
- Improve information collation and internal monitoring (C11b)
- Increase capacity building at national/local level (C15)
- Improve conceptualisation and sharing of both issue and process (C15)
- Ensure global campaigns information is shared downwards and made relevant (C15)

Ensuring relevance to local stakeholders and interests

There is an understanding that local campaigning, as part of global campaigns, should be tailored to suit the realities of each targeted area or country, and be rooted in local experience (Africa review of G-CAP work, C11b). Links with Oxfam country-office agendas can be important to ensure global work is relevant and to build interest at national/field level ('Strong regional and national actions are essential to ensure that work is not seen as yet another extension of an international campaign' (C11b)). Working through supportive individuals in local and national government can also help in this, alongside maintaining pressure on policy makers through local activism (C8).

Some challenges identified from the Make Trade Fair campaign in South Asia (C13) were that:

- Local opportunities and priorities may not suit the timing of global initiatives (e.g. the global priority for campaigning on agriculture and dumping was not a priority for India)
- Media interest in global campaign issues may be low in specific countries (e.g. on trade, in India, at the beginning of the campaign)
- Country teams have different capacities and constraints, so relative strengths must be considered (for example the size of India and its different languages and cultures, and lack of experience in media work)
- Regional political dynamics may affect relationships and communications
- Rapidity of change in international (e.g. trade) negotiations may be beyond local capacity to follow

Valuing regional mechanisms

A number of programmes saw regions as an important pivot point as well as an organisational means to co-ordinate and strengthen links between global and national campaigning (S4). In the Philippines work (C12), for example, there is a positive view of the complementary roles of global, regional, and national work, supported by the region. A regional perspective can help to ensure that regional strategies are clearly linked to global priorities (C16), and are a bridge between national campaigns and global resources. Regional management can also have a role (C16) in ensuring that local country management sees the relevance of the campaign.

Resourcing

Plans for resourcing allies and partners, as well as Oxfam affiliates, need to be clear at the start. This is particularly so in rapid, reactive campaigns. A lack of communication about future plans can limit the confidence of staff (MEEECIS (C2), Indonesia Make Trade Fair campaigning (C4b) and HECA Make Trade Fair campaigning (C16)). In a number of reports, it was felt that problems can be caused by a lack of priority given to local/national campaigning (regional feedback notes on Make Trade Fair campaigning C15), or weak regional leadership (HECA Trade Programme Impact Report C16). The Africa G-CAP review (C11b) felt there was a need for more long-term resources to be visibly allocated to local campaigning, and for funding to be flexible enough to match the reactivity of campaigns. In the Philippines (C14) it was felt that it was important to be prepared to provide the same flexibility in budgeting to Oxfam teams and partners. An overall lack of appreciation of the role of local campaigning exists when it is seen as an 'add-on' to core business (C15).

4.2 Developing local campaigning effectiveness

Linking with development and humanitarian approaches

Strong strategic and operational links between local campaigns and long-term development programming was seen to be a key factor in increasing the effectiveness and impact of both approaches (C3, C2, D13,15). In such a linked approach, working with partners and planning for long-term alliances is key (as found in the Programme Impact Report 2005). In an Oxfam workshop with partners to draw out lessons about campaigning in Africa, it was said (C11c) 'it is crucial to ensure that our stories and realities are at the centre of campaigning'.

Two ways to help ensure added value in the area of linkages were identified as: sharing strategy development and planning across teams. For example, in Russia, the towns chosen for popular campaigning about the MDGs were where the livelihoods programme is being implemented: this was felt to make campaigning easier because the local population and authorities knew Oxfam, and it was thought that the greater visibility arising from the campaign might also benefit the livelihoods programme (C8). In the Zambia Make Trade Fair work, it was considered that in addition to campaign interventions, other strategic work was important, such as providing information to farmers on pricing issues and values of crops affected by global trade policies (C7).

In the Trade work in the Philippines (C14) it was said that Oxfam often has little local research evidence, and the links between programmes on the ground and campaigning are sometimes nebulous. During the emergency response to the drought in Southern Africa in 2002/03 (H7), Oxfam played an important role in raising awareness of the need for public health interventions. However, the review team felt that if Oxfam had been slightly faster in implementing its public health response and had stronger data from the assessments done, it would have been more confident to voice this need for public health action and lobby for public health funds within the region.

It was noted that campaigns involving social change, and changes in ideas and personal beliefs, will require a longer and more consistent investment than more specific targeted campaigns. Increasing the capacity of civil society to relate to states and governmental organisations is critical for accountability (C11a) and requires a more complex response than just programme accompaniment alone. Analytical and learning approaches were seen to be important in gaining a clearer understanding of how personal and social change can be achieved (illustrated in the MEEECIS institutional accountability workshops (C2)).

Considering local capacity and competencies

National campaign teams and alliances are relatively new in many cases, and may require additional support in areas of conceptualising issues and strategies and developing links with global campaigning issues. Sometimes country-level interventions were felt to be affected by limited local capacity in certain areas, such as research, and linking global trade issues with local interventions (G-CAP C11b, Regional feedback notes on Make Trade Fair campaigning, C15). It was considered that there was sometimes a lack of strategic approach (C4), due to weak management support and prioritisation (C13). In terms of working with the media, the Africa G-CAP review (C11b) found it was critical to ensure that staff were confident in responding to media about solutions. Training of staff to work with the media was also identified as a priority in South Asia (Make Trade Fair campaigning, C13).

Staff need both campaigning skills and time for planning to build local capacity, otherwise they can depend too much on national and regional level support (C11b). Lack of time for shared analysis and indicator-setting can also affect a team's confidence and ability to assess impact. The Africa G-CAP review (C11b) felt that greater regional support for local campaigns was important – for example, a specific fund could be set up at regional level to support national coalitions. This could be in addition to support in other non-funding areas (such as information collation and internal monitoring of experiences).

The Education Strategic Evaluation (S4) calls for development of staff capacity for advocacy and policy work, and a balance of work between programme implementation and wider advocacy and coalition activity, as coalition building is a slow process and needs continued engagement. A number of the reports recommended greater investment at both national and local level particularly in the areas of learning and communications (in order to support increased understanding between local programmes and advocacy, particularly considering the different speeds and ways of working), training and support functions, and strategy for coalition capacity building (C16).

Using appropriate mechanisms, tools, and approaches

The reports showed that staff were keen to share their experiences of Southern campaigning – often a relatively new and expanding area of work for them – and to provide their analysis of areas of weaknesses and risk. Much of the campaign work involved popular campaigning, including media work. Interesting approaches that will be specifically mentioned are the change-makers strategy in the *We Can* campaign in South Asia, and the strategies used in the MEEECIS institutional accountability work. In Section III, other related issues will be looked at, such as capacity building, institution building and alliance building, and the establishment of strategic alliances with government and multi-stakeholder groups.

Local campaigning, whether part of global campaigns or not (C4b, C7, C8, C17) used strategies appropriate to the context. The most important factors for effective campaigning were felt to be: having an agreed overall strategy for ways of working; good allocation of resources (human and financial); and a clear message that is well communicated. Being in tune with local views, communicating one-to-one, having a human face, and providing local translation were also key. When working at local level either on local or on global campaigns, having access to a multiple, mixed set of strategies of support and partnership was felt to be effective. One-off campaigns were not seen as helpful (C7, C2), if they were not linked into a long-term strategy for institutionalising change.

Media work, in particular electronic and TV, appears to be effective in many cases for public awareness raising (*We Can*, C3), and can play a part in influencing policy makers (as in the Africa G-CAP work (C11b) and MEEECIS MDG work (C2)). However, it does need to be resourced properly in terms of budget and staffing (C11b). In India, setting up a regional network for economic journalists within an NGO (the Centre for Trade and Development, also initiated and supported by Oxfam) was found to be valuable. This initiative increased journalists' interest in and understanding of trade issues during the campaign (C13).

Locally specific and popular campaign tools such as travelling exhibitions and photos of celebrities were also considered to be relatively effective (Peru, Chile, and Colombia C17, and Zambia C7), particularly when paralleled with effective media strategies. Mass mobilisation and demonstrations

can strengthen campaigning effectiveness, as well as increase public awareness (C17). However, they can also result in repression, putting lives in danger, so teams have to consider risks. Mass signature collection (e.g. the Big Noise petition as part of the Make Trade Fair campaign) has been promoted in many countries. Experience is being gained about how the effectiveness and efficiency of this can be enhanced when it is linked with local activities and actions.

- In Zambia (C7) the Big Noise campaign involved a range of activities (e.g. community meetings, concerts, and media work) alongside signature collection and presentation. The campaign was felt to have strengthened the bargaining position and organising ability of poor farmers, as well as gaining good media support and having an influence on policy makers' views. Important to the campaign's achievements were the one to one communications between campaigners and local people, giving a 'human face' to campaign issues, strong media relationships, and good relationships with partners and allies, locally and internationally.
- In the Philippines Big Noise signature collection (C14), partners felt that the timescale was too short to be able to collect signatures in an efficient way through their networks. Moreover, it was felt that mass signature petitions are not held in high regard by policy makers, and that media coverage of campaign issues attracts more attention. However, partners felt that the signature collection did assist their education activities and raised popular support, and it was important that local people's voices are expressed globally. They would continue to undertake mass signature collections, but think carefully about when and how this is done.

It is particularly important at local level to have a focus on relationships (e.g. with journalists by running workshops and interviews) and to work with supportive allies (e.g. in government). The Peru work on good governance (C17), for example, has learned that it is crucial to have a good alliance strategy, either selecting already effective partners, or being prepared to build capacity and confidence. To gain support for campaigns locally, it can be productive to have good links with local communities – which is where links with long-term development activities can help. A multi-stakeholder perspective is critical (C19), supported by focused analysis and contextual understanding of issues concerning civil society (C7). Because of the long-term nature of local campaigning, it is also important that 'local' issues and relationships receive attention at the most relevant level. In India (C13), for example, most successful campaigning is done at state rather than national level, because many decisions are made at state level due to the size of the country.

A potentially effective local strategy appears to be focusing on long-term changes, using appropriate activities to bring about institutional accountability – which requires patience and concerted investment. Work in the MEEECIS region (C2) addresses attitudes and practice of government and institutional bodies through lobbying for and monitoring institutional change. It works across a range of countries at the same time (Albania, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Russia), with related but locally relevant operations. The four programme strategies focus on long-term issues of capacity building and network building (partners and allies), as well as public awareness raising on accountability, transparency, participation and participatory budgeting, local follow up on global campaigns such as MDGs, and specific lobbying on key issues (e.g. disability and gender rights).

Another innovative approach is technically a programme model that focuses on personal change to bring about social change. In a solidly grassroots-based approach, the *We Can* campaign in South Asia (C3) uses a long-term *development* model of personal empowerment. It works with 'change-makers' (on an individual level) as the basis for building a mass movement to bring about broader social change. It links the personal to the political by creating a cohort of 'change makers' who work with small groups of women. It has found that there can sometimes be too much focus on the tools or the 'training' and less on actual, long-term change. The next step for such a programme is to learn how personal empowerment can engage most effectively with building alliances and large-scale movements, and how a mass movement can bring about change, in ways relevant to each country context. The review specifically recommended looking at strengthening the links between the *We Can* work and the country development programmes.

