

Oxfam Management Response to the review of:
Humanitarian Quality Assurance – Central African Republic: Evaluation of the response in Bangui
(Effectiveness Review Series 2014/15)

Regional Director:	<i>Amy Glass</i>
Country Director:	<i>Ferran Puig Abos</i>
Name of Project reviewed:	<i>Intervention in Bangui, Central African Republic</i>
Date:	<i>21/01/16</i>
Participants in the Management Response:	<i>Amy Glass, Ferran Puig Abos, Maria Chalaux Freixa</i>

Summary of Results

Standard	Level of achievement	Rating
1. Timeliness: Rapid appraisal of facts within 24 hours of pre-defined trigger, plans in place and scale-up or start-up commenced within three days.	Not met	0/6
2. Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure with clear justification for final count.	Almost met	4/6
3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards.	Almost met	4/6
4. MEAL ⁱ strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators.	Half met	1.5/3
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.	Partially met	1/3

8. Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys.	Not met	0/3
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 actioned.	Not met	0/3
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.	Not met	0/3
Final rating		17.5/45
Equivalent to		39%

1. What follow-up to the review have you undertaken or planned (if any) e.g. discussion, analysis, workshop?
An action plan was drafted at country and regional level to follow the recommendations formulated in the HIT evaluation.
2. Overall, do the findings concur with your own expectations or assessment of the project/programme's effectiveness?
3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (ie large impact)?
The only standard that was fully met, according to the HIT report, was Standard 11: Programme has an advocacy/campaigns strategy and has incorporated advocacy into programme plans based on evidence from the field.
4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?
Standards judged as not met or partly met are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Standard 1, on timeliness, not met ➤ Standard 4, MEAL strategy, partly met ➤ Standard 5, accountability and feedback, partly met

- Standard 6, partnership, partly met
- Standard 7, safe programming, partly met
- Standard 8, gender equity, partly met
- Standard 10, preparedness, not met
- Standard 13, appropriate staff capacity, not met

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 response programme is ongoing. Since the publication of the HIT report, the following actions were taken:

- Draft of a contingency plan to improve timeliness
- Work on a country strategy
- Increase of WASH, Protection, EFSVL capacity in-country, development of programmatic strategies
- Expanding the programme in one new base (Paoua)
- Partnership identified as key axis in strategic workshops and Oxfam Country Strategy – participation of partners in strategic workshops
- Gender analysis and training
- Development of a MEAL strategy, and feedback and complaint mechanisms

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

Develop general MoU with strategic partners.

Define a funding strategy aligned with the programme strategy.

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?

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

¹ Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning