

Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Fran Equiza

Country Director: Ayman Omer

Name of Project reviewed: Disaster Risk Reduction Programming in Ethiopia's Somali

Date: 01/07/2013

Participants in the Management Response: Mark Blackett, Million Ali, Mohammed Ahmed Hussain, Mustapha Mohammed, Elias Kebede, Azaria Berhe, Abdirashid Mohammed, Houda Mohammed

Summary of contribution scores

G Overall Results		Positive and statistically significant differences found between general intervention and comparison groups on the base resilience index, on the Alkire-Foster resilience index, and on the Global Indicator for adaptation and risk reduction.			
Dimension	Characteristic	% of household in project communities scoring positively	Directly targeted by project	Connected to project logic	Evidence of impact on characteristic
Livelihood Viability G	Household asset ownership	29%	No	Yes	No
	Household food security	70%	No	Yes	No
	Household dietary diversity	18%	No	Yes	No
	Livelihood diversification	13%	No	No	No
	Gender risk differential	74%	No	No	No
	Crop portfolio	41%	No	No	No
	Livestock portfolio	40%	No	Yes	No
	Livestock herd size	42%	No	Yes	No
	Ownership of pack animal	70%	No	No	No
	Livestock lost to disease	77%	No	Yes	Yes (RDD III)
	Livestock lost to drought	54%	No	Yes	Yes
	Livestock vaccination	62%	No	No	Yes(RDD III)
	Access to early-warning information	43%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Drought preparedness practice	62%	No	Yes	No	
Innovation Potential G	Attitudes towards new livelihood practices	24%	No	Yes	Yes
	Awareness of climate change	17%	No	Yes	Yes
	Adoption of innovative practices	76%	No	Yes	Yes
	Access to credit	36%	No	No	No
	Access to state innovative support	10%	No	No	No
Access to Contingency Resources and Support	Market access	86%	No	No	Yes
	Awareness of drought preparedness plan	14%	Yes	Yes	Yes (RDD III)
	Participation in drought preparedness meetings	17%	Yes	Yes	Yes (RDD III)
	Group participation	28%	No	Yes	No
	Social connectivity	55%	No	Yes	No

A	Perceptions of local government emergency support	41%	No	No	No
	Savings	24%	No	No	No
	Remittances or formal earnings	8%	No	No	No
	Ownership of fungible livestock	34%	No	Yes	No
Natural & Built Environment	Extent of soil erosion	73%	No	No	Yes
	Access to irrigation for farming	31%	No	No	No
	Access to water for livestock/consumption	57%	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Access to grazing land	73%	Yes	Yes	Yes (Appeal/CIDA)
Social & Institutional Capability	Receipt of information or training on drought preparedness	9%	Yes	Yes	Yes (RDD III)
	Awareness of local DRR initiatives	42%	Yes	Yes	Yes (RDD III)
	Experience of violent disputes	99%	No	No	No
	Awareness of local efforts to support adaptation	36%	Yes	Yes	No
	Effectiveness of local leaders and institutions	15%	Yes	Yes	Yes (RDD III)

Applicability: These results apply to the general intervention population of all the communities targeted by the two projects in Awbare and Harshin woredas, except for Kam Harshin and Baligas. The effectiveness review did not cover the project activities as implemented in Kabribaya woreda.

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

The initial report was circulated in mid-May. ACD discussed findings with the project team in Jijiga. A telecom was held between the project team and PPAT. The 2nd draft was circulated on 10th June and final comments sent.

The review provided some important findings around the concept of resilience which has influenced the Oxfam Ethiopia programme team's thinking as we implement current projects and design new ones. We have also disseminated the draft findings at a National Disaster Risk Management conference which focused on resilience building and obtained positive feedback on our efforts to measure resilience. The participants were interested in how resilience at community level takes time to build in such challenging environments and the potential of linking community plans to various funding sources in government, UN, donors and NGOs.