Ensuring management support

Southern campaigning is inherently political work, as it often focuses on changing attitudes and beliefs both of partners and decision-makers at a local level, taking on unresolved issues of local power struggles. Partners and allies may have to take risks (C17). It is therefore important to ensure that Southern campaigns are included in the country strategic framework and operational plan.

Management has to make sure that there is sufficient local capacity for campaigns work, allocate resources, and create ongoing opportunities for links between programmes (Programme Impact Report 2005). Staff may have adequate skills for campaigning, but there is sometimes a need for them to be trained in management and leadership areas (C3).

As Southern campaigning and working with Southern alliances is becoming a higher priority for Oxfam in realising its overall organisational aims, increasing support for local campaigning should follow. Clarity about staff roles and the balance between skills at regional and country level has to be addressed, perhaps through a matrix-management approach as in the South Asia *We Can* campaign (C3). The *We Can* review felt that local/national campaigns can also need support in terms of programme planning skills, setting strategies, and monitoring and evaluation/documentation. Local programmes may also need to balance their long-term strategic aims with practical areas of short-term support (such as providing shelters and advice for women with issues around domestic violence).

One of the proven ways of supporting national and sub-national level campaigning appears to be setting up support mechanisms at a regional level. These may address both development and advocacy areas (e.g. D5, C3) or work on a rights-based framework (D8, C3, 17, 19). The work on trade in South America, for example, builds alliances at regional level, working with local campaigners, and pushes for greater presence in political debates (e.g. through setting up an Andean Co-ordinator function for Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru (C18)).

In the HECA regional pastoralist programme (D5), it was recognised how a broad-based regional alliance strategy can be extremely useful in supporting local campaigning approaches. Regional support can help develop stronger skills in analysis, encourage discussion of big questions, produce tools for use externally as well as internally, and encourage rigour in monitoring systems and security in funding. It can also lead to genuine cross-border programmes beyond current one-off ‘exchanges’. The programme’s long-term commitment to an integrated and innovative vision is seen to provide the ‘glue’ to link work in countries in the region together. The work includes service delivery components combined with advocacy approaches, and a commitment to working across sectors. It has helped enhance learning and advocacy through demonstrating good practice.

Ensuring effective and timely resourcing

A number of reviews (C6,11b,15,16) outlined the need for management to provide clear and flexible budget allocation and resourcing for local campaigning, both locally and from the region. In the Indonesia Make Trade Fair campaign for example (C4), the work had been successful because of budget contributions from other projects, as no specific budget allocation had been made in the country budget for Make Trade Fair campaigning. There is also a clear need to develop plans with partners on resource allocation and systems – again in Indonesia (C4), the main alliance partner had no plan on how to allocate human resources to manage the campaigns. What appears most important is linking budgets into country plans, and allowing them to be flexible enough to suit campaign strategies.

SECTION III – Implementing Oxfam’s principles through quality programming

‘Getting the approach right’ depends on the ability of management to balance a wide range of internal approaches and factors against external needs – whether in humanitarian work, development programmes, or campaigning. Oxfam has a strong planning culture and has invested in systematic programme and management systems, but there are still areas that can be strengthened. The following areas were seen to be integral to quality implementation across all approaches:

- strategy development and planning
- learning approaches
- principles of empowerment and equity
- working in partnership and alliance
- management systems and support

5. Strategy development and planning

Some critical lessons about the need for planning for quality programming (apart from the later sections on monitoring and evaluation and management) were around the need for:

- Coherent strategy (a clear planning framework, an integrated approach including phase-out and exit strategies, and collaboration and communication)
- Good assessment and analysis tools
- Regional support approaches

5.1 Coherent strategy

Good quality, long-term, visionary planning is critical to support quality implementation. A ‘common conceptual framework’ was seen by many to be key in bringing together humanitarian work, development work, and advocacy work. The UK Poverty Programme review (D10) found that better use of Programme Implementation Plan (PIP) processes,⁷ an overall visioning document, and systematic inclusion of a rights-based analysis would contribute to greater integration. Plans should be clear, and communicated – the Peru Human Rights Programme review (D8) concluded that some of the strategy documents prepared by external consultants had been elaborate and over-complicated, and that simplicity and sharing is key in strategic planning.

A lack of confidence in the organisation’s commitment to a programme can result in too great a focus on current activities, and therefore weaker outcomes. In the Benguela Public Health Programme Review, Angola, for example, (H15), the lack of articulated vision was felt to have brought about both weak strategic and operational direction and a crisis of confidence in staff. In Afghanistan’s Hazarajat programme, (H8) there was no one single document that laid out Oxfam’s understanding of livelihoods work or future plans. In the Gender Equity programme in Yemen, the complicated set of objectives (35 different objectives, and 17 added in the pilot phase) made it difficult for the programme to plan, let alone implement good assessment techniques with partners (D12).

A collaborative, cross-agency planning process can bridge the gaps between development and emergency implementation, and ensure links with advocacy and campaigns work. If done well, such a process can pre-empt biases in targeting by ensuring that Oxfam’s needs-based and rights-based approach is followed. In the Bangladesh Flood Response (H10), despite a contingency plan, most responses were felt to be triggered by media coverage and not by a rights focus. Approaches that are cross-cutting such as conflict reduction, education, and gender equality are also more likely to be addressed in a collaborative planning process. Several of the interviews with Southern campaign staff (C13,14,15) mentioned the need to ensure that campaign plans are well situated within a global–local

⁷ PIPs form part of Oxfam GB’s computerised programme management, accountability, and learning system (OPAL).

framework, to ensure greater impact. Reports on the *We Can* campaign that focuses on empowerment and activism noted that it would be more effective if integrated with other programmes in country (C3). Having a regional support project can also help in developing common frameworks or ‘nested’ strategies, as in the HECA Regional Pastoralist Programme (D5).

Exit and phase-out strategies

To ensure sustainability, all kinds of programmes should include phase-out or exit plans in their strategy as a matter of course. Choices will have to be made here, depending on resources and the strategic vision of the programme. For example, in the UK Poverty Programme there were those who wanted Oxfam to grow through more grassroots links, and those who proposed expansion through a stronger advocacy or lobbying base. These kinds of decision need to be reconciled through a strategy plan transparent to all key stakeholders. The joint Oxfams’ Malawi programme (D15) provides examples of phase-out strategies such as capacity building for partners and support for network independence.

5.2 Good assessment and analysis tools

A clear understanding and accurate analysis of the situation is essential for informed decision-making whether in humanitarian work, long-term development programmes, or advocacy. The analysis has to be well-grounded, and data has to be triangulated and disaggregated. Relevant criteria for targeting are essential, to avoid inequitable outcomes.

- In the Bangladesh flood response (H10), when selection criteria were developed centrally they were less relevant and staff less committed to using them than they might have been had they included local views.
- In the Chad response to the Darfur emergency (H3), it was felt that a good and confident analysis of the situation should have been a higher priority for managers, and would have helped with the decision whether to become operational.
- In the Southern Africa public health response in 2002/03, weak initial assessments and inefficient use of resources created delay (H7).
- In the Cambodia community development project (D3), a lack of capacity in assessment skills appears to have affected the partner’s ability to implement programmes.
- In the Bangladesh flood response (H10), knowledge about village coping mechanisms could have contributed to better needs assessment and challenged assumptions about household food security.

5.3 Regional support approaches

Regional support has already been mentioned as an important factor in quality programming. Regional and external advisers can play a critical role in giving support on scaling-up and budgeting, international fundraising, and relationships with donors. Other less tangible areas of programming, such as working on gender or protection issues, or human rights frameworks, may also be supported at a regional level where advisers can help to bring priorities into line and skills up to speed.

However, the contributions of consultants have not always been as effective as they could be in supporting programmes (e.g. D8, Peru Human Rights Programme), and support from Oxfam advisers may not be well used. In Afghanistan (H8) the regional advisers’ role was not always well understood and staff were not supported internally to work through future plans and links across programmes. Regional-level joint planning between country programmes can help local ownership and institutional memory.

6. Learning approaches

Throughout the reports, a ‘learning approach’ was seen as a key factor for effective programming. There were a number of cases where the absence of such thinking was noted, leading to weaker outcomes. However, there are also clear examples of integrated practice and cases of concerted learning initiatives, that all demonstrate commitment to improving practice.

One of the critical issues, particularly in a number of the humanitarian and development programmes, was the frequent lack of systematic data collection and coherent monitoring systems. Although there are good examples of coherent monitoring and review systems, it is clear that monitoring and evaluation systems are often not set up consistently, and learning approaches not always understood or promoted. This makes it hard to assess impact and outcomes of the programmes. The Oxfam International Strategic Evaluation also stated that there is no coherent system within Oxfam International to collect qualitative and quantitative programme/financial information for learning and accountability, so it is clearly a wider problem.

The UK Poverty Programme review (D10) concluded that not only is it difficult to assess impact because of poor assessment mechanisms (either in Oxfam or in partner organisations), but also because of the nature of change being measured (changes in ideas and beliefs), and because programmes are implemented through intermediaries. However, in the Summary of Lessons from Large Scale Disasters (S7), it was suggested that the ‘current process of strategic planning, the development of a coherent influencing strategy’ could be paving the way in Oxfam for improvements in these processes. This, along with increased management attention given to issues of quality, transparency, and accountability since many of the reviews in the current study were undertaken, could already be resulting in more time and energy being spent on monitoring, evaluation, and learning processes that is not obvious in these reports.

