

Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Fran Equiza

Country Director: Nigel Tricks

Name of Response reviewed: 2011/2012 Kenya Drought Response

Date: 20 September 2012

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

Summary of Results

Standard	Level of achievement	Rating
1. Timeliness	Partially met	2/4
2. Coverage	Met	4/4
3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere and Oxfam quality standards	Partially met	2/4
4. Indicators (both process and impact) in place and being measured	Met	2/2

5. Feedback/complaints system in place and functioning and documented evidence of consultation and participation	Partially met	1/2
6. Partners fully engaged in all aspects of the project cycle	Met	2/2
7. Programme reflects measures to address dignity and protection issues	Met	2/2
8. Programme delivery addresses gender and specific needs of vulnerable groups	Partially met	1/2
9. Exit strategy/recovery plan in place	Met	2/2
10. Evidenced utilisation of contingency plan in last humanitarian response	Met	2/2
11. Programme addresses advocacy issues	Met	2/2
12. Programme is linked to/will be linked to DRR interventions in area	Met	2/2
Final rating		24/30

1. Did the HIT identify areas that were particularly strong overall in the Region or in a particular country? (i.e. standards fully met)?

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

The review is a fair representation of Kenya's response. Yes, the high scores reflect the strengths of our programme's long term resilience approach, which allowed us to scale up rapidly once the emergency was declared, scale down easily and whilst working with long term partners

However the tool somewhat simplifies a complex context and response and its grading system is fairly black & white, particularly for the sections that are scored out of 2 which can work for and against in identifying gaps. Some of the high scores (e.g. advocacy, use of contingency plan) we acknowledge there is still room for improvement and we are taking measures to strengthen them.

2. Did the HIT identify areas that were weak or very weak in the Region or a particular country (e.g. standards partly or not met)?

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

The HIT identified accountability and gender as some weak areas in the country. Whilst there may be reasons for these weaknesses the findings reflect the situation.

We raise Timeliness as an issue to take up beyond the Kenya programme. As outlined in the Dangerous Delay report, reasons for the delay were as much institutional and sectoral as country specific.

3. What actions are being planned in response to the unmet or partially met benchmarks identified?

- Support from newly recruited Regional gender lead to work with programmes. The regional gender lead has already visited Dadaab.
- The programme has planned for deployment of Protection HSP to Dadaab in October and to conduct training for staff from other programmes.
- Post Drought Assessment study commissioned in July, the results of which have just been shared with donors, Government and UN/NGO partners is an example of how we have been more proactive in assessing the context and need, linked to improving timeliness.
- The new Country Operational Model highlighted some key aspects learnt from the Drought Response Programme. This includes revising the MEAL framework which will strengthen mainstreaming of accountability and gender and community resilience and preparedness.

4. Are there HIT findings that you would recommend for action by the Humanitarian Department? And how can HD support the Region's response to the HITs?

- Timeliness. A concerted and funded plan to invest in country level humanitarian capacity. Work with the country programmes to create an organisational framework or triggers for pre-emptive investment or response to early warnings that would allow CPs to raise the alarm in a way that guarantees a response.