

## Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response




**Regional Director:** Cherian Mathews

**Country Director:** Anthony Scott Faiia, Oxfam in Nepal


**Name of Project Reviewed:** Climate Change Adaptation and Advocacy Project Nepal

**Date:** 01042013

**Participants in the Management Response:** Binay Dhital and Prabin Man Singh

Dimension	Outcome / indicator	Cut-off – a household scores positively if:	% supported households above cut off (unadjusted)	Evidence of impact	Large/modest impact	Directly targeted by project	Linked to project logic
Overall resilience 	Overall Resilience Index – global outcome indicator	Household has an AF Resilience score above the median score for comparator households	86%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
Livelihood viability (30% weighting) 	Household wealth status	It owns $\geq 3$ small assets Or $\geq 2$ big assets Or 2 small assets + 1 big asset.	79%	No		No	Yes
	Household food security	It reports having had to cut the size of meals, eat fewer meals, or reduce food consumed by adults in household $\geq 3$ times in past week and reports not incidence of having to borrow food, going to sleep hungry, or going through a whole day with no food.	87%	No		No	Yes
	Household dietary diversity	It consumed in the past 7 days a carbohydrate source $\geq 7$ times; a protein source $\geq 3$ times; and any vegetable source $\geq 3$ times.	87%	Yes	M	No	Yes
	Livelihood diversification	It engages in $\geq 2$ livelihood activities with $\geq 50\%$ dependency on activities assumed to be significantly drought tolerant.	46%	No		Yes	Yes
	Livelihood risk – males in household	Male household members are involved in at least one livelihood activity which is assumed to be significantly drought tolerant	90%	Yes	M	No	No
	Livelihood risk – females in household	Female household members are involved in at least one livelihood activity which is assumed to be significantly drought tolerant	83%	No		No	No
	Crop portfolio	It cultivated $\geq 3$ crop types, including at least one drought-resistant crop.	88%	Yes	M	Yes	Yes
Innovation potential (20% weighting) 	Attitudes towards new livelihood practices	Respondent either does not agree at all or agrees only to a small extent with 5 out of the 6 negatively phrased statements (Likert scale).	67%	No		Yes	Yes
	Awareness of climate change	Respondent either does not agree at all or agrees only to a small extent with 5 out of the 6 negatively phrased statements (Likert scale).	93%	No		Yes	Yes
	Innovation practice	Respondent reports having tried out or experimented with at least one new activity over the past 2 years.	68%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes

	Access to credit	Respondent reports that household took out loan in last 2 years Or could borrow at least 10,000 rupees in the event it was needed from a money lender, non-local family members, savings group, or bank/credit institution.	89%	No		No	No
	Access to state innovative support	Respondent reports having had accessed state extension support in new techniques in the last two years and reports at least finding the support moderately helpful	21%	Yes	M	No	Yes
<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Outcome / indicator</b>	<b>Cut-off – a household scores positively if:</b>	<b>% supported households above cut off (unadjusted)</b>	<b>Evidence of impact</b>	<b>Large/modest impact</b>	<b>Directly targeted by project</b>	<b>Linked to project logic</b>
<b>Access to contingency resources and support</b> (20% weighting) <b>G</b>	Group participation	Respondent reports having had accessed state extension support in new techniques in the last two years and reports at least finding the support moderately helpful	84%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Social connectivity	Respondent reports being an active participant in at least 2 groups with medium involvement in decision making in at least one.	87%	Yes	L	No	No
	Perceptions of local government emergency support	Respondent agrees at least to a medium extent with 5 out of the 6 positively phrased statements.	22%	Yes	M	No	No
	Savings	Respondent states that there is enough savings to enable them to survive for at least 14 days in the event of a drought.	68%	Yes	M	No	Yes
	Remittances or formal earnings	It reports have receipt of transfer money from outside community and/or someone in the home has a formal job	62%	Yes	M	No	No
<b>Integrity of the natural and built environment</b> (15% weighting) <b>G</b>	Fertility of local soils	It reports no negative change in fertility of farm plot	31%	Yes	M	No	Yes
	Extent of soil erosion	It does not report experiencing severe erosion.	97%	Yes	L	No	Yes
	Access to irrigation for farming	It reports having access to irrigation facilities or experienced only of small portion of its crops being lost during the 2011 drought.	60%	Yes	M	Yes	Yes
	Access to safe drinking-water year round	It did not report experiencing serious difficulties accessing drinking water for domestic use.	43%	No		Yes	Yes
	Extent of vegetative cover in farm plot	It reported having at least 5% coverage of agricultural land with trees/non-agricultural vegetation	78%	Yes	M	No	Yes

	Extent farming activities affected by drought	It reports having experienced only of small portion of its crops being lost during the 2011 drought.	55%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
<b>Social and institutional capability</b> (15% weighting) 	Awareness of drought preparedness plan	It is at least partly aware of the contents of the plan.	38%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Participation in drought prep. meetings	It has participated at least one meeting in past 12 months	30%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Receipt of drought prep. information	It had received such information in past 12 months	36%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Awareness of community level drought risk reduction initiatives	It is aware of at least 2 community level initiatives taken place in past 3 years	90%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Water resource dispute experience	It does not report being involved in any disputes in past 2 years	81%	No		No	No
	Awareness that local leaders are undertaking action	It is at least partly aware that community leaders/institutions are doing something on the adaptation front.	30%	Yes	L	No	No
	Level of confidence in effectiveness of local leaders /institutions	Respondent agrees at least to a medium extent with 5 out of the 6 positively phrased statements.	24%	Yes	M	No	No

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

Following discussion on the review report in the project team, the team had a teleconference with PPAT team. In the telecom, PPAT team briefed the project team on the findings of the report and clarified its questions and queries. The review report has been shared with other programme teams of Oxfam in Nepal and the partner organisation that implemented the project.