6.1 Weaknesses in systems

Effective monitoring, documentation, and reporting systems are needed to ensure that learning is possible (H3). Weaknesses can be due to a lack of strategy, management oversight, inadequate staff training or lack of promotion of a ‘learning culture’ (H6, H15, H3, D3, D5, etc). Examples of some of the problem areas in monitoring systems were:

Indicators

- In the West Bank Water, Sanitation and Hygiene response (H6), badly managed baselines resulted in community expectations being raised inappropriately
- In the same programme (H6), the original ECHO logframe was over-ambitious in terms of indicators, showing how important it is to ‘own’ indicators, and to ensure they are measurable
- In the Bangladesh flood response (H10), the proposal indicators required information that was not easy to collect (e.g. reduction of mortality and maintenance of nutritional status)
- There were few indicators for process changes mentioned in the documents reviewed, although the reviews of the Southern Africa Public Health response (H7) and the UK Poverty Programme (D10) did mention the need for developing indicators for participation

Analysis and assessment

- In the Kitgum, Uganda, humanitarian programme review (H14), little evidence was found of a coherent system in which the data collected from different sources was analysed, triangulated and used systematically to review and plan programme activities
- In the review of the public health response in Liberia (H11), the lack of good quality analysis and baselines was felt to result in donor concerns about inaccurate targeting, as well as disregard for a rights-based approach
- In the Hazarajat Integrated Rural Development programme in Afghanistan (H8), the lack of a conceptual framework made it difficult to develop appropriate indicators for assessing impact
- Mapping of needs is not always done well, and staff often lack skills and tools in this area (e.g. the Bangladesh Flood Response, H10)
- In the Mauritania drought response (H12), poor assessment meant a lack of information for planning purposes, resulting in confusion over proposals for funding

Documentation and reporting

- In the review of the Liberia public health programme (H11), it was said that there were no written records on water quality except from UNICEF
- In the early Chad response to the Darfur emergency (H3), lack of documentation meant that when staff left there was no continuity of monitoring

- Reports were frequently said to be a narrative of tasks or activities, with little thought given to analysis of impact or consequence (H12, H11, H3, H1, D5)

6.2 Effective approaches

Among the programme reports reviewed, there were a number of good examples of consistent investment in solid systems of monitoring, evaluation, and learning, and setting up of national/regional support functions in particular. Improvements in the quality of programming appeared where the monitoring processes were integrated within a strategic approach to planning, policy development, strong planning systems, and staff training (e.g. D10, D13, C2, C12 and also shown in the Oxfam International evaluation of the Make Trade Fair Campaign). Across humanitarian, development, and campaigning programmes, there was a common call for stronger assessment and analysis tools, support for increased staff skills (in particular at a local level), the setting and sharing of goals and expectations, and a focus on learning.

Good examples of coherent monitoring and evaluation systems demonstrated:

- indicators appropriate to goals and objectives as well as activities
- staff understanding and owning the systems
- good assessments and baselines
- consistent documentation systems
- good handover notes
- staff trained well in monitoring and evaluation approaches and tools
- guidelines developed and provided both for internal and external evaluation processes
- management encouraging learning attitudes and learning opportunities

Learning can provide opportunities for increasing impact. The Philippines Advocacy workshop report (part of the Oxfam country team's Programme Quality Initiative (C12)) pointed out that without analysis and reflection, advocacy work can focus too much on policy and legislative change and not enough on the changes needed in practice to bring benefits for people living in poverty. Therefore programmes have to be clear about the change model being used.

- The workshop reports from the advocacy Programme Quality Initiative in the Philippines (C12) and the Institutional Accountability programmes in the MEEECIS Region (C2) illustrate how programmes can start to strengthen institutional learning systems.
- In the HECA Regional Pastoralist Programme (D5), a monitoring, evaluation, and learning system has been piloted, and discussed within the region. The programme has also used a consultant to draw up a learning and communications strategy.

7. Principles of empowerment and equity

As a rights-based organisation, two of Oxfam's key principles are empowerment and equity. Oxfam seeks to build local capacity for people experiencing poverty to be empowered to claim rights for themselves, and to help to create opportunities for all people to exercise voice and ownership. This is also linked inherently to the commitment Oxfam has to being accountable.

Gender equality is also a key pillar of a rights-based approach, and issues of gender and diversity are the focus of one of Oxfam's Strategic Aims (Aim 5). Yet it is still a challenge to mainstream these intangible issues unless they are specifically identified and resourced, and ensure equitable outcomes for all. The Gender Review (2002) highlighted the need to integrate gender issues more widely and at every stage, and that still stands. The Programme Impact Report (2005) also highlighted the need for increased attention to be given to solving this problem – 'we are making progress yet wider gender changes are not being achieved...we need to consider who is being excluded'. The recent Oxfam International Evaluation states even more bluntly that 'mainstreaming gender equality has failed'.

7.1 Gender equality

The evaluations studied did not equally assess gender issues. However, generally it appeared that gender mainstreaming in the programmes reviewed does not ensure that gender equality (the goal to which Oxfam aspires) receives adequate attention unless explicitly outlined as an objective. Many reviews supported the well-known finding that work on gender could still be extended into more structural areas, such as gender-based power relations (H10), and many programmes did not use gender-analysis tools. Most of the programmes reviewed had targeted activities focusing on women's needs, but it is important that these activities are carried out within gender 'transformatory' frameworks, and are supported by empowerment and accountability initiatives. In humanitarian work, women have certainly been seen to benefit from increased access to food and water and training, and in development programmes women were involved in committees (sometimes the only space for women's views). However, there appear to be problems implementing a wider gender equality (rights) approach in many programmes. Some of the challenges associated with this appear to be:

- the ongoing struggle to ensure work is planned through a rights-based approach and focuses on achieving strategic rather than only practical change
- the implementation of gender-mainstreaming strategies
- integration with other aspects of inequality and discrimination.

A number of reviews felt there is not enough work on women's leadership to create change, as for example in the Southern Africa Public Health review (H7). This may be because of poor targeting (D4), but is more likely to be due to a lack of long-term planning and support and scarce management prioritisation for equality issues.

The Bangladesh review of the flood response also found that standard 'packages' and approaches could disadvantage women in certain cultures or contexts. Sometimes work was found to focus more on immediate responses to problems, rather than focusing on empowerment (as concluded for example in the 2003 evaluation of the Sri Lanka 'Ending Violence against Women' programme (D9)).

Progress towards women's empowerment is more evident where programmes have incorporated a specific focus on gender and rights issues, or where this is the primary objective. Where programmes have been more long-term, progress has also been more obvious, such as in Bangladesh, where the review of the flood response programme found that women were prominent in areas of community participation and decision-making. In the education sector, work has gone beyond issues of girls' enrolment and access to promote a broader equity approach (S4). Programmes which have introduced gender sensitisation training, disaggregation of data, and gender analysis (Yemen D12, Sri Lanka D9, UKPP D10, Sierra Leone D11) also show evidence of gender equality being understood better – in the UK one partner said that the work was 'transformational and inspirational... the women involved... will never be the same again'. Solid gender-based analysis and a focus on changing wider social attitudes and awareness are important elements of the stronger programmes.

In a number of cases, such as the Ending Violence against Women programme in Sri Lanka (D9), despite gender work with communities, it has been hard to sensitise the wider public unless men are involved in the gender programme, showing the importance of a broad-based understanding of gender issues. When programmes focus mainly on women's issues and not gender issues, it is also hard to encourage men's direct involvement (either as staff (H9 and D9) or as beneficiaries (H9, H15)).

- The UK Poverty Programme work (D10) was seen to have 'some excellent and groundbreaking gender work', but still faces a challenge in influencing attitudes within government. The review felt that it is important to pick your battles if work is particularly politically sensitive – i.e. the risk of a backlash needs to be assessed.
- The team involved in the Good Governance programme in Peru (C17) knows there will be ongoing problems with their advocacy work, if it does not always start with consideration of gender practice within partner organisations.

Gender mainstreaming

It is clear that the commitment of management to including gender as a priority is key to facilitating staff understanding and ownership. Creating a gender-adviser role is a strategy that can be effective in providing a useful focal point. However (as in the East Chad Gender Review, (H16)), it was found that sustainability depends more on local staff and partner capacity and interest, so advisory support may be best done on a contract basis. On the other hand, however, (also as was found in the Chad review, (H16)) an adviser needs to be placed at a strategic-enough level, focused attention has to be sustained for long enough to address deeply entrenched attitudes and issues, and gender mainstreaming has to be sufficiently prioritised by management.

A lack of gender-sensitive planning means that it is not possible to assess clearly the impact of a programme, or the role Oxfam plays in achieving this. For example, gender was rarely mentioned in programme objectives and logframes. In the Peru Human Rights programme (D8), for example, the programme had a stated commitment to integrating gender analysis and methods into all work, but neither Oxfam nor DFID logframes had gender-disaggregated indicators. Only two of the programme partners had gender indicators in their planning tools and it is not clear how much they saw change in gender equality as a prerequisite for social change. Where mainstreaming has been implemented more clearly, such as the Malawi integrated rural development programme (D15), the review felt there was still room for more in-depth analysis, concrete strategies, and action plans, and reflection on what rights-based gender analysis entailed.

- Only one of the partner NGOs in the Philippines Community-Based Coastal Resource Management Programme (D14), for example, has a gender plan or programme, and most activities only went as far as sensitisation – despite the responsibilities women have for managing resources in this situation.
- In the evaluation of the Mauritania drought response (H12) it was noted that planning and assessment formats need to be better gendered, gender analysis used within existing planning, and the team needs greater ownership of gender priorities, including in human resources/induction processes. Documentation and sharing of good practice was also weak.

Another means of strengthening programmes may be through building up greater understanding of the issues, for example through research on assumptions about gender relations. Understanding more on the myth of ‘community and trickledown benefits for women’, and how women are affected by disaster would have helped target programming more effectively in the Cambodia drought responses (H17). The links between gender and context – in particular the complexity of gender within livelihoods strategies (in both rural and urban settings) – could also be better understood. For example, in East Timor, women’s involvement in agriculture programmes has traditionally been marginalised, despite their key role in farming systems (D2). A number of programmes (including the UK Poverty Programme) also felt that a greater focus on livelihoods issues would open up opportunities for work on important dimensions of gender equality and social inclusion.

7.2 Other areas of inequality and discrimination

Only a small number of evaluations addressed issues of HIV or other areas of discrimination. This is perhaps because of the timing of the evaluations, but even now some regions are still not focusing on HIV, for example. In the reports reviewed it is reinforced that HIV is an extremely important issue that Oxfam needs to take seriously – across programmes and at all levels, not only in HIV-focused projects. One of the issues raised was that the links between HIV and vulnerability, especially as they relate to women and children, need to be further analysed and understood – and linked to appropriate interventions. It is important to do this early in the programme so that it is part of management commitment and systems (H7, Southern Africa public health response).

The HECA pastoralist work (D5) also saw little progress on mainstreaming other issues such as disability. (It was also interesting that there was little programming let alone analysis done on issues of age inequality, such as those for children or youth). In both the UK and the South it is considered important that the race/ethnicity/poverty interface is mainstreamed into all other work – rather than worked on discretely. The reports focusing on these areas clearly indicate a strong need to continue to

support mainstreaming tools and approaches for programming as well as focused and targeted projects (a two-pronged approach). This means an operational budget, partner support, monitoring systems, reconsideration of strategic approaches, and decisions about long-term support versus exit (H9).

7.3 Participation and voice

Participation is a priority of Oxfam's work, and key to ensuring accountability to those living in poverty. However, it is not evident from the reviews that poor and marginalised people are always involved sufficiently in issues that affect them, through strategic decision-making, ensuring sustainability, community representation, and wider issues of voice. This is therefore still an area that could receive attention across all approaches: humanitarian, development and campaigning.