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

Overall the Ethiopia team is happy with the green lights showing positive change, especially regarding the livestock vaccination campaign. However the team has concerns with the following findings:

- The review concluded that the impact of Pastoral Field Schools (PFS) could not be assessed given that participants had a different profile to the target beneficiaries. The team believes that PFS participants are not significantly different from target beneficiaries in terms of education and wealth and it is unfortunate that this important intervention could not be evaluated. We will therefore ensure that the next phase of support for PFS's (with FAO support) will ensure that there is sufficient investment in selection/profiling to demonstrate that poorer households are engaged in PFS's and we can clearly track impact.
- The review found that HH level engagement in committees and use of Early Warning Information (EWI) was relatively low. This is not the experience of the project team who have worked closely with the communities on these structures and use of EWI. This finding also contrasts with the RDDIV Baseline finding¹ which found that "94 percent of the sample population have had basic training on drought management, 28% rate their preparedness as very good, while 72 percent rated it good. The timing of the preparedness activities showed that 84 percent undertake the activities during alert phase."

We therefore believe that there may have been a problem in translation/communication around the issue of household vs. community preparedness and resilience.

¹ The effectiveness review focuses on the Regional Drought Decision III (RDDIII) project. OGB implemented a subsequent project (RDDIV). It conducted a baseline survey and final external evaluation at the beginning and end, respectively, of RDDIV.

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

The following areas were highlighted as strengths:

- Livestock lost to disease (77% scoring positively)
- Drought preparedness practice (62% scoring positively)
- Access to water for livestock/consumption (57% scoring positively)
- Access to grazing land (73% scoring positively)

These are in line with our expectations

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

The following areas were highlighted as weaknesses:

- Awareness of drought preparedness plan (14% scoring positively)
- Participation in drought preparedness meetings (14% scoring positively)
- Effectiveness of local leaders and institutions (15% scoring positively)

As indicated in section 2 these weaknesses are inconsistent with the results of the baseline survey and the final evaluation of RDDIV.

On effectiveness of local leaders and institutions we would have expected significant improvements with respect to the CMDRM Committees, however perhaps this indicator reflects the lack of progress in improving effectiveness of government institutions. This was a target for RDDIV and is being taken forward in the Dutch funded project.

5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?

Yes, the project work continued in a fourth phase of funding from ECHO (RDDIV), which ended on 30th June 2013. The work will now focus on strengthening structures and policies under a 4 year Dutch funded project. Specifically Oxfam is working to establish and strengthen hybrid (government/traditional) committees to effectively manage natural resources (pasture and water) using an eco-system approach i.e. cross-border. This Dutch project also aims to institutionalise CMDRM Committees and draw down funding for Community Plans from external sources. In this way Community Plans will also become more “alive” in that actions will be funded and we would expect community engagement to become even stronger.

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

Programme Learning Considerations:

- **Explore how to involve community members more widely in community-level drought preparedness activities, and to ensure that training and early-warning information is fully disseminated.**

As noted above, the very low level of participation (14%) is inconsistent with the findings of the baseline survey and final evaluation of RDDIV. While the final evaluation recommends strengthening community-level drought preparedness, it scores various variable of community-level drought preparedness much higher than the effectiveness review. For instance, it was reported that (64.6%) of the target population received EWI from community early warning committee which enabled them to prepare and response to risk within the community. The household survey confirmed that the community utilizes the early warning information to enhance livestock marketing (59.4%) and plan for mobility (51.1%). The community also utilizes the early warning information to preposition resources (41.2%) and conduct livestock disease response/vaccination (35.1%).

We are therefore continuing to invest in improving the system and household/community engagement in it. Specifically there are country plans to develop the EWS aiming for a simple, harmonized system that all Oxfams can promote. In the operational area of the Dutch project we also aim to improve the system based on these plans and strengthen existing information flows from Government to community and vice-versa.

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 noted above, work is continuing. However the initial Dutch project submitted was EUR10m of which we only received less than 50% in the final contract. We are therefore working to secure additional funds which can strengthen the work and scale up strategy. We therefore need RC and Oxford support to improve technical design of project, support on policy work and find suitable donors.

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

Ethiopia team has no objection to publishing the report.