

**Report**  
**on**  
**End of Project Evaluation**

**Project Title: SHO Four Famine Appeal 2017 -  
Nigeria**

**By**

Muyiwa Oladosun, PhD  
Sani Njobdi, MSc

***Covenant Friends*** International Consultants

Suites 30 Crossway Plaza,  
3/5 Charity Road, New Oko-Oba,  
Agege/Abule-Egba, Lagos  
Tel: 234.86045264210, 234.8178836612  
E-mail : [fso8260@gmail.com](mailto:fso8260@gmail.com), [fso226@yahoo.com](mailto:fso226@yahoo.com)

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The evaluation team is grateful to Oxfam Novib and the Dutch Public Appeal Fund (SHO) for providing the financial support to this evaluation. We thank Oxfam team in Nigeria specifically the Abuja and Maiduguri offices that guided and facilitated the exercise. We appreciate Kenneth Otieno the Humanitarian Programme Coordinator based in Maiduguri at the time of evaluation for his managerial support and the information he provided on the SHO project. Also, thanks go to the project coordinators based in Maiduguri namely: Samuel Komakech, Neil Pancipanci, Shahid Sadiq, David Mwenda, and Abdi Gedi who provided useful insight on the project implementation. Special thanks to Gloria Affiku, the MEAL coordinator who directly facilitated this evaluation from start to finish. We thank Jacob Fintan, Nienke Hiemstra, and Valerie Bay who provided detailed reviews which enhanced the quality of the report. Many thanks to Oxfam/SHO base manager, Robert Ekemini, and Sunday Ikwebe the MEAL officer who volunteered their time and effort despite that the project closed since February 2018. We thank the project volunteers, and beneficiaries including the lawans, bulamas, and members of IDP and host communities for providing valuable information on the project.

## **PREFACE**

The killings, maiming, displacement, and dislocation of families in the north-east region of Nigeria by the Boko Haram in the past eight years has attracted the attention of world governments, international and local humanitarian response working with the Nigerian government to alleviate the situation. Pulka the main focus of this evaluation is located in Gwoza LGA in Borno state. According to International Organization for Migration Tracking Matrix, as at February 2018, the town had 11,545 people in the host communities, and about 10,844 IDPs. At the same period, displacement overview reported by REACH Initiative, showed that Pulka is a beehive of IDPs from at least 30 neighbouring towns and villages in the Gwoza and Bama LGAs. Pulka major attraction to IDPs are improved security, access to basic services, closest safest place in the area, and the potential for reunify people of the same kinship or village. The humanitarian response to date has gulped substantial amount of financial commitment from various stakeholders interested in attenuating the human suffering in the north-east region of the country. Equivalent effort has however not been in the direction of evaluating this response especially with respect to inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact. There is dare need to have evidence based on the response so far that will feed into future programming to better attend to the needs of the displaced people in the area. The evaluation of SHO project is intended to contribute to the evidence most needed to advance programming to help meet the growing and dynamic needs of IDPs in host communities and the newly arrived in Pulka from surrounding towns and villages. Also, the evidence may be useful for similar response in other similar settings in Nigeria or other parts of the world.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since its advent in 2009, Boko Haram (BH) insurgency has affected many communities in north-eastern region of Nigeria. The displacement of people and ongoing return of displaced persons presents serious humanitarian emergency in many parts of Borno and other states in the region. Oxfam's humanitarian presence was in the region since 2014, and was scaled-up in May 2016 covering many locations including Maiduguri, Gosa, Pulka, Damboa, Chibok, and Rann, in Borno state and Mubi and Madagali in Adamawa state. Oxfam contributed to the humanitarian response along with other international NGOs and the Nigeria government agencies. This report is on the SHO (Dutch Public Appeal) response in Pulka, Rann, Damboa, Maiduguri, and Madagali LGA in Adamawa state. It was implemented between 6 March 2017 and 28 February 2018.

Oxfam activities in response to the humanitarian emergency involved provision of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), and emergency food security and livelihood (EFSL). Therefore, this report assesses SHO project overall achievements, effectiveness and impact based on the empirical evidence obtained from the different stakeholders including; the beneficiaries, service providers, and implementing agencies.

