

Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Mamadou Biteye

Country Director: Mamudu Michael Salifu

Name of Project reviewed: RHV Campaign, Liberia

Summary of Contribution Scores

| Outcome | Rating | Commentary | Other evidenced explanations and extent of their contribution (high, medium, low) |
|--|--------|---|--|
| Outcome 1: Women's complaint heard by government (Monrovia) | 4/5 | High level of change realised, Medium project contribution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past incidents of women's mobilisation (medium) • Existing grievances among women's groups prior to mobilisation (high) |
| Outcome 2: Perceived decrease in GBV and rape in community (Buchanan, Kakata, Tubmanburg) | 2/5 | High level of change realised, Low project contribution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other NGO advocacy (High) • Ministry of Gender advocacy (High) • Police activity (High) |
| Outcome 3: Perceived decrease in GBV and rape in community (Compound 3 Area B) | 4/5 | Medium level of change realised, High project contribution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other NGO Advocacy (Medium) • Ministry of Gender advocacy (low) • Police activity (Low) |

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

This will be shared with other partners to promote learning; it has also been used to support a comprehensive operational framework for the RHV Programme. Learning from this project will also be used as baseline for the second phase of the RHV project.

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

This question was not asked in the interim management response form. Therefore no response is available.

| |
|---|
| <p>3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (ie large impact)?</p> |
| <p>If so, please comment briefly on why you think this was so.</p> <p>The evaluation did not elaborate deeply on the contributions of the Radio Programme to the project. Awareness was created amongst the people of Buchanan city on the AU Women’s protocol through its transmission in Bassa dialect. This methodology had not been employed in the area before.</p> |
| <p>4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?</p> |
| <p>If so, please comment on why you think this was so.</p> <p><i>The results identified weaknesses in the areas of advocacy programming and Monitoring and evaluation. However minimal supports from the country programme /RMC to the partners were not identified especially on capacity in advocacy and programme quality.</i></p> |
| <p>5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?</p> |
| <p><i>The programme is ongoing up to March 2013. The following actions have taken place so far; a comprehensive change theory for the project to guide implementation; The MEL Framework has been reviewed and its operational framework put in place to guide the monitoring and evaluation process; Monthly progress reports, bi monthly monitoring visits by project manager and quarterly joint monitoring visits by the country leadership team have been put in place. The country programme will also review the MOUs signed with the partners to introduce new clauses that define Oxfam and partner responsibilities such as monthly reporting, accountability at community level etc.</i></p> <p><i>The RMC and HD should support country programmes to move from generic gender equality to specific issues on women rights such as violence against women. That way, these offices will be well equipped with human and financial resources to support such initiatives at a country level.</i></p> <p><i>Relating to the evaluation, increase resources for such studies to enable researchers cover wider ground when collecting their data. For instance, the consultant on this study was only able to visit 3 sites out of 8 to gather data due to financial limitations</i></p> |
| <p>b) What actions are you planning in response to the Programme Learning Considerations?</p> |
| <p><u>Advocacy Programming</u></p> <p>1. Increased attention to the development of technical skills like media outreach, writing policy briefs and bills, and lobbying as effective means of voicing concerns against government could benefit the stakeholders. If such training is not possible, then partner organisations would benefit from further sensitization on the scenarios in which to use mobilization and sit-in activity, and the possible negative</p> |

effects that can result from these. It would also be beneficial to provide further sensitization that is focused on the management of expectations with advocacy – specifically to let beneficiaries know that the act of ‘raising your voice’ and letting government know that you are aware of laws protecting women, does not automatically translate into positive actions by the government.

2. It can be recommend that more systematic records are taken surrounding specific interventions that have occurred, and further research conducted on other organizations in the area that have had similar interventions in the past, or are planning similar interventions in the future. From there, well-organised partnerships could help consolidate the advocacy efforts.

Monitoring and Evaluation

3. It can also be recommended that there be more attention given to monitoring and evaluation of project implementation and outcomes from all project partners involved. Even where country-level programming does not necessarily match the guidelines proposed by regional and global log frames, the outcomes that are being pursued are still minimally supervised and in many cases, activities stop or are poorly executed. This inhibits the ability to learn what programs are effective and whether certain outcomes can be attributed to RHV programming. In addition to frequent communication between partners, there should be more frequent evaluations conducted on key programmes being implemented. If it seems that partners are not doing evaluations on their own, then it might be useful to assign an external evaluator to RHV projects, responsible for visiting site areas at random times to assess.

See response 1. and 5a.

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?

N/A

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

No objections