

Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Fran Equiza

Country Director: Ayman Omer

Name of Response reviewed: 2011 Ethiopia Drought Response

Date: 25th September 2012

Summary of Results

Number	Quality standard	Met (score 4)	Partially met (score 2)	Not met (score 0)
1	Timeliness – rapid analysis within one day of getting reports of raised alarm, assessment within one week and assistance started within one week of assessing need to response		2	
2	Coverage – 25% of the total affected population but in exceptional circumstances then: Total number of beneficiaries is at least 5% of the disaster-affected population and selected areas the most-affected or marginalised		2	
3	Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere and Oxfam quality standards			0
4	Indicators (both process and impact) in place and being measured		1	
5	Feedback/complaints system in place and functioning and documented evidence of consultation and participation		1	

6	Partners fully engaged in all aspects of the project cycle	Not Applicable		
7	Programme reflects measures to address dignity and protection issues		1	
8	Programme delivery addresses gender and specific needs of vulnerable groups		1	
9	Exit strategy/recovery plan in place			0
10	Evidenced utilisation of contingency plan in last humanitarian response			0
11	Programme addresses advocacy issues			0
12	Programme is linked to/will be linked to DRR interventions in area		1	
	Total Score		9	

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.

No

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.

Seven areas were partially met and four were not met. This is mainly due to:

- a. Significant lack of documented evidences (e.g. how we addressed advocacy issues) and data (e.g. coverage), which is crucial for a desk review/research such as this evaluation,
- b. The complexity of some areas (e.g. Dolo Ado) constrain full adherence to Sphere standards within a short period of time. Furthermore Ethiopia's Government has its own set of standards for EFSL and WASH work, some of which are endorsed by UNICEF as appropriate for dryland areas e.g. water trucking standards. A desk review may not have picked up on these nuances.

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

The following actions have been undertaken:

- A contingency plan has been developed (signed off in May 012) and is currently under revision. This contingency plan is much clearer on target population which aims for between 10 and 15% of affected people, not 25%. 10 – 15% considered appropriate for the anticipated scenarios (slow onset drought-related emergencies).
- Technical aspects of some interventions have been reviewed and strengthened and/or strengthening is underway (e.g. water supply system in Dolo Ado),
- One Humanitarian Technical Team is under development which will strengthen technical support provided to all Oxfam work. Already the WASH team has been significantly strengthened and a new full time position has been created for an EFSL Coordinator.
- An action plan to bridge the divide between long-term development programming and humanitarian response has been developed. Implementation is progressing
- Shinile Programme Team has been significantly strengthened which will allow faster and higher quality start-up
- Addis Programme Support team has also been strengthened and will be more mobile which will allow faster start up.

The programme is planning the following actions:

- Developing an Emergency Response and Preparedness Team (ERPT), including the One Technical Team, as part of Contingency Plan review
- Investing in this ERPT through capacity building plan which is being developed from findings of the Humanitarian Capacity Assessment
- Reviewing and strengthening of MEL framework,
- Developing exit strategy for Dolo Ado,
- Reviewing structure and ways of working to strengthen the linkages between response and advocacy.

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?

No specific recommendations to HD but a suggestion to complement the desk research of the HIT with short validation visits as lack of documented evidences may affect the findings of the HIT.