*Methodology:* Participatory approach was employed from the beginning to the end of this evaluation. This involved desk review of project documents, consultations with relevant stakeholders including key Oxfam staff in Maiduguri office and Pulka who worked on the SHO, and beneficiaries of the project. The fieldwork for this evaluation was conducted between September 1 and 7, 2018.

*Achievements:* Oxfam's SHO response was through water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), and emergency food security and livelihood (EFSL). Under the WASH sector in Pulka, three boreholes were upgraded which improved access of 3200 people to safe water, and five emergency latrine blocks were constructed for 250 IDPs in Camp 2, and another five blocks for 1250 IDPs in Camp 3. In Rann, the construction of 279 latrines improved sanitary access for 1,395 households (approximately 8,370 people), and bucket chlorination of hand pumps prevented water borne diseases among approximately 45,000 people. In Damboa 5 boreholes drilled with submersible pumps protected about 45,000 people from water borne diseases and Hepatitis E, and in Maiduguri, 50 handwashing stations set-up near shared latrine blocks prevented further cholera outbreaks in 3,604 among 3,604 IDP household (approximately 17,905 people). Also in Madagali LGA, 1046 households (about 6773 people) received unconditional cash transfer which avert acute malnutrition. On EFSL, in Pulka, the project helped 1,300 households (approximately 7800 people) meet their nutritional needs, and 400 households (approximately 2400 people) were helped to re-establish small livelihood activities and provided with agricultural training. In Rann, 10344 households (approximately 64,796 people) benefitted from unconditional cash transfer, and in Damboa cash grants for agricultural support helped 1173 households (approximately 7,038 people) restore disrupted or lost livelihood.

*Appropriateness and relevance:* Oxfam met the critical needs of IDPs through improved access to safe water, and improved sanitary conditions in Pulka and other project sites which helped to eliminate outbreak of diseases like cholera, hepatitis E, diarrhoea etc. Oxfam through SHO met nutritional need of both host communities and in the IDPs camps, and stopped the acute nutritional deficiency among newly arrived IDPs. Also, through the EFSL platform, many households were able to re-establish small economic activities, and met other basic household needs.

*Effectiveness and efficiency:* Generally, the Oxfam SHO interventions achieved their objectives by improving the health status and livelihood in beneficiary communities within the limit of human and material resources and in good time. Effective decision-making structure and coordination among stakeholders were instrumental to the overall success of the interventions.

*Coordination and feedback mechanisms:* Oxfam team actively participated in WASH, EFSL, and security coordination groups both in Maiduguri and Pulka. Coordination meetings were helpful for Oxfam response team and other humanitarian actors (international NGOs and government agencies) to compare notes, identify gaps in project operations, discuss difficult issues and challenges, and proffer solutions and way forward. One inherent benefits of coordination meetings are reduction in duplication of efforts and learning how to do things more efficiently.

*Challenges and constraints:* Oxfam team had to deal with a number of challenges and constraints which included logistic challenges with respect to restrictions caused by security concerns, rapidly increasing demands in the face of limited resources and having to deal with some unscrupulous community members and leaders who resort to dubious practices of nominating unqualified households for access to project's facilities.

*Lessons learned:* Integrated approach to programme implementation has been one of the most impactful strategies in the implementation of Oxfam-SHO project alongside other projects. Effective coordination and community engagement have played key roles in the speedy realization of project's objectives.

*Conclusion:* The impact of SHO interventions along with other similar interventions have demonstrated that communities could recover rapidly if appropriate and relevant assistance is provided. In the light of the ongoing resettlement in the Northeast region of Nigeria, there is the need for continuous reinvestment into recovery activities to support livelihood and restore community systems and services.

# TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
PREFACE .....	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	2
Main Evaluation Purpose/Objective .....	2
Specific Evaluation Objectives .....	2
EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....	4
ACHIEVEMENTS .....	4
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) Response .....	4
Emergency Food Security & Livelihood (EFSL) Response .....	5
RELEVANCE & APPROPRIATENESS .....	7
Specific Needs of Different Sub-Groups .....	8
Added Value Provision .....	9
EFFECTIVENESS .....	10
FEEDBACK MECHANISM .....	11
COORDINATION MECHANISM .....	12
SUSTAINABILITY .....	12
CHALLENGES & CONSTRAINTS .....	13
LESSONS LEARNED .....	14
BEST PRACTISES .....	14
OVERALL PERFORMANCE & IMPACT .....	15
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	15
APPENDIX I .....	17
List of Evaluation Participants .....	17
APPENDIX II .....	19
Evaluation Instruments .....	19

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: SHO project activities on water, sanitation, and hygiene .....	4
Table 2: SHO project activities on emergency food security, and livelihood .....	6
Table 3: Overall rating of project performance by project staff and beneficiaries .....	15

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

BH	Boko Haram
CJTF	Civilian Joint Task Force
EFSL	Emergency Food Security and Livelihood
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HH	Household
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IDP(s)	Internally Displaced Person(s)
IOM	International Organization for Migration
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGA	Local Government Area
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
MSF	Medecins Sans Frontieres (Doctors without Borders)
NGN	Nigerian Naira
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
SHO	Dutch Public Appeal Fund
ToR	Terms of Reference
UCT	Unconditional Cash Transfer
UNHAS	United Nations Humanitarian Air Services
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children Emergency Fund
WASH	Water Sanitation and Hygiene

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Boko Haram (BH) violent attacks on communities around the Lake Chad Basins, has resulted into mass disruption of settlements in the region. The consequences of BH actions include forced migration to unknown places for safety, dislocation of families, trauma, death, destruction of indigenous homes and farmland, destruction of the insufficient infrastructures causing unbearable hardships to millions of affected families and individuals alive to absorb the pain and agony. Evidence from the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) of 2017 showed that Borno is the worst affected state in the region with over 4.4 million people in need of urgent humanitarian assistance, and the state's internally displaced persons (IDPs) was estimated at 69% of the estimated 4.4 million in the north-eastern region. Oxfam's humanitarian assistance in the region started since 2014, and was expanded in May 2016 to include Maiduguri, Gosa, Pulka, Damboa, Chibok, and Rann, in Borno state and Mubi and Madagali in Adamawa state. Oxfam was a major contributor to the humanitarian response in north-eastern Nigeria working with other international NGOs and the government agencies.

The SHO project was implemented between 6 March 2017 and 28 February 2018. This report focuses on the SHO (Dutch Public Appeal) humanitarian response in Pulka, Rann, Damboa, Maiduguri, and Madagali LGA in Adamawa state. Oxfam/SHO project activities in response to the humanitarian emergency involved provision of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), and emergency food security and livelihood (EFSL). The report is on SHO project's overall achievements, effectiveness and impact based on the empirical evidence obtained from various stakeholders including; beneficiaries, service providers, and implementing agencies.

### **Main Evaluation Purpose/Objective**

This evaluation assessed SHO project overall achievements, effectiveness and impact based on the empirical evidence obtained from the different project stakeholders including; the beneficiaries, service providers, and the government.

### **Specific Evaluation Objectives**

The specific objectives of this evaluation specified in the Terms of Reference (ToR) are rephrased below:

- Based on evidence, establish the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the project to its respective beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- Assess how project activities were coordinated based on laid out guidelines and modalities.
- Examine the extent to which gender and age variables factored into project implementation.
- Assess the extent of involvement of affected communities in the project activities design and implementation.
- Provide post evaluation plans to help ensure that findings inform institutional learning and future project outcomes.

### **SNAPSHOT OF MAJOR FINDINGS**

- Evidence showed that access to safe water improved in the intervention communities during the life of the project with the upgrade of three boreholes in Pulka which served 3200 people; drilling of five boreholes with submersible pumps in Damboa for 13,000 residents; and chlorination of hand pumps against water borne diseases in Rann for 45,000 people.