The way that participation is engaged depends on the type of programming and the role that Oxfam plays. For example, key factors for participation in rapid response may be consideration of consultation and choice. In development programmes it can be critical to consider capacity, competencies and commitment of staff and partners to use participatory processes. A range of influencing strategies were employed by programmes and campaigns to encourage communities and beneficiaries to participate in development processes, such as promotion of popular mobilisation and mass movement activities. There was also a range of initiatives working to change the environment that people are located in, such as promotion of institutional accountability and involvement within democratic processes like participation in elections. Good examples of these can be seen in the MEEECIS Institutional Accountability work (C2), or the NGO Forum in Cambodia that were both focusing on building up democratic practice. The *We Can* campaign and the Women in Leadership project in Sierra Leone (D11) also work to promote women's involvement as change agents (C3). These programmes show the importance of allowing space for people's voices.

Appropriate ways of working

In many of the humanitarian programmes, the pressure of time in the early stage of response was seen to be a factor limiting local people's strategic participation. In addition, the need for results and the choice to operationalise sometimes meant effective participation was reduced to brief consultation. There are of course different issues depending on the situation, for example if people have been displaced and are in camps (e.g. Darfur/Chad H3) as compared to where people are still in their communities (e.g. flood and drought evaluations).

Working with local partners, engaging local staff, and working through community institutions and directly with beneficiary communities were all seen to help increase local grassroots participation. In most cases, the key to successful participation was seen to be the length of time and the degree of engagement with community committees and bodies by Oxfam staff or partners. It was recognised (H8) that trust and local knowledge are essential. Trust needs to be formed through dialogue over a period of time and then evidenced through practice.

- Listening to Angolan communities about their desire for choices led to cash rather than food for work, and a more effective approach (H15).
- Being prepared to work in local dialects and languages also helped (e.g. translation of documents and provision of legal literacy in Afghanistan (H9)), as did ensuring staff understand the local culture (H15).
- Promoting community preparedness mechanisms can assist communities to become more confident in their own abilities, and also help increase women's participation levels (Bangladesh H10 and Liberia H11).

Ensuring sustainability

Many of the reviews felt that participation of target groups in key decisions from the start (choices about water pumps and maintenance, for example) added to sustainability of impact. Participation can also reduce dependency and enhance future rehabilitation efforts through supporting community confidence and skills building (Angola H15, Afghanistan H9, Mauritania H12). Encouraging community-based participation is essential in remote contexts, where external assistance will probably

not be continuous. What was felt to be most important was allowing the reality of people's lives to be at the centre, and having a respect for diversity and local ownership.

Factors held to be important in building community confidence and participation within a longer-term development perspective were:

- Long-term support to village leaders and strengthening community institutions where possible
- Capacity building and helping set up simple systems and regulations
- Development of a phase-out process (with the community leaders or partner)
- Involvement of both women and men and gender-based strategies

A solid approach to participation requires not only systematic assessment tools, but also time for reflection and feedback to communities, and effective local documentation about improving practice (D6, D1). Community sensitisation and equitable targeting can kick start this process, but ensuring local committees are fully representative and have a strategic direction will involve a long-term strategy and investment in local support processes operationally or with partners. Where communities are motivated and see activities as relevant to their future, they will often exercise greater ownership and enhance activities. Staff involved in the health-fund work in Georgia for example felt that strengthening the sense of solidarity within the community, as well as among health providers, would ensure sustainability (D5). Up-front prioritisation of participation by management is important to ensure that programme implementation as well as policy supports long-term goals of capacity development and empowerment.

- During the Mauritania drought response (H12), communities felt that the support provided by NGOs to local committees gave them a voice for making choices about inputs, which was a starting point for empowerment.
- In the evaluation of the Sierra Leone Women in Leadership project (D11) it was felt that working on collective rather than individual aims and avoiding hierarchical structures would support people most effectively in the long run.

A factor felt to be restricting community participation was lack of local staff capacity and ownership of the development process. When local staff were not involved in planning and co-ordination, and were unfamiliar with or weak in participatory approaches, local participation was seen to be adversely affected (H15). This factor is often exacerbated by weak management support. A sustainable approach to participation will therefore entail capacity building of staff as well as partners and appropriate strategies to devolve ownership of programme processes as much as possible (H15).

When an organisation (or partner) does not delegate effectively, has centralised decision-making and weak accountability systems, a risk is that communities see themselves as just beneficiaries rather than empowered to change their situation (Cambodia, D3).

Local institutions and capacity

The Community-Based Coastal Resource Management programme in the Philippines (D14) illustrates clearly how community organising requires both process and method – involving not only formation but also consolidation of local organisations to achieve autonomy and self-reliance. This requires a structured and very clear definition of models of change and involvement by Oxfam and partners. The Philippines programme also identified the need for both horizontal and vertical linkages as appropriate depending on the strengths of different stakeholders. Analytical work should therefore be grounded in a good understanding of community beliefs, values, and needs, as well as stakeholder and power analyses of local relations and vulnerabilities.

Critical factors for strengthening community organisation, as identified by the Community-Based Coastal Resource Management programme, were:

- appropriate sectoral approaches to organising
- situational analysis

- innovative organising strategies
- systematic awareness-building processes for local communities
- support of co-operatives
- appropriate technical and organisational training
- local level planning

8. Working in partnership and alliance

Oxfam GB is committed to the Oxfam International principle that whenever possible, humanitarian, development and advocacy work should be carried out with and through partners. Oxfam's Fundamental Review of its Strategic Intent (1998) concluded that Oxfam should 'empower staff to seek new partnerships – across public, private, and voluntary sectors – in line with its values, wherever these will improve effectiveness.' In the documents reviewed, a range of different types of funding and non-funding relationships were indeed represented:

- Community groups and institutions, often where Oxfam is directly involved in implementation (e.g. Ethiopia, Angola)
- NGO partners, that receive funding to implement programmes, including campaigns (e.g. Peru)
- Networks and alliances, that receive funding to support their activities and programmes (e.g. Cambodia)
- NGOs (local and international) that work in alliance with Oxfam towards an agreed set of objectives (e.g. in the Make Trade Fair campaign). This includes other Oxfam International affiliates
- Government agencies in countries where Oxfam works: as implementing partners (e.g. in Ethiopia, Georgia) or within co-ordination structures for humanitarian response (e.g. Bangladesh)
- Donor-government agencies, sometimes in collaboration in the implementation of a programme (e.g. DFID in Peru)
- A range of professional, private, and public sector groups, in funding and non-funding relationships working towards shared objectives (e.g. journalists, unions, businesses)

Working through partnership and in alliance is a specific strategy for increasing influence and impact in all areas – humanitarian, development, popular campaigning, lobbying and advocacy. Coalitions can pool resources and share risks and costs. Alliances can help create an environment that 'levels the balance of power, that resources and positions the public to demand transparency and dialogue...and provides greater opportunities to participate in such processes' (C11b). Focusing on partners has the potential to link humanitarian with development work and support advocacy work by building local ownership and capacity to demand change. Collaboration with others can also add value to Oxfam's contribution towards less tangible goals such as conflict reduction and peace building (Conflict Reduction Review S3). As the Education Strategic Evaluation states (S4), work with partners and national coalitions is both a means to increase impact and also valuable in terms of civil-society involvement and democratic processes. The way that Oxfam works offers opportunity to 'walk the talk' of participation and equality – and to demonstrate its commitment to empowerment and accountability at all levels.

Some of the reviews of programmes that are working in alliance (C1, 10, 16) summarised a number of key lessons for developing good partnerships and relationships in general. These were:

- Factoring in time to understand each other
- Being realistic about expectations, goals, and objectives
- Clarifying ground rules and processes in a document (including budgets and exit strategies)
- Discussing ways of dealing with conflict
- Using a flexible management model and leadership style that suits the partnership type
- Not relying on a small number of individuals
- Being honest about levels of resources, commitment, and capacity
- Communicating clearly and being willing to trust

The next sections look in more detail at working with partners, supporting networks, working in alliance, and other kinds of relationship.

8.1 Working with partners

Some of the specific lessons about working in partnership were: clarity about goals and desired changes; clarity about the relationship; and being strategic and realistic about capacity.

Goals and desired changes

In each programme Oxfam needs to specify what type of partnerships are being formed and the overall desired change that is sought. This requires thorough assessment and analysis, a strategy up-front, and identification of how the relationships may impact on partners and other programmes. Risk analysis is also important, as partnerships may entail greater risks for some partners than others (e.g. local NGOs involved in lobbying and advocacy or in emergency situations may be at risk). An explicit strategy for phase-out or exit is also important, so that sustainability is considered (H8). The development of exit strategies needs to be both administrative and programmatic, to outline choices for all partners, and to ensure management is proactive in handing over programmes (H8).

The UK Poverty Programme (D10) works with a wide range of partners operating at different levels (from community level to influencing nationally), and the common factor here is developing a shared political analysis and values. The team realised that there was still room to broaden the range of advocacy partners they work with and to set up more links with government and partners outside the development sector (e.g. trades unions) to effect greater change. Overall, their plan is to work towards a 'relationship of trust and support', discuss what is required of each partner, clarify roles and responsibilities, and be transparent about what benefits and costs are involved.

Clarity about the relationship

For humanitarian work, a contingency planning process can help identify potential needs and relationships. In long-term programmes and campaigns, strategy plans for both Oxfam and the partner are essential. Outlining the type and form of partnerships and ways of working that will be used is of course important for all types of programmes. It is particularly critical when there is not much time to make decisions and solve conflict. For example, in the Sierra Leone Women in Leadership project (D11), the NGO that was training women as local government candidates had relatively weak capacity in some aspects of project management, and there was little time to undertake the training before the elections. The evaluation concluded that Oxfam could have recognised that the tight timeframe would mean that even more time than that invested was needed for partnership development.

When there are contractual relationships, discussion about values and vision, and clarity about procedures, is critical. It is important to share this understanding across the respective organisations and divisions. In the Human Rights Programme in Peru (D8), for example, some confusion emerged about funding and spending patterns between Oxfam and its partner and donor (DFID), as a result of the two agencies' different financial years, and differences in vision for the programme. Although here there was an underlying mutual commitment to partnership and learning principles, differences in organisational cultures and procedures made this challenging to implement in practice.

It is important to have clearly defined relationships between Oxfam affiliates, because, despite shared principles, ways of working are often very different. Partners' views about Oxfam's role are also key, but are not always heard. During the response to the floods in Bangladesh (H10), although partners were appreciative of Oxfam's support, some felt their voice was not heard much during the response.

Being strategic and realistic about capacity

It is important to be realistic as well as strategic about partner capacity. In Mauritania (H12), for example, several current partners did not have experience in drought response work and could not take on the challenge of taking part in the response in 2002/03. However, this then provided the opportunity to strengthen and mentor these organisations for the future. There may be a range of partners with differing abilities and experience (e.g. in Sri Lanka (D9)). Capacity assessment skills are

therefore important both for staff and partners alike. Ideally, a structured needs assessment should lead towards consolidation of skills locally, and include a strategy for future expansion of skills. This should be set out in a Memorandum of Understanding of some kind. Preparedness planning, risk analysis, and partnership planning enables these assessments of capacity to be made more strategically and in advance of a humanitarian crisis.

