






Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Francoise Vanni

Country Director: Aida Pesquera

Name of Project reviewed: Guatemala Highlands Value Chain Development Alliance (GUAB49)

Date: 21/12/12

Outcome/Impact	Rating	Short Commentary
Outcome 1 – Greater women’s involvement in household decision-making		No evidence of an increased level of involvement for women in household decision-making.
Outcome 2 – Greater influence for women in community-level associations		Evidence of positive change, not among women direct beneficiaries, but among the wives and partners of male beneficiaries.
Outcome 3 – Attitudes to women’s economic roles		Evidence of improved attitudes among the female household members of male beneficiaries, but no indication of attitude change among the female beneficiaries themselves.
Outcome 4 – Women’s self-efficacy		Evidence of increased self-efficacy among women direct beneficiaries <i>and</i> among female household members of male beneficiaries.
Outcome 5 - Increased household income		No evidence of improvement in indicators of household income or wellbeing.

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

The report was discussed with the implementing partner, Oxfam team and the evaluation team. Two teleconferences were held.

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

Yes.

The project audited is one of 3 projects developed with ADAM (partner) to support the same 4 producer organisations and thus, the Alliance with the private sector: GUAB49 - building of infrastructure (the project audited); GUAB38 – food security; GUAB62 – women empowerment in the value chain.

The project GUAB49 was selected for the effectiveness audit because it had been closed in Opal. The project was created in Opal to build infrastructure facilities to support the Alliance with the private sector companies called “Guatemala Highlands Value Chain Development Alliance”. The “closed” status in Opal reflected that the construction of the infrastructure facilities (the main project activity) had finished, but they were mostly not in use yet, so we couldn't expect the project to show impact.

This limitation was identified by Oxfam team in Guatemala in an early stage but only until the beginning of the field work was taken into consideration, meaning that a new “logic of change” was created to be able to integrate the work developed by the 3 projects. This model was not really well described.

Even though there was still potential to find impact from the earlier food security project (GUAB38) in the same four producers' associations, and from the women's economic leadership support to access the broccoli value chain (GUAB62) – but even the earliest of these other activities began only in the second half of 2010. While the effectiveness audit will be able to make an assessment of the short-term impact of these activities, it would have been best to wait until the project(s) were more mature before becoming eligible for an effectiveness audit.

Because of the strategic importance of these 3 projects, Oxfam gives a close follow up of the progress towards impact, so the results were not a surprise. Regular meetings amongst ADAM, Oxfam and the private sector companies are held during the year for monitoring results. For operational follow up, a Management Committee also monitors the results every 3 months. This committee is integrated by: ADAM (Director, technicians and admin staff), Oxfam (CD, Program and admin staff) and the 4 representatives of the producer organisations.

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 outcome related to women self efficacy was well scored.

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.

Yes.

There was no evidence of an increased level of involvement for women in household decision-making two main reasons may explain this:

- More deliberate activities oriented to specifically to change power dynamics in the household level are needed. ADAM has been trained in WEL and has implemented projects with WEL methodology, but this particular set of projects do not have enough emphasis in increasing the level of involvement for women in household decision making.
- The other reason has been already described above: the short period of implementation. In fact since the end of the audit some progress has been achieved

There was no evidence of increased household incomes:

- When the audit was done, the producer organisations had done only one commercial transaction with the companies members of the Alliance (Sysco, Superior and Sumar). That transaction was done with the normal rules of the companies. Now a negotiation committee was installed (between producer organisations and Sumar with support of ADAM), new rules were agreed with Sumar, and as a consequence, producers got better returns in the next commercial transaction.
-

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 GUAB49 in Opal is closed but the process that the project funded is continuing.

The following activities have been implemented since the audit was done:

- The infrastructure is being used to produce organic compost and seeds. These businesses are being managed by women. In the last crop the productivity and incomes received by women improved.
- A negotiation process was held with the buying companies (private sector companies members of the Alliance) – which have allowed the women to get better conditions and prices for their crops and thus, better incomes.
- Activities are being designed in order to improve the analysis with women and men on how to better involve women in household

decision-making.

- Re. the recommendation related to review the fertilizer which had not shown an increase of the productivity of the maize: we reviewed and now the producer organisations are producing organic fertilizer. By doing this their incomes have increased as well as the productivity of the land (doubled).

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

Programme Learning Considerations

Oxfam and ADAM will monitor the evolution of the outcomes calcified as weak to endure they keep on improving. The mechanism for doing this is by keep regular field meetings, and the regular meetings of the Management Committee and the meetings between ADAM, Oxfam, private sector companies and the producers.

We have considered using the sample interviewed for the project effectiveness review as a baseline for the full project (GUAB62) as the report suggests but it was too late for this, as the sample for the baseline had already been selected. We can nevertheless use the outcomes detailed in the audit report as a reference to improve the project.

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 project hasn't ended.

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

It is ok to publish it, if we make clear that the results of the audit are a consequence of the immature nature of the process evaluated.