- Sanitation improved in the targeted communities during the life of the project with the construction of 10 blocks of latrines (5 emergency) in Pulka that served 1500 people; construction of 279 latrines in Rann for 8,370 people; and setting up of 50 hand washing stations near latrine blocks in Maiduguri which prevented further outbreaks of diseases.
- The project succeeded in reducing malnutrition and increased nutritional intakes of the communities served through cash transfers to 1300 households in Pulka, 10344 households in Rann, and 1046 households in Madagali LGA in Adamawa State.
- The project boosted economic activities in the targeted communities through livelihood recovery grants and agricultural techniques training provided to 491 men and 543 women in Pulka, and cash grants for agricultural support provided to 1341 men and 1670 women in Damboa.
- Evidence from the quantitative data obtained from the program office and of the qualitative data collected during the evaluation which included the elderly, women and the disabled suggest that the vulnerable sub-groups of the IDPs and host communities were most served by the project, and the project added values to their lives.
- The SHO project was implemented effectively based on reports which showed that all planned targets were accomplished within the project lifespan. Efficient use of resources was demonstrated by repairing existing facilities when possible, and the synergy and complementarity of services to strengthen project outputs and outcomes.
- Findings showed that knowledge and skills gained may have been internalized and access to safe water and improved sanitary conditions may be sustained for some time through the maintenance of constructed water boreholes and latrines, and small businesses created through livelihood grants. But unconditional cash transfer, and financial motivation of volunteers may not be sustainable since the mechanism for the sustenance were not yet in place.
- The main challenges were the issues of security which hampered project logistics and economic activities of respondents, and interference of some community leaders in the processes of providing services to the most vulnerable sub-groups in the communities.
- Key lessons learned were the effectiveness of integrative programming which were evidence in the improved sanitary and hygienic situations, reduction in malnutrition and increased nutritional intake of community members. Another lesson learned was the collaboration between implementing partners which fostered cross fertilization of information and reduction in duplication of efforts.
- The best practices were community engagement using existing community structure and team spirit among project staff which enhanced efficiency of inputs and effectiveness of outputs and outcomes.
- The majority (88.6%) of project beneficiary rated the project performance excellent based on what they received and how these impacted or changed their lives and their environment, while four (66.7%) of the six project staff who participated in the evaluation rated it satisfactory. Project staff had more information on the strategy and implementation plan and were probably more critical of the process of implementation.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Participatory approach was employed from the beginning to the end of this evaluation. This involved consultations with relevant stakeholders including key Oxfam staff in Maiduguri office and Pulka who worked on the SHO project, and beneficiaries of the project. The exercise reported here is more of a post-evaluation since the project closed February 2018, and evaluation fieldwork was conducted between September 1 and 7, 2018.

The evaluation used mixed approach combining both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data was from project documents mainly monthly, quarterly and final project reports. And qualitative data included key informant interviews (KII) with project staff, and focus group discussion (FGD) with beneficiaries in Pulka. In total, 8 FGDs and 4 KIIs were conducted. Four FGDs were conducted in IDP camps, 1 each for males and females, 1 for vigilante group, and 1 for community leaders. Three FGDs were conducted in host communities, 1 each for males and females, and 1 for volunteers. One FGD was conducted with former SHO staff in Pulka, and a KII with the MEAL staff, and 3 KII with Oxfam staff in Maiduguri.

Data analysis involved extracting and summarizing quantitative data from SHO project's document. Qualitative data was transferred from field notes into excel spreadsheets and analysed.

## ACHIEVEMENTS

SHO project closed since February 2018, therefore, reporting on achievements relied on the reports obtained from Oxfam staff and retrospective information which are sometimes subject to memory lapse. The specific achievements are presented below according to the types of services provided i.e. water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), and emergency food security and livelihood (EFSL).

### Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) Response

Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) response consisted of a number of interventions: provision of safe water, construction and care of sanitation facilities, public health and hygiene promotion campaigns as well as distribution of hygiene kits and cleaning materials. Table 1 below summarizes the achievements from WASH response. The project did not have monitoring and evaluation plan, logical framework or baseline data to benchmark achievements.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Population Reached</b>
1. Upgrade of boreholes for safe water in IDP camps (Pulka)	3	3200
2. Construction of emergency latrine blocks for improved sanitation (Pulka)	5	250
3. Construction of latrine blocks in IDP camps for improved sanitation (Pulka)	5	1250
4. Improved sanitation access through construction of latrines; 5 households per latrine (Rann)	279	1,395 (hh); 8,370 population
5. Bucket chlorination of hand pumps against water born related diseases (Rann)	65 chlorinators; 5 supervisors	45,000
6. Drilling of boreholes with submersible pumps (Damboa)	5	13,000
7. Hand washing stations set-up near latrine blocks (Maiduguri)	50	17,905