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

Yes, they do. The review brought out both intended and unintended achievements made by the project. This serves as learning for the country team that it should try to capture changes and impacts even beyond a particular project scope in the course of monitoring and evaluations.

Out of 30 indicators used in the review, 13 are directly targeted by the project. The levels of impact of 7 out of the 13 indicators are measured as '**Large**' and those of 2 indicators as '**Modest**'. Measurement for 9 indicators has shown **evidence of impact**, while that of only 4 indicators shows **no evidence of impacts**.

The findings of the review report are well in alignment with the expected targets of the project.

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

The review report concluded that *86 per cent of surveyed intervention households demonstrate greater ability to reduce risk and adapt to emerging trends and uncertainty*. It further said that the overall impact of the project is '**Large**' and there is **evidence of impact**. The project was aimed at building the target communities' resilience to climatic shocks and the results of the review prove that we have been able to meet the objective.

Of the five dimensions of resilience surveyed, the review report concluded that in four dimensions – **Innovation potential, Access to contingency resources and support, Integrity of the natural and built environment and social and institutional capability** – the project has demonstrated evidence of large impact. At community level, the project had two key components – building awareness on climate change and its impacts, and community based adaptation focussing on agriculture and water resources. The project conducted training, organised street drama, published posters, wall paintings and other activities to raise awareness to the community about climate change and its impacts. The project supported the communities with improved drought tolerant seeds, drip irrigation scheme, solar water lifting scheme and watershed management to help them better adapt to climate change impacts. These are the elements that the five dimensions of resilience surveyed are also made up of. Therefore the review has been able to identify the strong aspects of the project.

The impacts have come from a confluence of various factors. They include, among others, concentration in a small geographical area, regular monitoring and follow-up, active participation and influence of partners and target group members in the project, and proper response to community needs and problems. However, a detailed assessment is required to further analyse the reasons for these results.

**4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?**

The review report has identified the area that need to be improved --livelihood viability. According to the review finding, the project has demonstrated evidence of modest impact in this area. We agree with the finding.

**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 ended in March 2012.

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

*Programme Learning Considerations:*

The review report has identified the following points for further consideration of the country team and partners:

**1. Consider further research to evaluate the effects of advocacy efforts connected to this project.**

At present, there is no plan to separately evaluate the effects of advocacy part of the project. Oxfam has started a new project on food security governance in three districts including the Village Development Committee (VDC) covered by the reviewed project. The new project also focuses on building advocacy capacity of women and men farmers to hold the government agencies accountable to ensure their right to food. Some of the advocacy agenda, especially policy change/implementation agenda, are similar in the reviewed project as well as in the new one.

At the national level, the advocacy work initiated by the reviewed project is further supplemented by two other projects — EU-Supported project focussing on strengthening non-state actors' role in climate negotiations, and Adaptation Finance Accountability Initiatives (AFAI). The project reviewed together with the EU-supported project lobbied the Ministry of Environment for formulating National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) and a national climate change policy. Currently, our lobby has a focus on honest implementation of priority projects identified by NAPA. Findings of the AFAI will serve as concrete evidence for us to advocate for effective implementation of the provision in the climate change policy for allocating 80% of adaptation finance for the community level initiatives.

As part of our regular monitoring and evaluation, we will be assessing the effects of our advocacy efforts made as part of the reviewed project and the three other current projects.

**2. Keep monitoring progress of the supported villages, and consider whether it is appropriate to scale-up the project interventions to the wider area.**

The new project is implemented through the same partner organisation that implemented the reviewed project. Oxfam and its partner organisation have physical presence in the project VDCs and will be following up with the project beneficiaries on the progress of the supported villages. It is certainly appropriate to scale up the project interventions to wider areas. However, in view of the limited UNR available in the country and the unpredictability of donor funding, scaling up the project interventions at our own initiative is not easy. But our project designing in the days to come will be informed by the learning of the reviewed project.

**3. Explore options for strengthening the support to existing livelihood practices by considering greater investment in the improved cereal seed and water resource management components of the project.**

The new project (food security governance) focuses on advocacy to hold the government line agencies accountable to ensure food security. One of the key policy asks is to increase government investment in community based adaptation programme, especially on agriculture and water resources management. Within Oxfam, there is currently no programme on climate change adaptation. However the Sustainable Livelihood and Food Security (SLFS) programme has a plan to design such a project, particularly focusing on water resources management based on the learning from the reviewed 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?**

As our suggestion, we would like to ask the PPAT team, if the scope of the effectiveness review allows, to make the review further effective by assessing the reasons for achievements, under achievements and failures. Such analysis would be highly beneficial for the project team to learn and strengthen future programme design.

The resilience framework adopted in the review is very useful in designing similar project on community based adaptation. It has also been good learning that while undertaking project monitoring and/or evaluation, both intended and unintended achievements need to be documented. Very often we only limit ourselves to logical frame indicators during monitoring and evaluation. Review methodology is very comprehensive. In future projects, we will try to apply control versus experimental group method while evaluating the project.

We expect Oxford to undertake a detailed assessment of the reasons behind the impacts of the reviewed project so that we can utilise the learning while designing similar projects in future.

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

We have no objection to publishing the report.