Consideration of partner strengths is important – sometimes partners have more experience and knowledge in the area than Oxfam does. Such consideration may allow a more strategic choice of partners and more rapid outcomes. For example, in the Mauritania drought response (H12), the partners' knowledge enabled activities to be adjusted after design to meet beneficiary needs better and at the right time. Their ongoing livelihood support projects (small and micro-enterprise loans) also provided the most effective drought relief in many cases. It is worth considering where local NGOs and bodies may have new insights and knowledge to bring to the table (as in Sierra Leone (D11) where local women's NGOs had strong links with grassroots mobilisation). Risk analysis was important, followed by resourcing capacity building where necessary.

The networks involved in the Community-Based Coastal Resource Management programme in the Philippines (D14) are well established, yet the programme had to decide how to get more sustainable cross-programme learning and management mechanisms. They outlined a possible multi-stakeholder process to frame the partnerships, identify needs, and plan appropriately for capacity building with different partners.

In feedback from regions on Trade Campaigning (C15), a great disparity in the understanding and capacity of civil society players to contribute to regional or global campaigns was noted. The Africa workshop on campaigning (C11b) found that sometimes relationships with other networks can even be threatened by the success of an externally funded coalition – which must be watched for.

8.2 Supporting networks and coalitions

An important key to the sustainability of local civil society organisations and a strategic approach to change is ensuring strong and independent networks. Oxfam's work is well placed for supporting networks and broader coalitions when it is committed to partnership from the grassroots up to policy level, and willing to prioritise staff time and funding at a range of levels (D10).

Building networks can be a complex and challenging task, as a weak network may need support to build capacity to meet its objectives, interact with other stakeholders or create a public profile, and overall, have clarity about its goals (e.g. D7, 12). Ensuring the sustainability of an effective network therefore entails more than capacity of individual members – it also requires the establishment of processes for financial sustainability, and a formalised management structure of an appropriate sort, with strategic planning capability. The capacity and role of a network therefore needs to be clarified in the same way as that of a single partner. Where the network seeks to have an influencing role and is not strong enough for advocacy, it may be necessary to engage a range of parallel strategies – capacity building where network partners are weaker, recognising other allies, engaging wider advocacy objectives, and encouraging broader linkages with other external organisations. The challenge is to provide support in a range of areas as well as encouraging independence.

The NGO Forum in Cambodia (D13) has a pragmatic approach to capacity building and network strengthening through creating different 'levels' of membership and enabling 'like' members to work together on sectoral or programming approaches. It has been able to extend its influencing on government and policy through shifting its focus from technical and organisational partner capacity building to local networks. It has 'localised' (becoming a Cambodian owned organisation) and formalised its management structure to manage better the wide range of stakeholders (it has 72 member organisations, 12 sectoral member groups, and 24 donors). Some critics feel it is overextended, but the Forum still has overwhelming approval and credibility internally and externally.

A number of the reports felt that networks need to be encouraged to be adaptable, so that they can provide innovative, creative alternatives to members' current approaches. If effective, networking can

provide weaker members with a valuable space for dialogue and learning (Sri Lanka D9, Philippines D14), and stronger members with vision and challenge (D13, D10). Ways that programmes have been able to support networks are by: creating links with academic research institutions; encouraging regular internal and external dialogue and consultation to enrich knowledge and skills; and facilitating ongoing sharing around learning. It is important also to recognise that needs will change and approaches need to be flexible.

- The UK Poverty Programme(D10), for example, has played an important role in building networks by introducing new and diverse models and approaches, bringing together actors, making informal links, and decentralising alliance-building to a regional level.
- The Community-Based Coastal Resource Management programme in the Philippines (D14) also aims to provide opportunities for partners to share and exchange experiences, creating a feeling of togetherness, leading towards more organised praxis.

8.3 Working in alliance

Working in alliance is complex as the relationships between parties are often less clearly outlined or agreed than for development programmes, and understanding of the ways of working and relationship may not be explicit. The expectation may be of equality, but issues of power and capacity are critical. Managing diverse expectations and degrees of ownership is often a challenge (C13). As there may also be greater risks for local partners and allies involved in policy work and campaigning, expectations of their role in particular need to be clear. There also needs to be a long-term commitment, flexible ways of working, and a strategy for selection of allies.

Understanding expectations and the model of management

In some arenas Oxfam is perceived to have a hierarchical, competitive, complex way of working – this may mean it is faster to act in some cases, but it jeopardises relationships in others. The Oxfam International Evaluation mentions Oxfam’s ability to ignore the roles, contributions, and views of others, its predominately ‘Euro and Anglo-centric’ character, and a lack of concrete implementation of mechanisms to enhance strategic collaboration, even within Oxfam affiliates. An understanding of the implicit ways of working of each partner is absolutely critical to prevent this, and this can only be done through developing an environment of trust and openness.

At the same time, Oxfam is also recognised in many places for its commitment to co-ordination mechanisms in working with other agencies, between Oxfam affiliates, and with partners and allies (H11,12, D14,15). This can be achieved in different ways (e.g. through supporting or attending forums and co-ordination meetings), but it is important to ensure that the time is well spent. It was found that forums can involve little more than exchange of information instead of sharing strategy, directions, and learning (D9).

Long-term commitment

Changes wrought by alliances at policy and practice level (government and civil society) take time (D6, D8, D13), and achieving the impact of advocacy work and policy change requires vision and continued investment (C17). The UK Poverty Programme (D10) has been running for ten years already, but there is still a way to go to achieve concrete outcomes and shifts in ideas at political levels – i.e. ‘to win the war, not only the battle’. The partner working with Oxfam on trade campaigning in Zambia felt that for good advocacy, one-off initiatives don’t help in the long run (C7) as they need to be linked both into a broader strategy or to global campaigns to have greatest impact. The Education Strategic Evaluation (S4) shows how a longer-term approach, working with government sector-wide approaches (as in the coalitions supported by the Commonwealth Education Fund), will support NGO work on accountability and policy change.

Flexible ways of working

A national or local campaign alliance may have links with other networks and partners that maintain different views and positions. This can provide opportunity to explore differences, such as the ongoing dialogues between Oxfam and Focus on the Global South, and in Hong Kong in 2005 where a daily East Asia Regional caucus was arranged for sharing experiences with groups working on different

issues (C14). Sometimes potential allies do not want to collaborate on an issue because of differences of views, as reported from the Philippines in relation to Make Trade Fair campaigning, when some NGOs disagreed with Oxfam's stance on the WTO (C14). In the long run, Oxfam in the Philippines chose to work tactically, get issue-based consensus, and work on linked campaign issues (C14).

Strategy for selection

Work on justice and human rights in Peru (C19) has shown that it is crucial to develop a good alliance structure and strategy up-front. This may mean choosing groups that have appropriate technical capacity (participatory and decentralised), and ability for mobilisation and political action. It was found that broad-based alliances (NGOs, civil society, and some public institutions) can be extremely powerful in addressing the state and increasing success because of the public recognition and reputation of a few members (as in the Truth, Justice and Redress programme in Peru, C19). At the same time, (D10, D11) it is important to ensure that there is enough input from grassroots experience to provide evidence and support for national-level policy.

8.4 Other relationships – government

Either working with or lobbying government can be challenging. At local level in particular, government may be partners in terms of being 'counterparts' (such as at local project level in Cambodia) and in humanitarian work, but at other levels they may be allies, or targets of an advocacy campaign. In other cases they are contractual donors and partners (e.g. DFID in Peru). Work in the MEEECIS region has demonstrated how necessary it is to understand the relationship and expectations, because in most cases government is the 'gatekeeper' to the political and economic environment and controls the legal framework (C2). Programmes have to make a clear choice about the focus of the relationship and strategic direction.

There may be tensions between government counterparts and communities and Oxfam. For example, in the East Hararghe programme, Ethiopia (D4), relationships were strained over financial control issues, when the local government departments felt that Oxfam held the purse strings, while they were seen as only responsible for implementation. Contrary to this, at provincial level in Chad (H3), Oxfam was seen as 'just' an 'implementer' at the early stage of the humanitarian response to the Darfur crisis, and there were few agreements established for example on approaches to monitoring and community selection. Sometimes in the short term, staff may feel that developing these relationships is time consuming, but the risk lies in being seen as a tourist, or hiding behind the experience and face of others and losing opportunity for constructive dialogue, as in Chad (H3).

- In Cambodia (D3), the NGO Forum chose to work with and alongside government where they could, neither confrontationally nor too collaboratively, but strategically through an advocacy approach calling for reforms from both donors and government.
- The MEEECIS MDG campaigns team in Georgia (C8) has consciously taken a balanced approach between challenging and co-operating with government and opposition parties, trying to show no political bias. In the campaign in Azerbaijan, tactics were selected according to the political context (C8).
- In Bangladesh (H10), good working relationships with government at local and national level has ensured that during emergencies there was effective co-ordination and communication (of course, in this case it was easier as there was a positive commitment from the government to dialogue).

Being clear about expectations

The nature of the relationship that it is possible to establish will of course vary depending on both the political and NGO context in each country. Constructive relationships can be built with government 'if NGOs are willing to work together and they continuously track policy developments, cultivate effective and strategic contacts, engage government at all levels, have an advocacy plan, actively promote practical proposals in relation to civil society participation and maintain regular meetings and networks within the country and regionally/ internationally with both government and development agencies' (Education Strategic Evaluation S4).

Finding allies

There are also sometimes allies within government, which can play to Oxfam's advantage. In Africa, staff can see that 'creative leaders are starting to recognise the value that comes from engaging broadly and seeking wide participation of all stakeholders' (C11c). To influence policy change, it has been found that it helps to have a specific sector of government favouring those ideas (e.g. a women's ministry or working with individual sympathisers as in Azerbaijan (C8)). However, this can be risky and backfire if the 'partner' is weak or the political context is not well understood.

8.5 Other relationships – the private sector

There was little discussion in the reviewed reports about work with the private sector, although this is becoming higher profile for Oxfam. Depending on context, the private sector can be an important stakeholder, and Oxfam can establish different forms of collaboration, such as:

- In the Georgia MDG campaigning work (C8), Oxfam had a commercial company as an advocacy partner
- In the trade campaigning in the Philippines (C14), industry leaders facilitated access for Oxfam and its partners to government policy makers, which was not available at the beginning of the campaign
- In the Commonwealth Education Fund work, it is felt important to consider how the private sector could support public investment in education (Education Strategic Evaluation S4)

9. Management systems and support

Many reports included recommendations for how management could help to improve systems and provide support in order to enhance the quality of programming. 'Quality is more likely to be improved if managers can provide higher quality support and guidance and if better systems are developed for such support' (Conflict Reduction Review, S3). In the Southern Africa public health response (H7), staff felt that lack of appropriate and effective responses could often be attributed to weak management, and this could lead to de-motivation and missed opportunities. There were many reasons given – to do with local or regional management and leadership, weak integration of programmes, a lack of strategy, or too great a focus on day to day issues. The points gathered below are overall lessons and recommendations from the specific readings, but may be useful for managers to consider.

