

Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response





Regional Director: Sarah Ireland

Country Director: Arif Jabbar Khan

Name of Project reviewed: Community-based Disaster Risk Management and Livelihoods Programme in Pakistan

Date: September 2012

Please return the Management Response form to the International Programmes Director within 4 weeks, copied to PPAT.

Outcome/Impact	Rating	Short Commentary
Outcome 1 – OGB global ARR outcome indicator		Strong evidence that the programme affected the majority of the ‘resilience’ characteristics in all four dimensions assessed.
Outcome 2 – Increased advanced warning before onset of extreme flooding		Households in the intervention villages received, on average, about two days of advance warning, against an average of one day for households in the comparison sites.
Outcome 3 – Reduced loss of assets in times of extreme flooding		Households in the intervention villages reported losing less livestock, grain, and equipment/tools than households in the comparison villages.
Outcome 4 – Ability to meet household needs in times of extreme flooding		The intervention households were poorer in 2008 than the comparison households, but they are now relatively richer and reported being in a better position to meet household needs.

1. What follow-up to the review have you undertaken or planned (if any) e.g. discussion, analysis, workshop?

In order to ensure effective information sharing and to gain key insight of the best practises, there has been a conscious effort towards sharing of effectiveness review findings with the partners. Moreover, focus has been on the dissemination of information and key findings with other stakeholders involved in the process. Also, we would ensure that the key learnings of the project are shared at various other forums, i.e. National DRR forum.

2. Overall, do the findings concur with your own expectations or assessment of the project/programme's effectiveness?

The overall findings of this review are very much in accord with our expectation because from various community consultations during field visits it has been deduced that the same impacts have been noted by the community and partners. However, the findings regarding livelihood interventions provide sufficient basis for joint programming between DRR and livelihood departments. As suggested, there will also be an added emphasis on the integration of climate change and adaptation measure in the overall programme approach.

3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (ie large impact)?

If so, please comment briefly on why you think this was so.

The review has certainly highlighted the strong project areas such as; preparedness and emergency response, community organization/ social mobilization and strengthening institutional linkages. The results had previously been tested in the 2010 floods, where they were informed 2 days prior to the natural occurrence of the disaster, which resulted in reduction in loss of life and assets.

4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?

If so, please comment on why you think this was so.

The review highlighted livelihood diversification & climate change adaptation as weak areas. However, it is important to note that the percentage of interventions related to livelihood varied from one partner to the other which was insufficient to achieve diversification. Hence, the scope of livelihood intervention was very limited which resulted in not having the desired impact. Moreover, the subject communities where livelihood related interventions were implemented were considerably food secure which most probably is one of the reasons for their lack of interest in perusing diversification.

5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?

This project ended in June 2012 and hence the weaknesses identified cannot be rectified in the current project. However, the findings of the review will help in the design of ARR programmes in the future.

b) What actions are you planning in response to the Programme Learning Considerations?

Programme Learning Considerations:

- Review, document, and share the Doaba Foundation and Help Foundation's approaches to programme implementation and working with the participating villages.
- Explore possible reasons why the programme was unsuccessful in promoting livelihood diversification.
- Assess whether there are differences between the two partners in promoting awareness about climate change.
- Seek ways of integrating climate change adaptation measures into the programme more thoroughly.

The following actions will be taken to ensure follow-up to the review:

- ARR Team will discuss the review findings and learning points with the partners.
- Together with the partners, further analyze the review findings and document the analysis.
- Disseminate the analysis within CMT for future use in programme design and planning.

6. If the project/humanitarian response is ending or has already ended, what learning from the review will you apply to relevant new projects in the future? How can the Regional Centre and Oxford support these plans?

The following learning from the review will be applied in future programmes/projects:

- Livelihood diversification through joint programming (DRR and Livelihoods)
- Integration of climate change adaptation in DRR programming

Technical and advisory support from the RC and OH Advisors will be needed, especially for sharing experiences and learning from other programmes in both the above areas.

The reports will be published by Oxfam. If you have objections to this, please say so and explain why.

We have no objection to the publication of this report.