







Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Sarah Ireland

Country Director: Richard Mawer

Name of Project reviewed: Building Resilience in Eastern Indonesia: Management and Technical Support (IDSC35)

Date: 5 September 2012

Outcome/Dimension	Rating	Short Commentary
OGB's global ARR outcome indicator		Strongly significant and positive results only found for LP2DER.
Dimension 1 – Livelihood Viability		Strongly significant and positive results only found for LP2DER.
Dimension 2 – Livelihood Innovation Potential		Modestly significant results only found for LP2DER.
Dimension 3 – Contingency resources and support access		After controlling for baseline information for the characteristics scores, no evidence of impact – either overall or at partner level – was found.
Dimension 4 – Ecosystem health		After controlling for baseline information for the characteristics scores, no evidence of impact – either overall or at partner level – was found.
Dimension 5 – Social Capability		Significant differences between the intervention and comparison sub-villages identified for all partners, but with variation in the magnitude of these differences

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

Building Resilience in Eastern Indonesia Project (BR Project) was a 3 year project and funded by AIFDR (AusAID) which aimed at accomplishing substantial progress in reducing disaster risks by strengthening the capacity of vulnerable communities, civil society and government institutions in Eastern Indonesia. The Project implemented community based disaster risk management through local partner organisations in 16 districts and 129 villages. Communities were supported to identify hazards and vulnerable groups and prepare action plans to reduce community vulnerabilities to disasters. This was complemented by the capacity strengthening of partner organisations and sub-national Government agencies and, through advocacy, to promote a culture of risk reduction and preparedness for disasters.

Upon receiving the document of Effectiveness Review of BR project, there has been some follow-up actions undertaken by Oxfam country team as follows:

1. Sharing the document with Oxfam field team and partners.
2. Discussion among the field team who were the key staff in implementing the project including project manager, project officers, partners, Area Manager, facilitated by DRR coordinator. The full technical report was shared and key points and findings were highlighted and discussed.
3. Discussion among management in country office involving DRR coordinator, RiC Lead, MEL Coordinator, Programme Development Coordinator, and Country Director involving area programme manager and project manager.
4. Discussion between project management, MEL Coordinator, Programme Development Coordinator in country office to analyse the design of the review including its theoretical framework, methodology, and result to draw up lesson learnt.

During the discussions, two documents of evaluation were used as reference: (1) effectiveness review document itself, and (2) Evaluation report document. The first review was conducted directly under Oxfam house (PPAT) supervision, while the latter was under project management country team but undertaken by independent consultants. The two evaluations were conducted nearly at the same time which was about 1 month after the main project activities were completed..

In November 2012, Oxfam will discuss this effectiveness review report in more detail with partners and Oxfam field team in a proper workshop. The workshop is part of Oxfam's new DRR project called BDR (Building and Deepening Resilience). This project is designed to deepen and strengthen the approach and strategies from the previous BR project to achieve more resilience among vulnerable communities. It is expected that during the workshop, the project team and partners will incorporate lessons learnt from this effectiveness review into the on-going and future programme implementation.

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

The design of BR project was developed based on the 5 pillars of Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) comprising of (1) DRR Good Governance, (2) Risk Identification and Monitoring, (3) Knowledge Innovation and Education, (4) Risk Reduction, and (5) Preparedness Strengthening. Nearly all of the HFA pillars were ambitiously addressed in the project, and therefore, within the three years time frame of implementation, the result was not at the same level for each pillar. An evaluation undertaken by external evaluators concluded the impact of the project was that: "Communities in project location becomes more organized and able to collaborate in overcoming disaster risk, despite the fact that their communal capacity is still limited, especially in social economy vulnerability" (evaluation report, 2012 page 31).

However, the evaluators also mentioned the weaknesses that the quality and quantity of the outputs vary from one location to another due to the variations of project duration and therefore to the different quality of achievement.

The effectiveness review initiated by Oxfam House has different focus in evaluation as it is using the OGB Global Performance Framework (GPF) to measure the resilience of household to shocks and stress and their ability to adapt to change. It is using OGB Global Adaptation and Risk Reduction (ARR) outcome indicators which is defined to find **the % of targeted household demonstrating greater ability to minimize risk from shock and adapt to emerging trend and uncertainty** by using 5 dimensions as listed in the first page.

The finding of the review reveals that the project is significantly successful in 1 dimension (social capability) but there is little evidence of success in the other 4 dimensions. This finding is not surprising as those four dimensions are not the focus of the project as it is explicitly recognized by the report of the review (Effectiveness review report, page 1).

However, overall the findings of the review do not coincide with our expectations, those of our external evaluators or our donors as the focus of review, including its indicators used, does not match with the focus and key performance indicators of the project. As comparison, the outcome indicator set up by the project focuses at a community level, while the effectiveness review at household level. For the BR project, changes in the household level outcome indicators were expected to happen after 2 or 3 years of the project end as an impact of the successful resilience in community /village level. Therefore the results of the effectiveness review especially Dimension 2,3 and 4 are not appropriate for measuring the project (IDSC30) effectiveness as the process of evaluation was using different standards of measurements .