Specific lessons that could be critical in achieving high-impact and quality programming were in two main areas:

- **Overall management systems and approaches:** clarity in overall aims, goals, and delivery systems, so that there is good communication, continuity, and consistency (framework, guidance, and standards); addressing accountability and transparency; measuring cost-effectiveness
- **People management tools:** team building; consistent human resources systems; local support; work with partners and allies

9.1 Organisational goals, approaches, and principles

Management systems need to support organisational goals efficiently and effectively. This is made more complex with rights-based, qualitative, and often ambitious goals. As the Oxfam International evaluation states, 'Oxfam's models of change are visible but need to be articulated more clearly and be practical and consistent in day to day programme development, planning, and management'. Some of the key issues raised are outlined below.

Communication, continuity, and consistency

Clear communication lines that are understood and implemented were considered an important feature in management support. Empowering local managers to have a more strategic viewpoint, providing a focal person to draw attention to issues, or holding managers more accountable can help here. The review of the Afghanistan Hazarajat programme for example (H8), noted that there had been

insufficient sustained and consistent management overview of the programme, and little accountability demanded of technical staff or those charged with implementing recommendations for strengthening the programme.

When staff do not own or understand the programme fully, there may be a perceived ‘bureaucracy of paperwork’ required by headquarters from the field. In the Peru human rights programme (D8), having a manager with little Oxfam experience, as well as a whole new team, made it difficult to establish processes and understanding with DFID, slowed down relationships with possible partners, and caused an underspend. Developing solid management systems requires investment and commitment, and willingness to make explicit the expectations and relationships between regional and country teams, and headquarters.

The Peru Human Rights programme review (D8) suggested that adopting a framework they developed called ‘Focus, Integration, Reflection, Simplicity, and Trust’ (FIRST) might be productive.

Frameworks, guidance, and standards

In a number of reports it was mentioned that Oxfam could still make better use of existing Oxfam guidelines and external frameworks and guidelines. For example, the review of the UK Poverty Programme felt it could strengthen the ‘relationship of trust and support’ it already has with partners, by using the standards developed in 2005 (‘Minimum Standards of Participation’) to test the nature of partnerships, involvement and roles, and provide transparency about benefits and costs. In the review of the Peru Human Rights programme, it was felt that encouraging donors to use rights-based standards would also strengthen Oxfam’s work (D8). In emergency work, the Emergency Response Manual is a good tool that could be used more consistently. Working to Sphere standards could receive greater consideration and promotion in humanitarian work, and also increase overall impact of partners’ and allies’ work.

Few rights-based development standards and international conventions (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), etc.) were mentioned in any of the reviews, and appeared to be missing in analysis within the programmes too. Mainstreaming of HIV issues is not prevalent across the sample of work reviewed; and only one review mentioned disability frameworks. Most programmes discuss concerns for women and may work on issues of sexual harassment and gender violence, but fully integrated gender programming is infrequent, poorly monitored, and usually reported on only when the evaluation is specifically focused on gender.

Accountability and risk management

Effective management systems are key to accountability to beneficiaries, partners, allies, donors and the public, and management of risk. Financial and legal accountability is critical to programme and agency reputation, and this must also flow on into projects and work with partners. For example, working in micro-finance with partners, as in Georgia (D6), meant having to have policies to deal with issues of fraud and bias, and transparency in budgeting. This can only be done through increasing and supporting local staff and partner capacity, setting up guidelines that are shared, and monitoring against external standards.

One of the gaps was felt to be in the establishment of good management information systems and the collection of monitoring and evaluation information to provide an evidence base. This can be critical for organisational reputation, particularly if standards are not seen to be met. In the reviews of the Southern Africa and Angola public health programmes (H8, 15), it was recommended that there is a need to communicate tools in a more participatory way, for example by translation into local languages.

9.2 A short note on cost-effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness is one of Oxfam GB’s seven areas for assessing programme performance. It involves an analysis of the relationship between the resources put in, and the outputs or outcomes achieved. Guidance notes ask staff to reflect on the following questions:

- Do the results of the programme/project warrant the resources invested in it?
- Within this programme/project, are there ways by which the same or greater results could have been achieved for a smaller investment?
- Could the resources invested have achieved more if used in a different way, i.e. rather than on this programme/project?
- Where it is possible to make comparisons, are there factors that have added to, or reduced, the costs of this programme/project compared to similar ones?

Oxfam International has agreed a broad classification of costs across affiliates, but it is recognised that there are problems in achieving consistent application of this. The Oxfam International Evaluation (S1) noted that at the level of joint working, such as Make Trade Fair campaigning, there is no systematic recording or reporting of direct and indirect costs across affiliates, and that until this happens Oxfam will not be able to judge the cost-effectiveness of all its work.

Cost-effectiveness is certainly not assessed to any great degree across the evaluations in this review. However, several interesting dimensions for assessing cost-effectiveness in different situations did emerge, and are outlined in the box below.

- The analysis of the Southern Africa public health review (H7) concluded that the Zambia programme, which was the most integrated and long-term, was the most effective – but also the most costly. In contrast, programmes in Zimbabwe and Malawi suffered from a lack of understanding of the term ‘integration’, and had more ‘ad hoc’ ways of working in terms of water/sanitation/health promotion. There were also fewer links between health and food security sectors.
- From the TEC ‘Initial Findings’ tsunami report (H18), the work of NGOs was seen as effective in that it met needs, but expensive because of issues of duplication and gaps in coverage. Findings from the Oxfam International Evaluation (S1) about the Humanitarian Consortium and Tsunami Fund Management Team are that such new mechanisms will enable greater co-ordination than previously, as well as providing a base for more effective programming – however, there is still some way to go.
- An assessment from the UK Poverty Programme (D10) found that value for money (or cost-effectiveness) was best when programmes were linked in some way, and funds could leverage grants for other small organisations. However, most investment was in ideas, relationship management, and leadership/catalyst activities, and over a long timespan. It was hard to measure future impact, but the team and partners felt that the benefits will be reaped over another decade of solid work.
- In the Afghanistan Hazarajat programme (H9), cash for work appears highly cost-effective as an intervention, as it provides livelihoods inputs without high implementation or operational costs (but does have to be managed well). However, it will only be appropriate in specific situations.
- In South America (C18), it was felt that the Oxfam International Trade campaign (in which Oxfam GB is one of four participating affiliates) has been, in general, cost-effective. The funds for the campaign are generated centrally, and campaign teams then use them strategically, according to opportunities. However, opportunity to create synergies is lost if affiliates do not co-ordinate.

9.3 Human resources

Ensuring and maintaining good staff competence and confidence is a key responsibility for managers, and an ongoing one. The key issues that arose in this area were:

- staff capacity building
- team work
- balancing staff skills
- sustained management support

Staff capacity building

In humanitarian work in particular, a lack of local capacity or weak knowledge of expatriate staff can be compensated for or supported by good recruitment procedures and staff support systems (H7). The scale-up for emergencies can mean staff are recruited too quickly, and may have insufficient skills. It may also affect security, as in Bangladesh, for example, when the system did not monitor risks taken by female staff.

Other solutions to the problem of staff supply in emergency situations may involve the despatch from other Oxfam teams in the region or elsewhere (as in the tsunami response, although reduced capacity in the areas seconding staff may then be a concern), or a roster/warden system for holiday periods (H7).

A number of strategies have been found effective in establishing local capacity:

- Having a clear technical leader to work with other sectors (e.g. public health)
- Developing local skills in core specialities
- Calling on pools of internal and external skills
- Reviewing partner skills
- Reviewing flexibility of human resource systems – recruitment etc.
- Having processes of systematic needs assessment followed by capacity building and training

Team work

A key factor for management is the way the team as well as individuals perform. This is tested particularly in situations with short timeframes where managers need to recognise the added challenges for staff when they are involved in alliances, and seek to build strong teams across agencies which have different mandates and ways of working. ‘Soft’ issues such as participatory practice, and the need for managers to have ‘people’ skills, are also important in holding a team together.

Opportunities for reflection and shared planning processes are essential for team work, both with partners and across programmes within Oxfam (Peru, D8). In the East Chad Gender review (H16), it was suggested that informal information-sharing mechanisms and qualitative tools (such as story-telling) and conflict resolution methods can help to create bonds within a team. Expectations of roles and responsibilities should be clear to staff through documentation and training which is available in local languages and adequately supported.

Balancing staff skills

A key management responsibility in any programme has to be to ensure the appropriate balance of staff and capacity to meet overall programme objectives and to engender sharing of ideas and experiences.

In many emergency programmes, the balance of local to international staffing and how they related was found to affect programme success. Expatriate staff may have experience but not local knowledge; whereas local staff may not have adequate skills or encouragement to work to a new or broader strategy. It was recognised in a number of cases that expatriate staff needed to work better with local staff, recognising and listening to their contributions. The DEC evaluation of the tsunami response (H17) backed this up, saying that local knowledge and skills were not utilised adequately after the tsunami (although agencies differed).

The Education review, among others, recommended that Oxfam invest more in staff capacity in process areas, in particular in relation to advocacy, coalition building, and campaigning. The most important thing is that the balance of staff capacity and workloads has to be appropriately and realistically matched to strategies – whether short-term emergencies, longer-term capacity building, or advocacy campaigns.

Sustained management support

Technical support and programme/management training has to be backed up by consistent and competent management capacity, local as well as regional. In the Digest of Recommendations from

Evaluations of Emergency Programmes (S6) it was stated that good quality managers are the key factor affecting the success of humanitarian programmes. Preferably such programmes should be managed by a long-term, committed country representative, and a dynamic field-level co-ordinator. A coherent human resource system will help reduce 'ad hoc' or 'personality' styles of management. However, this does not always happen unless individual managers are skilled in human resource issues, and motivated to create the space required for good management (Sri Lanka D9, Uganda H14). It may require a senior manager with specific human resource skills in the team to implement support systems.

Analysis of staff needs, relevant training, follow up, and setting of realistic workloads were all felt to be important to reduce gaps in technical skills and in administrative and finance management, risk assessment, and monitoring. Training in Oxfam procedures when staff are new is critical, or when experience in Oxfam 'systems' is lacking, such as in new global campaigns or in humanitarian response. For example, the review of the early response in Chad to the Darfur crisis (H3) recommended new staff had training on gender equality policies within the first two months of their recruitment. In addition, if staff are not specifically encouraged and provided with good examples of monitoring practice, the quality of partner programming may suffer. For example, in the Yemen Gender Equity programme (D12), partners were felt to be weak in reporting, and their focus on outputs was felt to be due to Oxfam's emphasis on financial reporting.

SECTION IV: Conclusion

The purpose of this report was to analyse lessons from Oxfam's programming from across the world and to consider the contribution that Oxfam makes in bringing about changes in poor people's lives. The report has also looked at whether Oxfam's key strategies and ways of working are firmly based on its principles and stated programme approach. Overall, there are many good examples of how Oxfam's work is effective and can contribute to accountable, equitable, rights-based development when appropriate models are used and adequate support given. What has worked particularly well has been when the approach used in a programme has been appropriate to the context and capacity of the team. Although it was difficult to make any global conclusions about overall programming, it has been possible to collect together a number of lessons and issues that were significant within their context and may be relevant to others working in similar situations.

