

Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Laurie Adams

Country Director: Nellie Nyang'wa

Name of Project reviewed: Community-Led Disaster Risk Reduction in Mongu, Zambia




Date: May 2013

Participants in the Management Response: Dailes Judge, Teddy Kabunda and Eneya Maseko

Table 1: Summary results

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 G	Overall Resilience Index – global outcome indicator	Household has an AF Resilience score above the median score for comparator households	64%	Yes	M	Yes	Yes
Livelihood viability (20% weighting) G A	Household wealth status	It owns ≥ 3 small assets Or ≥ 2 big assets Or 2 small assets + 1 big asset.	60%	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 ≥ 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.	37%	No		No	Yes
	Household dietary diversity	It consumed in the past 7 days a carbohydrate source ≥ 7 times; a protein source ≥ 3 times; and any vegetable source ≥ 3 times.	54%	Yes	M	No	Yes
	Livelihood diversification	It engages in ≥ 2 livelihood activities with $\geq 50\%$ dependency on activities assumed to be significantly drought tolerant.	41%	No		Yes	Yes
	Crop portfolio	It cultivated ≥ 3 crop types, including at least one drought-resistant crop.	62%	No		Yes	Yes
	Availability and use of early warning information	It received early-warning information prior to the flooding in 2012.	82%	Yes	M	Yes	Yes
	Flood preparedness practice	It took preparatory actions to protect their household or their assets from flooding in 2012.	47%	No		Yes	Yes
Innovation potential (20% weighting) G	Attitudes towards new livelihood practices	Respondent either does not agree at all or agrees only to a small extent with 2 out of the 3 negatively phrased statements (Likert scale).	75%	No		Yes	Yes
	Innovation practice	Respondent reports having tried out or experimented with at least one new activity over the past 2 years.	81%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Access to credit	Respondent reports that household took out loan in last 2 years Or could borrow at least 500 ZMK in the event it was needed from a money lender, non-local family members, savings group, or bank/credit institution.	53%	No		No	No

2012/13 Zambia Project Effectiveness Review – Management Response

	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.	45%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Market access	Respondent reports having had no severe problems in accessing markets or market information.	33%	No		No	Yes
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
Access to contingency resources and support (20% weighting) 	Group participation	Respondent reports being an active participant in at least 2 groups with medium involvement in decision making in at least one.	54%	No		No	No
	Social connectivity	Respondent agrees at least to a medium extent with 3 out of the 5 positively phrased statements.	40%	No		No	No
	Perceptions of local gvnt emergency support	Respondent agrees at least to a medium extent with 1 out of the 2 positively phrased statements.	43%	No		No	Yes
	Savings	Respondent states that there is enough savings to enable them to survive for at least 7 days in the event of a drought.	21%	No		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.	34%	No		No	No
	Ownership of convertible livestock	It reports owning at least 5 goats or at least 5 poultry.	36%	No		No	Yes
Integrity of the natural and built environment (20% weighting) 	Fertility of local soils	It reports no negative change in fertility of farm plot	24%	No		No	No
	Extent of soil erosion	It does not report experiencing severe erosion.	61%	No		No	No
	Access to irrigation for farming	It reports having access to irrigation facilities.	62%	No		No	Yes
	Access to water for drinking and livestock	It reports no difficulties in accessing water for the household or its animals during the 2012 dry season.	53%	Yes	M	No	Yes
	Extent farming activities affected by flooding	It reports having experienced only of small portion of its crops being lost during the 2012 flooding.	50%	No		Yes	Yes
	Use of improved sanitation	It reports using improved sanitation facilities.	40%	Yes	L	No	No
Social and institutional capability (20% weighting) 	Awareness of drought preparedness plan	It is at least partly aware of the contents of the plan.	54%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Participation in drought prep. Meetings	It has participated at least one meeting in past 12 months	69%	Yes	L	Yes	Yes
	Receipt of drought prep. Information	It had received such information in past 12 months	50%	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	79%	No		Yes	Yes

Water resource dispute experience	It does not report being involved in any disputes in past 2 years	85%	No		No	Yes
Awareness that local leaders are undertaking action	It is at least partly aware that community leaders/institutions are doing something on the adaptation front.	53%	Yes	L	No	Yes
Level of confidence in effectiveness of local leaders /institutions	Respondent agrees at least to a medium extent with 1 out of the 2 positively phrased statements.	54%	No		No	Yes

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

Two project review workshops have been conducted in Lusaka and Livingstone for the Citizen Participation in Adaptation to Climate Change – CPACC project which is the successor to the Community Led Disaster Risk Reduction - CLDRR project.

The first project learning review was conducted in Lusaka in July 2013 where all implementing partners were present, representing the three districts where Oxfam is implementing the CPACC project. This meeting focused on: sharing the effectiveness review draft report and lessons learnt from the CLDRR project; review of project plans & scope; identifying areas for learning and synergy; enhancing methodologies and practices for better implementation and results monitoring; and increasing partner collaboration and networking.

A second program review meeting was held in Livingstone in November, 2013, comprising of a wider range of stakeholders including government and community members. This meeting focused on the programme strategy and discussed partner & stakeholder operational challenges and opportunities as well as application of lessons as highlighted in the draft effectiveness review and from implementation of the projects. In both meetings, the gaps identified in the review process were discussed extensively with the view of identifying priority actions and key strategies for improving resilience work.

The measurement of the selected outputs was also a major focus as the newly revised MEL framework was shared.

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

The project that was reviewed (CLDRR) was developed and implemented before the organisation (Oxfam) developed the resilience building indicators and monitoring frameworks. As such the project design did not include some of the resilience dimensions and outcome indicators that it was subjected to such as access to contingency resources and integrity of natural and built environments. The two “R” ratings therefore are measured against elements that were not part of the project design or its implementation. However the CPAAC and the Climate Justice Initiative (CJI) projects that are now being implemented have a broader scope beyond the initial project.

Though the reviewed project did not specifically have the indicators that are now being used, we recognise and acknowledge the importance of aligning the follow on projects (CPAAC and CJI) to these dimensions and outcome indicators and ensuring that activities are delivered in a holistic and sustainable manner if we have to realise long term changes in the target communities. As such the action planning following the review meeting held recently in Livingstone will attempt to establish the extent to which interventions align to the resilience dimensions and to the new MEL frameworks that have been developed and in use for data capturing.

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.

Yes. The review showed a large impact in improving livelihood viability, and promoting social and institutional capabilities. There was also a high score in innovation potential, and overall resilience. This could be attributed to the project's extensive focus on developing community preparedness plans that were linked with district plans, community trainings and increasing their knowledge on sustainable livelihoods and giving them options on diversifying livelihood choices, supporting district and national level government to respond to early warning and extension service needs of the communities as well as supporting community mitigation and adaptation actions such as damming and river bank protection. The project did not only provide an opportunity for community members to learn new techniques but also provided a forum for exchange of ideas and have platforms for engaging (or challenging) local authorities on matters relating to risk reduction and development in general.

The project was not designed to have rigid activities as communities were given an opportunity on an annual basis to develop implementation plans based on their vulnerabilities and capabilities and develop local solutions which they felt would give better results. The dynamic, consultative process and flexible approach to implementation of various activities facilitated ownership and sustenance of results. It was the aim of the project to include as many stakeholders as possible in activities for maximum impact, learning and networking. The local leadership and the communities in general were determined to reduce their vulnerability to shocks and welcomed the opportunity to be supported to upscale their capabilities to make their plans a reality.

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

The two weak areas identified by the review are access to Contingency Resources (especially savings) and Support and Integrity (particularly sanitation) of the natural and built environment. As noted above the programme is implementing the CPAAC and CJI projects that have been developed with these concerns in mind and will work to improve the use of natural resources particularly strengthening women's access to natural resources as well as improving the natural resource management. The programme is also working with the Economic Justice team to support community's investment in producing beyond their consumption needs by strengthening their power in markets. It is envisaged that their income base will increase and contribute to higher savings and asset building at household and community level.

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 reviewed project is continuing but as two different projects – 1) Citizen Participation in Adaptation to Climate Change – CPACC; and Climate Justice Initiative and have taken into account the weak areas. The programme is also strengthening linkages with the Economic Justice Programme and the WASH programme with regard to markets and environmental issues respectively.

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

Programme Learning Considerations:

- Invest in research to inform advocacy efforts connected to this project at all levels – Local to national
- Explore use of evidence built to increase the scale of community ownership and replication adaption and resilience building.
- Facilitate /strengthen community and district government demands for investment in locally applicable early-warning systems and extension service support that is current with climate adaptation and resilience building methods and practices.
- Continue monitoring programme approaches to check if we are getting the desired results.
- Household profiling and case study documentation for evidence building
- Learning exchanges with similar Programmes in country and in the region

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