

Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Fran Equiza

Country Director: Nigel Tricks

Name of Project reviewed: Drought Management Initiative: Livestock Component, Kenya

Date: July 2013

Participants in the Management Response: Brian McSorley (Humanitarian Programme Coordinator); Clemence Nyamandi (MEAL Advisor) and Joost Van De Lest (ASAL Coordinator)

Summary of contribution scores

A	Overall Results	Households of members of the supported PFS and VICOBA groups demonstrate significantly higher levels of resilience than do the corresponding comparison households. There is no difference in the resilience index between the general population in the project and comparison communities.					
Dimension	Characteristic	PFS & VICOBA group members			General population		
		% deprived	Positive difference with comparison group	Difference likely to be a result of project activities	% deprived	Positive difference with comparison group*	Difference likely to be a result of project activities

Livelihood Viability G	Livelihood diversification	46%	Yes	Yes	57%	No	No
	Livestock diversification	22%	Yes	No	25%	Yes	No
	Herd size	57%	Yes	No	65%	No	No
	Crop diversification	64%	No	No	74%	No	No
	Access to deworming and vaccination	27%	No	No	20%	No	No
	Access to curative veterinary care	52%	Yes	Yes	49%	Yes	Yes
	Access to early-warning information	60%	No	No	60%	No	No
	Drought preparedness practice	23%	Yes	No	30%	Yes	No
	Livestock lost to drought	77%	No	No	68%	No	No
	Household food security	91%	Yes	Yes	91%	No	No
Household wealth status	62%	Yes	Yes	78%	No	No	
Innovation Potential A	Attitudes towards new livelihood practices	46%	Yes	Yes	49%	No	No
	Awareness of climate change	70%	No	No	67%	No	No
	Access to credit	29%	Yes	Yes	46%	No	No
	Use of livestock price information	79%	No	No	78%	No	No
Access to Contingency Resources and Support A	Group participation	16%	No	No	73%	No	No
	Savings	63%	Yes	Yes	75%	No	No
	Ownership of fungible livestock	19%	Yes	No	43%	No	No
	Remittances or formal earnings	78%	Yes	No	78%	No	No
Natural and Built Environment G	Access to water for livestock/consumption	57%	Yes	Yes †	54%	Yes	Yes †
Social & Institutional Capability A	Participation in community decision-making	30%	No	No	28%	No	No
	Receipt of training on drought preparedness	47%	Yes	Yes	80%	No	No

* A positive difference among community members, beyond that accounted for purely by the PFS and VICOBA group members.
 † Access to water was not an activity directly of the DMI Water project.

Applicability: These results apply to all the households in the three communities of Kokuro, Lokamariyang and Napak who were represented among the membership of the PFS and VICOBA groups, and who had an adult member available to be interviewed at the time of the field work in July 2012. The results for the general population apply to all households in those three communities who had some adult member available to be interviewed at the time of the field work.

<p>1. What follow-up to the review have you undertaken or planned (if any) e.g. discussion, analysis, workshop?</p> <p>There has not been a review specific to this project since it ended in 2011. However, the programme teams have discussions during programme design, involving a detailed analysis of the operational context and how the situation is evolving over time. Several key lessons learnt from implementation of this and many other projects have informed designing of preceding programmes. The Turkana programme has over time built several other projects building on the successes of this projects working with the same targets groups to strengthen specific areas identified as weak during the implementation of this project.</p>
<p>2. Overall, do the findings concur with your own expectations or assessment of the project/programme’s effectiveness?</p> <p>Yes, the programme was aimed at building resilience in the communities. The findings concur with the expectations of the programmes in that the programme beneficiaries had a significant resilience level against the comparison group.</p>
<p>3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (i.e. large impact)?</p> <p>Yes, the review identified areas that Oxfam in Kenya is strong in and these include the 2 dimensions: Livelihoods viability and Natural and Built Environment.</p>
<p>4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (i.e. no or very little impact)?</p> <p>Areas identified as weak were the dimensions on Innovative Potential, Social and Institutional Capability and Access to Contingency Resources and Support. After this project Oxfam implemented and continues to implement projects targeted at improving the capacity of the communities in these dimensions. The programme has increased piloting on innovative approaches and research in various areas of interest to enhance evidence based programming. The programme seeks to strengthen social and institutional capability by increasingly exploring mechanism for participation of communities in the decision making process.</p>

<p>5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?</p>
<p>No, the project ended in 2011 but Oxfam in Kenya continues to strengthen community capacity and building resilience through community based contingency planning, livestock support, and peace building initiatives. Oxfam is also using value chains approach to livelihoods interventions to change attitude towards new livelihood practices and addressing market systems for sustainable livelihoods. Oxfam also continues to engage in research and piloting innovations to diversify and increase the impact of our work.</p>
<p>b) What actions are you planning in response to the Programme Learning Considerations?</p>
<p><i>Programme Learning Considerations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep monitoring progress of the PFS and VICOBA groups, and whether the training and skills provided are eventually being used/applied • Explore whether the model used for community land-use planning structures was the right one to achieve sustainable improvements. <p>Although funding challenges always impede follow up activities, the team has already taken steps to implement follow up projects based on lessons and experiences from this project. The team has implemented various projects including an ECHO La Nina III Consortium project aimed on building community resilience. The current programmes include community based risk reduction mechanism and include working with the VICOBAs and PFS in planning risk reduction at community level and coming up with community disaster risk reductions plans which will form the country plans.</p>
<p>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?</p>
<p>The project ended in 2011. The key learning from the implementation of the project enabled Oxfam to initiate resilience building programming through promoting community based disaster risk reduction and exploring alternative livelihoods.</p>
<p>The reports will be published by Oxfam. If you have objections to this, please say so and explain why.</p>
<p>None</p>