The following things have worked well:

- Across the range of humanitarian programmes, key strategies that have been particularly successful in bringing about effective programmes were: the use of preparedness strategies; good tools of assessment; focusing on issues of sustainability (e.g through rehabilitation activities, and working in partnerships); and creating links with long-term development and advocacy programmes.
- In long-term development programming, particularly effective initiatives appeared to be those that had a more holistic, systems approach, good strategy development and clear operational plans, were focused on capacity building of staff and partners, expanded the partner approach to supporting networks, and also integrated advocacy into planning.
- In the area of advocacy and campaigning what appeared particularly clear was the call for an increased focus on local campaigning; and a recognition of the importance of having Southern voices alongside global vision, and investment in local capacity, linkages, and joint planning.

The evaluations and reports clearly show that there is much high-quality programming that is moving in many cases in the right direction towards being more accountable and empowering. The strategies chosen demonstrate great potential to bring about change, particularly strategies of integration and 'one programme', working through partnerships and alliances, and linking policy and practice through advocacy. Learning from these reports indicates that the effectiveness of Oxfam's work could be supported now by increased investment in a number of areas:

- the creation of clear strategy and stronger linkages between programmes
- coherent planning, from understanding and analysis stages through to exit strategies
- the building of strong staff capacity, holistic and innovative approaches
- good learning and communications strategies
- strategic investment in support of local-level programming

Overall, the policy and commitment of the organisation is not in question, and staff and management are clearly committed to Oxfam's rights-based vision and goals of accountability, equality, and empowerment. What is needed now is consideration of whether current commitments and priorities provide the most coherent and accountable frameworks of management to ensure staff are able to work to their best ability and programmes are as effective as possible. Ongoing focus on the processes of planning and resourcing, and on approaches to learning, is more than ever critical. The current Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) project provides encouragement and an appropriate space for Oxfam management and staff to consider how best to prioritise and support the quality of Oxfam's work, to enhance its already significant contribution to bringing about a more just world.

Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference (Summary)

From 2005–2007 Oxfam GB is undertaking a review of monitoring and impact assessment processes, to better meet demands for greater accountability, for learning at different levels, and to assess the impact of its work. This is being led by a global Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Project. During this period, instead of the annual Programme Impact Reporting process, Oxfam will commission a Programme Learning Report. This report, drawn from an analysis across recent programme evaluations, will contribute to the MEL review by identifying patterns and trends in Oxfam's work, lessons learnt, and aggregating the findings for decision makers within and outside Oxfam. A Communication/Learning Plan will be drawn up to facilitate learning and action. The emphasis of the Programme Learning Report 2006 will be different from the Global Programme Impact Reports produced in each of the last three years.

The Programme Impact Reports sought to identify the outcomes and impacts of Oxfam's work with partners and allies against each of Oxfam's Aims, and illustrate this through case studies. The reports also sought to draw out lessons about Oxfam's ways of working and how change was effected. The Programme Impact Reports prepared in recent years have been based largely on internal analysis.

The Programme Learning Report will focus on exploring what helps and hinders Oxfam contribute to changes that benefit people experiencing poverty. The report will identify strengths and weaknesses in Oxfam's strategic and operational management of programmes and in its ways of working – in relation to the results that are being achieved in programmes. The report will not seek to describe outcomes and impacts in any detail. External evaluations will be considered, and an external consultant will write it. These factors will strengthen the objectivity of Oxfam's reporting this year.

Audience: The primary audience for the report is Trustees and senior managers in Oxfam. Senior managers will be able to act directly on some of the findings themselves, and will be responsible for facilitating action by front-line programme staff and others as appropriate. The report will also be put into the public domain for the information of supporters and other parties who are interested in the strengths and weaknesses of Oxfam GB's work.

Purpose: To analyse what is emerging about the quality of Oxfam's programme

- What are the main factors that are influencing the contribution Oxfam makes? How do programmes match up to Oxfam's approach to programming? Are objectives clear and coherent between objectives, strategies, and activities? What evidence supports this?
- What learning is there about specific intervention strategies and how they are used in combination? Are we making a difference with our wide variety of campaigning efforts? How do we know? Are we asking the right questions? What strategies and tactics are effective at a national level?
- What lessons are there about working in partnership and alliance with others (civil society, government, private sector relationships) – effectiveness and quality of relationships? What lessons are there for different types of partnership (i.e. that tend towards sub-contracting, as opposed to significant capacity building)?
- What are we learning about how programmes are managed and resourced to deliver quality programmes? Where there are lessons about cost-effectiveness of programmes, these should be highlighted.
- What patterns and trends are emerging? From comparison with previous meta-evaluations, are the issues being identified new or the same as before? What appears to be changing?

The Programme Learning Report will look at about 30 evaluations, and learning from other recent synthesis or meta-evaluation processes – the Strategic Review of Education 2005, the Strategic Review of Conflict 2004 and humanitarian meta-analyses since 1990, and other documents such as Oxfam International's recent evaluation, and recent Oxfam GB Programme Impact Reports.

Annex 2: List of acronyms

CEDAW: Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CRC: Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSO: Civil Society Organisation
DEC: Disasters Emergency Committee
DFID: Department for International Development (UK)
ECHO: Humanitarian Aid Department of the European Commission
G-CAP: Global Call to Action Against Poverty
HECA: Horn, East and Central Africa (Oxfam GB Region)
MDGs: Millennium Development Goals
MEEECIS: Middle East, Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States (Oxfam GB Region)
MEL: Monitoring, Evaluating and Learning
PIP: Programme Implementation Plan (Oxfam's Programme, Accountability and Learning System)
TEC: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition
UN: United Nations
UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund
WTO: World Trade Organisation

Annex 3: Selection of evaluation documents, quality of material, and listing

Selection of evaluations and other material for study

Sixty-one documents were included in the sample of materials reviewed by the consultant. The materials selected fall into four categories:

1. The primary source is evaluations and reviews of Oxfam GB's programmes with its partners and allies. A sample of 33 evaluations carried out between 2003 and 2006 were chosen from the 97 evaluations available from this period. Two of these were evaluations for Oxfam partner agencies (D3, D13). Two were inter-agency evaluations of work, where Oxfam was working in partnership or alliance with other international NGOs (C1, D2).
2. Eight global strategic evaluation and review documents were selected from the period 2002–2006. Strategic evaluations of Oxfam GB's education and conflict reduction programmes had been carried out recently, so the consultant was provided with these documents and these programme areas were excluded from the sample chosen in 1 above. The recent Oxfam International evaluation against its strategic plan Towards Global Equity provided good coverage of international campaigning work. Other strategic review documents served as reference points, in order to check whether the pattern of findings from these studies were similar to or different from the current one.
3. Three inter-agency evaluations/reviews of the response to the Asian tsunami were also included as reference points on current practice and issues in the humanitarian sector.
4. One external and 16 internal Oxfam GB documents, commenting on campaigning work mainly in regions, were also included, because formal evaluations and reviews did not specifically focus on this area of interest. The evaluation manager approached staff directly to request materials, and these were added to the sample as they became available (adding to the challenge for the consultant to absorb this material, sometimes quite late in the process of preparing the draft report). The material included interviews with programme staff, workshop reports, staff reports, a presentation, an internal review, a discussion paper, and Programme Impact Reports.

The primary sample of programme evaluations and reviews were selected using the following criteria:

1. Coverage of areas pertinent to the ToR
 - Management
 - Gender
 - Participation
 - Intervention strategies
 - Working with partners and government
 - Impact analysis
2. Quality of the evaluation
 - Well-written
 - Good analysis
 - Data availability
 - Robust methodology – findings and conclusions are based on sound work and evidence
3. Balanced sample
 - Balance among different Oxfam regions
 - Humanitarian: different operational contexts and focus of response (conflict, natural disaster, food security, public health)
 - Development: different themes and intervention strategies
 - Campaigning

4. Priority to most recent evaluations that meet criteria
5. Avoid overlap with recent overviews and synthesis reports

The nature and quality of the data: issues and risks

- Regions and departments were asked to ensure that they provided recently completed evaluations to update the global database. However, the database may not be complete.
- External consultants led all but one of the development evaluations, whereas Oxfam staff (usually Humanitarian Department advisers) carried out the majority of the humanitarian evaluations selected. In total, external consultants led 21 of the 33 evaluations selected. In six of these, Oxfam or partner staff participated in the evaluation team (Oxfam staff were usually advisers or managers contributing expertise from outside the programme area). Oxfam staff (usually global and regional advisers) carried out the other 12 evaluations selected. One external and 16 internal documents, relating to campaigning mainly in regions, were added to the sample, and there was one inter-agency external global campaign evaluation. Oxfam GB favours the involvement of Oxfam and partner staff in evaluation teams, both for the experience they contribute, and as a way to promote learning by programme teams and across the organisation. However, the value of external scrutiny for accountability, and to bring in expertise and new perspectives, is also vital.
- The term evaluation has been used to cover a range of processes: internally conducted real-time evaluations, evaluative studies of specific aspects of programme work, reviews of ongoing work, evaluations of longstanding programmes, and strategic evaluations across more than one programme.
- The three categories of development, humanitarian, and campaigning inevitably overlap because of the very nature of Oxfam's integrated programming approach, which this Programme Learning Report seeks to explore. The categorisation made in the sample was therefore to ensure sufficient material was included focusing primarily on each of the three programming approaches.
- There is some risk that the sample is not representative of Oxfam GB's work.
 - Although the quality of the programme was not a selection criterion, they were selected on the quality of the evaluation. If there is some correlation between the two characteristics, then the selection will not be representative.
 - Another potential bias in the selection is if some programmes that share the same characteristics (say, weak management) did not submit or commission evaluations.

Table 1: Summary of materials included in the sample

	Total	Development	Humanitarian	Campaigning	Strategic reviews
2001	1	0	0	0	1
2002	1	0	0	0	1
2003	9	4	4	1	0
2004	14	7	5	0	2
2005	23	4	9	8	2
2006	13	1	0	10	2
Total	61	16	18	19	8
CAMEXCA	2	1	1	0	0
East Asia	9	4	1	4	0
HECA	6	2	3	1	0
MEEECIS	7	3	2	2	0
Southern Africa	5	2	2	1	0
South America	4	1	0	3	0
South Asia	6	1	3	2	0
UK Poverty Programme	1	1	0	0	0
West Africa	4	1	3	0	0
Pan-Africa	3	0	0	3	0
Tsunami - inter-agency	3	0	3	0	0
Global	11	0	0	3	8
Total	61	16	18	19	8

Table 2: Categorisation of evaluations and other assessment reports

Category	External	External led, plus Oxfam/partners	Internal	Total
Programme evaluations				
• Development	11	4	1	16
• Humanitarian	3	2	10	15
• Campaigns	1		1	2
Campaign analysis reports	1		16	17
Inter-agency Tsunami evaluations	3			3
Strategic evaluations/ synthesis reports	1	6*	1	8
Total	20	12	29	61

* **Note:** Six of the strategic evaluations/synthesis reports were based on analysis by both external consultants and staff members. In three cases the synthesis report was prepared by an external consultant, and in three cases by a staff member.

