Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review
Management Response

Regional Director: Aboubacary Tall

Country Director: Cecilia Millan / Abakar Mahamat Ahmat

Name of Response reviewed: 2012 Chad Food Crisis Response

Date: 24th January 2014

Participants in the Management Response: Abakar Mahamat Ahmat, WN Eibrahim, Kumud Chandra, Mayanne Munan , Dedeou Yahya, Brigitte Topinanty, Mathilde Gueho

Summary of Results

Standard	*Level of achievement*	*Rating*
1. Rapid appraisal of facts within 24 hours of pre-defined trigger, plans in place and scale-up or start-up commenced within three days[1]	*Partially met*	*2/6*
2. Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure with clear justification for final count	*Met*	*6/6*
3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards	*Partially met*	*2/6*
4. MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators	*Partially met*	*1/3*
5. Feedback/complaints system for affected population in place and functioning and documented evidence of information sharing, consultation and participation leading to a programme relevant to context and needs	*Partially met*	*1/3*
6. Partner relationships defined, capacity assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle	*Partially met*	*1/3*
7. Programme is considered a safe programme: action taken to avoid harm and programme considered conflict sensitive	*Met*	*3/3*

---

[1] The timeliness standard for slow onset disasters was used because of the gradual evolution of the outbreak from January to June 2012.

8. Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys and vulnerable groups[2]	*Almost met*	*2/3*
9. Evidence that preparedness measures were in place and effectively auctioned	*Almost met*	*2/3*
10. Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy and has incorporated advocacy into programme plans based on evidence from the field	*Met*	*3/3*
11. Country programme has an integrated approach including reducing and managing risk though existing longer-term development programmes and building resilience for the future	*Almost met*	*2/3*
12. Evidence of appropriate staff capacity to ensure quality programming	*Almost met*	*2/3*
Final rating		**27/39**

1. Did the HIT identify areas that were particularly strong overall in the Region or in a particular country? (i.e. standards fully met)?

Yes. The following areas were identified as particularly strong overall.

- Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure with clear justification for final count - This was because of the usage of HEA as a targeting tool, helped in identifying the most vulnerable populations for humanitarian assistance. Oxfam was familiar with the context since we were present in the affected zones and this contributed in planning for 10% of the population and in calculating the scale up required.
- Programme is considered a safe programme: action taken to avoid harm and programme considered conflict sensitive – Oxfam's humanitarian response used a community based, participatory approach. Discussions with beneficiary populations were carried out at all stages of programme design and execution. Targeting ensured that there was no exclusion of certain sections of the populations. These measures contributed to the programme being safe and conflict sensitive.

- Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy and has incorporated advocacy into programme plans based on evidence from the field- existing country strategy and a specific advocacy strategy for the food crisis with strong buy in and implication of the regional office.

---

[2] Elderly, disabled, HIV positive, single women, female-headed households are examples

2. Did the HIT identify areas that were weak or very weak in the Region or a particular country (e.g. standards partly or not met)?

The areas identified by the HIT that were weak / very weak in Chad are:

Weaknesses in the rapid appraisal of facts to be able to start up a response in 24 hrs.
Application of sphere standards in humanitarian response.
Non implementation of the Country and Regional MEAL strategies.
Weaknesses in the feedback/ complaints system
Weaknesses in working with partners

Reasons

a) **Delayed response**
This was a slow onset crisis and existing indicators are not adapted to this kind of crisis. Non existing contingency plan for food security did play a role in the delay in response. Delays by donors were also a cause for this. So, as already discussed with PPAT, the indicators need to be reviewed for slow onset crises.
b) **SPHERE standards**
Sphere standards are not sufficiently integrated in proposals, logframe and M&E plans. This is also true for other standards such as HAP, or cluster definitions.
c) **MEAL Strategy**: There has been a strategy (regional and national) in place but it has never been implemented.
- Lack of in-depth assessment
- Chad MEAL strategy was drafted too late, thus leaving no time for training and proper implementation of the strategy
- No progress monitoring
- Lack of coordination/communication between MEAL team and program staff
d) **Feedback:**
System was in place but did not record complaints. Feeling that people don't feel safe while complaining. Some complaints are received without going through the committee which reflects fears of being identified. This has since been remedied and communities freely report without fear of contradiction. Post-conflict situation made difficult the implementation of this kind of process
2014 : diagnostic is planned to understand why complaints are not collected
Community leaders might have been not all and always well consulted. This has since been improved with consultations taking place between Oxfam GB and community leaders throughout every intervention. Community leaders are involved from targeting of beneficiaries to the eventual post distribution cycle.

MEAL monitors not enough in the field to collect feedback

Lack of sensitization on the system to communities

e) Partnership:

Partnership wasn't systematic

Partners are all newly created organizations; they don't have expertise and there are mostly geared towards development and not towards humanitarian response. They need to be trained on how to implement a humanitarian response.

Partnerships were not developed beforehand thus collaboration was difficult while implementing emergency response

3. What actions are being planned in response to the unmet or partially met benchmarks identified?

a) SPHERE- Engagement to clearly integrate and systematize use of SPHERE standards in all programming steps. At writing stage, MEAL needs to make sure that all indicators are SPHERE. The MEAL coordinator will also see with the region how they / Oxford can support the Oxfam and partner staff team get trained on SPHERE standards.

b) After the planned analysis, we will put in place a systematic system which records all complaints, follow-up and feedback to beneficiaries

c) COMPLAINTS AND FEEDBACK MECHANISM - Sensitive cases need to be reported to management and unresolved cases in the sit-rep since the main issue is the proper implementation of the system. The New MEAL coordinator will be in charge of effective implementation of the complaints systems (database, follow-up, feedbacks to communities)

d) PARTNERSHIP - Since this period, then there has been an extraordinary effort to work in closer collaboration with partners – with 2 sessions to explain what partnership means, training local partners on technical aspects of humanitarian response. Chad is a tricky context to work with partners on and thus all work being carried out in this domain needs to be done carefully and cautiously. We have also identified 3 new partners with the aim to widen our humanitarian partner portfolio. Some sessions for capacity building have already been organised for them. We'll continue the effort to build their capacity for timely and quality humanitarian responses.

4. Are there HIT findings that you would recommend for action by the Humanitarian Department? And how can HD support the Region's response to the HITs?

- There is need for greater support from Humanitarian Department for management of category 2 and 3 responses
- Trainings on HIT for the country programmes would be essential
- Reinforcement of human resource capacity both at the regional and country level with adapted trainings to ensure that countries can easily adapt to a scale up
- The humanitarian department needs to vulgarise more the tools developed for feedback mechanisms and accompany country programmes in the implementation and monitoring of these mechanisms