



South Sudan

Humanitarian

2014/15

2013 Juba conflict response

On 15 December 2013, heavy fighting between factions of the South Sudanese armed forces broke out in the country's capital city, Juba, and spread rapidly across the country. The fighting, which resulted from a political showdown between the country's president and the former deputy president, quickly took on ethnic dimensions, with Dinka elements of the armed forces firstly turning on soldiers of Nuer origin inside the barracks, and then on Nuer civilians on the streets and in their homes. In Juba, civilians (mainly Nuer), immediately sought refuge in the UNMISS (United Nations Missions in South Sudan) bases: Tom Ping and UN House. Within one week an estimated 25,000 people were sheltering in the UNMISS compounds, while attacks continued across the city. Oxfam was one of the first agencies to respond to the needs of the first IDPs in Juba, supplying water and installing sanitation facilities in UN House, and supporting the World Food Programme's (WFP) food distributions in both UN House and Tom Ping compounds. Once water supply was established, Oxfam added a hygiene promotion component, as well as diverse Emergency Food Security and Vulnerable Livelihoods interventions to complement the food supplied by WFP. From January 2014 Oxfam conducted rapid assessments and launched responses in other states. This evaluation concentrated on the response in the UN House IDP camp, Juba only.

Evaluation design

The programme was evaluated using the Humanitarian Indicator Tool (HIT), a methodology designed to estimate the degree to which the programme meets recognised quality standards. The tool has 13 quality standards each with defined benchmarks, which allow evaluators to assess and score whether the standard was 'met', 'almost met', 'partially met' or 'not met'. The score is weighted and scored with a rating out of 6 for the first three standards due to their relative importance. The other standards are given a rating out of 3. The HIT is carried out as a desk study by an external evaluator using documented evidence that then generates a score against each standard and a cumulative total. For details on evaluation design, see the 'How are effectiveness reviews carried out?' document, and the full report for how these designs were tailored by individual reviews.

Response date: December 2013–December 2014

Evaluation: January 2015

Publication: January 2016

Results

Quality standard evaluated	Level of achievement	Rating					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Timeliness: Rapid appraisal of facts within 24 hours, plans and scale-up or start-up commenced within three days	Fully met	6					
2. Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure	Fully met	6					
3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards	Almost met	4					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
4. MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators	Almost met	2					
5. Feedback/complaints system in place and functioning and documented evidence of consultation and participation leading to a programme relevant to context and needs	Not met	0					
6. Partner relationships defined, capacity assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle	Not assessed						
7. Programme is considered a safe programme	Fully met	3					
8. Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys	Partially met	1					
9. Programme (including advocacy) addresses specific concerns and needs of vulnerable groups	Almost met	2					
10. Evidence that preparedness measures were in place and effectively actioned	Fully met	3					
11. Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy based on evidence from the field	Fully met	3					
12. Evidence of appropriate staff capacity to ensure quality programming	Partially met	1					
13. Resilience	Not assessed						
Final Rating		31 / 42					
Percentage Equivalent		74%					

The first three standards are weighted and scored out of 6 due to their relative importance. The other standards are scored out of 3.

Going forward

Oxfam exited UN House camp in February 2015, when activities were handed over to other agencies. Oxfam humanitarian response in South Sudan continues in other areas delivering critical support for host communities and displaced populations in clean water, sanitation, and hygiene, food aid and livelihoods, and protection programming. Findings of the Effectiveness Review were circulated amongst the team and an action plan has resulted in: SPHERE workshops for all staff, especially livelihoods; recruitment of a Programme Quality Manager and Adviser; recruitment of a Gender Coordinator and a Senior Protection Coordinator who manages trained Protection staff in each base; creating frameworks and monitoring plans for each base and ensuring evaluations are completed for relevant projects; new reporting, accountability, beneficiary counting, and feedback and complaints mechanisms and Programme Quality Review workshops for humanitarian, development, and campaigns teams. A new gender strategy is based on the country gender analysis; a standard induction plan has been finalised and there will be standardised capacity assessments, handovers, deployment appraisals, and job profiles for all staff. Moving forwards Oxfam will focus on resilience and conflict mitigation, strengthening the quality of its programming through increased accountability to beneficiaries and greater influence of the most vulnerable people in South Sudan.

Photo credit: Kieran Doherty/Oxfam