List of development evaluations

Code	Title	Year	Region	Internal/ external	Type of document
D1	Bartra, Armando and Araceli Burguete Cal y Mayor and María Cecilia Oviedo "Evaluación Y Prospectiva De La Construcción Del Modelo De Coinversión En Chiapas Fase Experimental 2001-2003" [Mexico]	2004	CAMEXCA	external	evaluation
D2	"A Gender Analysis of Permaculture in Timor-Leste" – Oxfam GB with Oxfam Hong Kong, Concern, USC Canada	2003	East Asia	external, with field staff for survey interviews/ group work	evaluation
D3	Visda, Bacud et al. "Community Development Project - Aphivat Strey" [Cambodia]	2005	East Asia	external plus partner staff	evaluation
D4	Zike, Wondimu "Review of Oxfam's Interventions in Deder and Meta Woredas, East Hararghe" [Ethiopia] - livelihoods	2004	HECA	external with Regional adviser input	evaluation
D5	Morton, John "A Review Of Oxfam GB's Horn/East Africa Regional Pastoral Programme"	2006	HECA	external	evaluation

D6	Atim, Chris "The Design and Sustainability of the Community-Based Health Financing scheme in Zugdidi, Georgia"	2004	MEEECIS	external	evaluation
D7	Andre, Henriques and Jorge Coelho "Producer Association Development Programme (PADP) Mid-Term Evaluation Report – Executive Summary" [Mozambique]	2003	Southern Africa	external	evaluation
D8	Buell, Becky and Rosalind Eyben "Review of DFID-Oxfam human rights programme in Peru"	2004	South America	external plus Oxfam evaluation manager	
D9	Hanifa, Anberiya "Evaluation of Oxfam GB in Sri Lanka's 2003 Programme on Ending Violence Against Women"	2003	South Asia	external	evaluation
D10	Payne, Lina "UKPP Learning - Impact Assessment Report"	2005	UKPP	external	evaluation
D11	Harding, Martha "Evaluation Report of component two of the <i>Women in Leadership</i> project" [Sierra Leone]	2005	West Africa	external	evaluation
D12	"Promoting Gender Equity in Yemen"	2004	MEEECIS	internal	evaluation
D13	Phoumy, Ouch and Brian Rowe "Building Democratic Practice Through Advocacy And Networking - An Assessment of the NGO Forum on Cambodia"	2005	East Asia	external	evaluation
D14	"Final Evaluation Report Community-Based Coastal Resource Management Programme – 1999-2002" [Philippines]	2003	East Asia	external	evaluation
D15	Hans Posthumus Consultancy and Mary Shawa, "Joint Oxfam Programme 2001-2004 - mid-term review" [Malawi] - sustainable livelihood, the right to basic social services and the right to be heard. (Oxfam GB, the Netherlands, Ireland and Hong Kong)	2004	Southern Africa	external	evaluation
D16	Institute of Social Researches "Micro-credit impact assessment" [Georgia]	2004	MEEECIS	external	evaluation

List of humanitarian evaluations

Code	Title	Year	Region	Internal/ external	Type of document
H1	Creti, Pantaleo "Evaluation of the Livelihood Programmes in Mapou and Cap Haitian" [Haiti]	2005	CAMEXCA	internal	evaluation
H3a	Herson, Maurice "Report of the Real-Time Evaluation of Oxfam's Darfur / Chad response" - Phase 1: Sudan	2004	HECA	internal	evaluation
H3b	Herson, Maurice "Report of the Real-Time Evaluation of Oxfam's Darfur / Chad response" - Phase 2: Chad	2004	West Africa	internal	evaluation
H5	Herson, Maurice "Desk Review of the role of the Humanitarian Department in the initial stages of the response to the Bam (Iran) earthquake on 26/12/2003"	2004	MEEECIS	internal	evaluation
H6	Silkin, Trish and Martin Ager and Sally Crook and Eddie Thomas "Report Of An Evaluation Of The Oxfam GB Water, Sanitation And Hygiene Humanitarian Response In The West Bank"	2003	MEEECIS	external, with global evaluation and regional advisers	
H7	Routley, Sarah, Jean McCluskey and Juliet Waterkeyn "Southern Africa Public Health Response Review"	2003	Southern Africa	external	evaluation
H8	Reddick, Moira "Evaluation of Oxfam Hazarajat Integrated Rural Development Programme" [Afghanistan]	2003	South Asia	external	evaluation
H9	Jones, Brian "Evaluation of Oxfam GB's, ECHO funded Cash for Work project in Hazarajat" [Afghanistan]	2004	South Asia	internal	evaluation

H10	Evaluation of the Bangladesh Emergency Flood Response	2005	South Asia	internal	evaluation
H11	Ockelford, Jeremy and Aly Lewis "Report of a Review of 2003 Oxfam GB's Public Health Response in Liberia"	2003	West Africa	external and Oxfam Humanitarian Support Person	evaluation
H12	Acacia Consultants "Evaluation of the Food Aid and Food Security Emergency Intervention of 2002-03 in Aftout and Affole Areas" [Mauritania]	2004	West Africa	external	evaluation
H14	Thelen, Bob and Liz Walker and Marion O'Reilly and Lucy Heaven "Review of Kitgum Humanitarian Programmes" [Uganda]	2005	HECA	internal	evaluation
H15	Carlos, Hou Sei "Benguela Public Health Programme Final Internal Evaluation" [Angola]	2005	Southern Africa	internal	evaluation
H16	Kalungu-Banda, Aggie "Eastern Chad Gender Review Report"	2005	HECA	internal	evaluation
H17	Ripoll, Santi and Tep Sokha "Learning from Oxfam GB in Cambodia's Drought Responses. Suggestions for future action"	2005	East Asia	internal	evaluation

Inter-agency evaluations/reviews of the response to the Asian tsunami

H13	Vaux, Tony and Mihir Bhatt and Disaster Mitigation Institute and Abhijit Bhattacharjee and Michele Lipner and Jean McCluskey and Asmita Naik and Frances Stevenson "Independent Evaluation of the DEC Tsunami Crisis Response - final report"	2005	Tsunami - inter-agency	external	inter-agency
H18	"Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: Initial Findings"	2005	Tsunami - inter-agency	external	inter-agency
H19	Bhattacharjee, Abhijit and Vivek Rawal and Charlie Fautin and Judy-Leigh Moore and Sylvester Kalonge and Vivien Margaret Walden "Multi-Agency [Oxfam, World Vision and CARE] Evaluation of Tsunami Response: India And Sri Lanka"	2005	Tsunami - inter-agency	external	inter-agency

List of evaluations and other material on campaigning and advocacy

Code	Name	Year	Region	Internal/external	Type of document
C1	Inter-agency Campaign Evaluation undertaken for the use of alliance members	2003	Global	external	evaluation
C2	"Regional Meeting on Institutional Accountability in MEEECIS - Full workshop process report"	2006	MEEECIS	internal	workshop
C3	Bronstein, Audrey and Kate Bishop "We Can Campaign - South Asia Regional Campaign to End Violence against Women - 'Light Touch' Review of Year 1"	2006	South Asia	internal	evaluation
C4	Interview with Purnama Adil Samata, comments and notes - "Make Trade Trade/ Big Noise Campaign in Indonesia"	2006	East Asia	internal	interview and staff notes
C7	Interview with ODCMT member (Oxfam's partner) - "Big Noise Campaign in Zambia"	2006	Southern Africa	internal	interview
C8	"MDG Campaign - Monitoring and Evaluation Matrix"	2005	MEEECIS	internal	internal report
C9	Oxfam Media Evaluation - Oxfam International launch of Kicking Down the Door, as part of Global Week of Action on Trade	2005	Global	internal	internal report

C10	Evaluation Report - Global Week of Action on Trade [Indonesia]	2005	East Asia	internal	presentation
C11a	Houghton, Irungu "Reflections on African Union, NEPAD 2005 and African CSO engagement with an eye on Continental Citizenship, Public Accountability and Governance"	2005	Pan-Africa	internal	paper
C11b	Ndomo, Atieno "GCAP Africa Light Review of Campaign activities"	2005	Pan-Africa	external	presentation
C11c	Pan Africa contribution to the Programme Learning Report - Notes	2006	Pan-Africa	internal	staff notes
C12	Advocacy Workshop Developing Oxfam GB's Advocacy Framework in the Philippines - Notes	2005	East Asia	internal	workshop report
C13	Interview with Samar Verma - Make Trade Fair Campaign in South Asia	2006	South Asia	internal	interview
C14	Interview with Shalimar Vitan - Make Trade Fair Campaign in Philippines	2006	East Asia	internal	interview
C15	Trade Campaign: Regional feedback notes	2005	Global	internal	staff notes
C16	Programme Impact Report – HECA Trade work	2005	HECA	internal	Programme Impact Report
C17	Programme Impact Report – "Participation and Good Governance in Peru"	2006	South America	internal	Programme Impact Report
C18	Programme Impact Report – "Trade Campaign in South America"	2006	South America	internal	Programme Impact Report
C19	Programme Impact Report – "Truth, Justice and Redress in Peru"	2006	South America	internal	Programme Impact Report

Strategic reviews

Code	Name	Year	Region
Oxfam International Evaluation (S1)	Salkeld, Geoffrey "Promises to keep - Report on the evaluation of the implementation of <i>Towards Global Equity</i> , Oxfam International's Strategic Plan, 2001 – 2006 – Synthesis Report"	2006	Global
Programme Impact Report 2005 (S2)	Programme Impact Report - Oxfam GB's work with partners and allies around the world	2005	Global
Oxfam GB Conflict Reduction Review (S3)	Preüss, Gavin "The Peace Is In The Programme' A Strategic Review of Oxfam GB's Global Conflict Reduction Programme - Synthesis Report"	2005	Global
Oxfam GB Education Review (S4)	Bines, Hazel "Oxfam GB Strategic Evaluation Of Education - Synthesis Report"	2006	Global
Oxfam GB Gender Review (S5)	Motla, Paresh "Synthesis Of Learning On Gender From Oxfam GB Reviews And Evaluations"	2002	Global
Oxfam GB Digest of recommendations, evaluations of emergency responses (S6)	"Digest of observations and recommendations from recent evaluations of emergency responses"	2004	Global
Oxfam GB Summary of lessons from large-scale disasters (S7)	"Summary of lessons for Oxfam GB from previous large-scale disasters"	2004	Global
S8	"Summary of Previous DEC Evaluations: Synthesis Report 2001/ For Tsunami Appeal - Based on the 2001 DEC Evaluations Synthesis Report by Vine Management Consulting"	2005	Global

