



Central African Republic

Humanitarian

2014/15

Evaluation of the response in Bangui

In December 2013, a long-running internal conflict in Central African Republic (CAR) deteriorated into a major humanitarian emergency. Bands of former rebels, predominantly Muslim 'Seleka' alliance, went on a violent rampage in various regions of the country, committing executions, massacres and rapes in communities they believed to be supporters of the ousted president. In response, predominantly Christian 'Anti-Balaka' groups that had originally been set up to defend themselves from Seleka rebels, transformed into militias and proceeded to commit massacres and lynchings of their own against populations they regarded as pro-Seleka. Across the country, villages were threatened and attacked by violent armed groups of one allegiance or another. In fear of their lives, hundreds of thousands of people fled to the capital, Bangui, where they set up makeshift camps in and around religious buildings, at the airport, and in other sites across the city. Meanwhile, fighting spread to Bangui itself, and over a period of a few days in December 2013, over a thousand people were killed. In response to warnings of a potential genocide, the international community began to react. The humanitarian assistance that Oxfam delivered in Bangui from February to October 2014 (the period covered by this evaluation) consisted of firstly water treatment, supply and distribution; hygiene promotion; provision and maintenance of sanitation facilities for Internally Displaced People and host communities; and secondly, food distributions and cash transfers. From May 2014 Oxfam made plans to set up a programme in Bria. However, this programme did not become operational until October 2014, and is therefore beyond the scope of this evaluation.

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: February – October 2014

Evaluation: November 2014

Publication: September 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	Not met	0					
2. Coverage uses 10% of affected population as a planned figure	Almost met				4		
3. Technical aspects of programme measured against Sphere standards	Almost met				4		
			1		2		3
4. MEAL strategy and plan in place and being implemented using appropriate indicators	Half met		1.5				
5. Feedback/complaints system in place and functioning and documented evidence of consultation and participation leading to a programme relevant to context and needs	Partially met		1				
6. Partner relationships defined, capacity assessed and partners fully engaged in all stages of programme cycle	Partially met		1				
7. Programme is considered a safe programme	Partially met		1				
8. Programme (including advocacy) addresses gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys	Not met	0					
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	Not met	0					
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	Not met	0					
13. Programme has an integrated approach	Not assessed						
Final Rating		17.5 / 45					
Percentage Equivalent		39%					

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

The response was not timely due to the lack of a previous Oxfam presence in the country. However, there is now an established office and a continuing programme as the conflict situation is chronic with little sign of being completely resolved. On-going security issues prevented the team from developing a contingency plan with triggers for a new scaled-up response as well as a strategy for a more acute programme which is in implementation until 2017. Partnerships were also felt to be weak in that assessments were not carried out and communications between Oxfam and partners was poor. An assessment has now been carried out with strategic partners and some of these took part in the strategy workshop. However, partnerships still need to be strengthened and improved. The programme was weak in gender, monitoring and evaluation and feedback systems: these have all been addressed. Gender training has been carried out for all staff, a feedback and complaints system has been set up and a monitoring and evaluation system put in place. A gender analysis has been carried out in order to inform the future programming. Security will always remain a concern in this unstable environment and protection of both staff and the affected population will remain an integral part of any future response. Oxfam is now playing an important role in both advocacy and coordination of other humanitarian actors.

Photo credit: Vincent Tremeau/Oxfam