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

The Review reported that 1 out of 5 dimensions, which is social capability, is rated a **G** (Evidence supporting large impact). Review found significant differences between the intervention and comparison sub-villages identified for all partners, but with variation in the magnitude of these differences.

This happened because the social capability is considered as the focus of BR Project which is aimed to strengthen community action for disaster risk reduction.

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 reported that 2 out of 5 dimensions, which are Contingency resources and support access (Dimension 3); and Ecosystem health

(Dimension 4), are rated as **R** (no evidence impact). The main reason for this is because these 2 dimensions are not the main focus of the BR project design.

Dimension 3-Access to Contingency Resources and Support:

Although this is not a main project component, there was a small element addressing this issue which was conducted in the last phase of the project (third year). However, this was also at a community level not at household level. For example, the activity of savings and revolving fund is managed by women group as part of community action plan following the disaster risk analysis in their village.

Dimension 4-Ecosystem Health

Even though this is also not the main focus of project design, relevant natural resources management activities which are listed on Community Action Plans (CAPs) have been implemented. The CAPs are appropriate and prioritised action plans addressing existing disaster risks as a result of risk analysis such as planting trees and trench/embankment building that are aimed to protect villages from flooding. However, these are undertaken at (1) community level instead of household level, and (2) only some prioritized villages.

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

The project has ended. However, as the donor (AusAid) was so pleased with the positive impact of project as mentioned above at point 1 they have provided funding for a new DRR project (BDR) which has started in June 2012 to build upon the work of BR Project. In response to the weak areas identified by this review, the BDR project will investigate the possibility for the inclusion of the 5 dimensions of Adaptation Risk Reduction indicators into relevant project activities through the following:

Dimension 3-Contingency Resources and Support Access:

- Household level preparedness will be strengthened

Dimension 4-Eco-system Health:

- Community Action Plan will promote households to manage natural resources management practices for ecosystem health

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

Programme Learning Considerations:

- **Explore whether there are key differences in the way LP2DER implemented the programme and/or whether it carried out any complementary interventions that could be scaled-up elsewhere.**

Action Plan:

Oxfam has started identifying different strategies and approaches applied by LP2DER. It is apparent that LP2ER has comparative advantage compared to the other two partners as it has worked in the villages since a long time and implemented some livelihood projects there.. However, Oxfam will seek further details in term of key differences to further elaborate the lesson learnt. Furthermore, the result of the findings will be shared and discussed among partners at regular quarterly meetings and internet based sharing via mailing list of the Indonesia Building Resilience Team for knowledge management.

- **Seek to understand why the effects of the programme under the social capability dimension are different for both men and women.**

Action Plan:

BR project was faced with main challenges related to gender mainstreaming As a patriarchal culture still exists in all communities. Initially, BR project targeted at least 30 percent of women participation in project activities. The Final Evaluation reported that BR project managed to ensure equal participation of men and women in which at least 30% of women participated in every activity. A significant success.

Oxfam will continue to work on promoting gender mainstreaming, in particular women's empowerment and leadership in the area of

Disaster Risk Reduction at local up to national level. Modified strategies and approaches will be developed and its quality improved to ensure better future project impact for both men and women, including conducting rigorous analysis of gender dynamics at household level as a base to developing interventions; utilizing existing women organizations; implementing separated group meetings for men and women; promoting local women champions and documenting their work as role models, and strengthening the role of Gender Focal Point in ensuring gender mainstreaming in project activities. These will be utilized for the implementation of the new BDR Project. The project will continue to link strategically with the Gender Justice team for getting adequate technical support.

- **Consider informing future programming decisions based on the current status of each characteristic examined through this effectiveness review.**

Action Plan:

To ensure the dimensions of this effectiveness review is incorporated into future project designs, especially in strategizing for household level, the country team will seek more technical support from different expertises, including DRR, CCA, and Livelihood experts. We hope that this will be available.

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?

Oxfam Indonesia will use ARR Dimensions in future project designs. While the current top level of the new BDR project design will not be changed, the lessons learnt from this review will be utilised for better BDR Project implementation as below:

- (1) Dimension 5- Social Capability, which is most relevant with current BDR design, will be promoted and implemented.
- (2) BDR project will seek the possibility of including of some activities which are relevant to ARR outcome indicators as explained in answer No. 5 , in consultation with the Donor and other stakeholders. (Dimension 3-Contingency Resources and Support Access through Household level preparedness; and Dimension 4- Eco-system Health through Community Action Plan on resource management practice) It would be appreciated if RC and Oxfam House can provide relevant implementation guideline, technical support, and best practice examples.)

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

No objection; however, it is important that the Effectiveness Review should include sufficient information of original BR project objectives context and assumption so readers will get adequate project background information while reading the review report.