

**Oxfam Management Response to the review of:**  
Humanitarian Quality Assurance – South Sudan: Evaluation of the 2013 Juba conflict response  
(Effectiveness Review Series 2014/15)

**Regional Director:** Nigel Tricks

**Country Director:** Zlatko Gegic

**Name of Project reviewed:** 2013 Juba Conflict Response

**Date:** October 2015

**Participants in the Management Response:** Nigel Tricks, Francis LaCasse, Zlatko Gegic, Sharon Thangadurai, Emma Jane Drew, Kate Attwooll

**Summary of Results**

Standard	Level of achievement	Rating
1. Timeliness: Rapid appraisal of facts within 24 hours, plans in place and scale-up or start-up commenced within three days	Fully met	6/6
2. Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure with clear justification for final count	Fully met	6/6
3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards	Almost met	4/6
4. MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators	Almost met	2/3
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	Not met	0/3
6. Partner relationships defined, capacity assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle	Not applicable	NA
7. Programme is considered a safe programme: action taken to avoid harm and programme considered conflict sensitive	Met	3/3

8. Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys	Partly met	1/3
9. Programme (including advocacy) addresses specific concerns and needs of vulnerable groups	Almost met	2/3
10. Evidence that preparedness measures were in place and effectively auctioned	Fully met	3/3
11. Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy and has incorporated advocacy into programme plans based on evidence from the field	Fully met	3/3
12. Evidence of appropriate staff capacity to ensure quality programming	Partly met	1/3
13. Resilience	Not applicable	NA
<b>Final rating</b> <b>Equivalent to</b>		<b>31/42</b> <b>74%</b>

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

##### Areas for action highlighted in the Effectiveness Review

QS3 – implicit rather than explicit linking of EFSVL programme indicators with Sphere.

QS4 – lack of Programme Quality (PQ)/MEAL staff, lack of impact and outcome monitoring, lack of disaggregated beneficiary data and viewpoints influencing Oxfam's programmes.

QS5 – decisions on locations of WASH installations and distributions did not consult beneficiaries, beneficiary feedback and complaints mechanisms were not in place.

QS8 – lack of gender analysis and gender strategy.

QS9 – lack of balance of representation of vulnerable groups managing assistance.

QS12 – lack of staff capacity assessments, performance objectives, inductions, deployment appraisals, lack of key PQ/MEAL, gender, and protection staff.

##### Actions agreed in country:

- Workshop on SPHERE for all humanitarian and support staff, especially EFSVL staff.
- PQ Manager and PQ Adviser recruited to manage PQ/MEAL team, MEAL Officers recruited and trained for each field office.
- MEAL frameworks and monitoring plans created for each project, new reporting, beneficiary monitoring, and accountability mechanisms rolled out across South Sudan by the PQ team.
- Programme Monitoring Review workshops and action plans developed on programme standards and CAMSA.
- OCS MEAL framework and PQ strategy measuring impact and outcome level data.
- CAMSA and accountability training for all staff.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ PQ e-learning global induction pack.</li> <li>➤ Gender analyses and strategies in place for each project; gender justice is one of the four change goals identified in South Sudan's OCS for the next five years.</li> <li>➤ All staff performance objectives and performance reviews documented and signed. All JPs reviewed and signed off for each post. PQ, gender, and protection staff hired. Standard induction pack developed for South Sudan and consistently implemented alongside group inductions. Handovers and deployment appraisals implemented as a condition of final salary payment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Overall, do the findings concur with your own expectations or assessment of the project/programme's effectiveness?</b></p>
<p>Yes, absolutely. They are similar to the findings of the real time evaluation which triggered the inclusion of a new programme quality position, its advertisement and recruitment in addition to staff trainings, RRT MEAL staff deployed and the introduction of a senior gender advisor. Improvements continue to be required and are ongoing.</p>
<p><b>3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (ie large impact)?</b></p>
<p>Areas that were identified as particularly strong in the Effectiveness Review were timeliness, beneficiary coverage, experience and capacity of staff in relation to programme standards and assessments, output monitoring, protection and safe programming, preparedness and coordination, and advocacy and campaigns.</p>
<p><b>4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?</b></p>
<p>Areas that were identified as weak in the Effectiveness Review were lack of disaggregated beneficiary data and beneficiary feedback and complaints mechanisms, gender, lack of vulnerable groups managing assistance, and HR.</p>
<p><b>5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?</b></p>
<p>The reviewed project ended in February 2015, when Oxfam handed over remaining EFSVL activities to SAADO, IRC and Terres des Hommes (WASH activities were handed over to Solidarites International gradually through a phased approach between July and August 2014).</p>
<p><b>b) What actions are you planning in response to the Programme Learning Considerations?</b></p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Trial accountability groups and new accountability mechanisms and produce learning documents to ensure focus is on beneficiaries and that their voices influence Oxfam programme design and impact.</li> <li>➤ Gender training for all staff, including senior management to ensure gender is taken into consideration from the start of and throughout all responses /</li> </ul>

projects.

- Programme quality, gender, and protection teams to exist and support all projects and new responses. Regional Centre and Oxford to respond faster and better to future requests for staff in these sectors, particularly in emergencies.
- Investment in PQ as the management of MEAL structures and learning on impact.
- Review of HR documents and procedures.

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

No objections to publication.