### *Safe Water facilities*

Oxfam's SHO WASH interventions cover a number of major community needs. Even before the insurgency and the consequent breakdown in public infrastructure, Pulka had a history of water scarcity especially in dry seasons. With the collapse of public infrastructure and heavy influx of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and many returnees, water became one of the foremost needs of residents and IDPs in Pulka. In response to this need, SHO project (Table 1) upgraded three existing boreholes in Pulka which provided 3200 residents access to safe water. The upgrade included fitting of higher capacity water pumps and fitting the boreholes with diesel and solar power generators to increase volume and duration of water supply. Evidence during focus group discussion showed that the water supplied by the upgraded boreholes was also extended to IDP camps to provide water points within the camps.

Qualitative evidence showed that a number of new boreholes were also drilled by Oxfam in Pulka funded by UNICEF. However, only two of the newly drilled boreholes were functioning at the time of evaluation probably because the water dried off as the level of underground water in the area decreased. Qualitative evidence showed that prior to the upgrading and drilling of boreholes, Oxfam also trucked water from other parts of Gwoza Local Government Area (LGA) to Pulka as an emergency intervention for IDPs. As Table 1 shows, in Rann Oxfam intervention protected 45,000 IDPs in the camps and host communities from water borne and related diseases through chlorinated water enabled by 65 chlorinators and 5 supervisors who also distributed aqua tab for home purification of water.

Also, evidence from qualitative data analysis suggest that despite the interventions in water supply in Pulka, host community members were still faced with difficulties in accessing water for domestic use and the fear of a more acute shortage of water during the dry season abound, especially as the population in the camps and hosts communities grows in the future. In fact, many host community members lamented that Oxfam's intervention in the provision of water has not had the much desired effects because of the sharing of available water with neighbouring IDP camps. The real reasons behind the persisting water scarcity could be increase in population mainly due to new IDP migrants, low water level, and security concerns preventing sourcing of water beyond predetermined safe parameter in a militarized environment. Table 1 also shows that the drilling of five boreholes with submersible pumps in Damboa enabled 13,000 people in the intervention communities to access safe water.

### *Sanitation facilities*

An urgent problem of the rapidly growing population of Pulka, was lack of sanitation facilities. Table 1 shows that SHO project constructed five emergency latrine blocks for 250 IDPs in Camp 2, and another five latrine blocks for 1250 IDPs in Camp 3 thus, improving access to sanitation facilities (latrine and bathroom) of a total 1500 IDPs. In Rann, the construction of 279 latrines (5 households per 1) improved sanitary access of 1,395 households (approximately 8,370 people). Also in Maiduguri 50 hand washing stations were set-up near latrine blocks and these helped to prevent further outbreak of cholera among 17,905 IDPs.

In addition, Oxfam conducted several rounds of distribution of soap and detergents, water jerry cans as well as "aquatab" for water purification. Oxfam recruited and trained community members as WASH volunteers who worked along with Oxfam staff to create awareness about water, sanitation, and hygiene issues within the host community and the IDP camps.

## **Emergency Food Security & Livelihood (EFSL) Response**

Another Oxfam humanitarian response under SHO project was in the emergency food security and livelihood (EFSL) sector. The response mainly consisted of three streams of livelihood support interventions but also with some cross cutting additional benefits such as refuse clearing and road rehabilitation undertaken through the cash for work intervention. The three main interventions are cash-for-work, unconditional cash transfers and the livelihood support (also known as cash for business which includes agri-business and other small-scale businesses).

Activity	Number (HH)	Population Reached						
		Total*	Men	Women	Sub-total (men & women)	Boys	Girls	Sub-total (boys & girls)
1. Cash transfer activities in Pulka town (cash for work = 1000; unconditional cash = 300) (Pulka)	1300	7800	1596 (40.2%)	2371 (59.8%)	3967 (100%)	1765 (46.4%)	2068 (53.6%)	3833 (100%)
2. Target households for unconditional cash grants (Rann)	10344	64469	9220 (40.1%)	13796 (59.9%)	23016 (100%)	23016 (55.5%)	18437 (44.5%)	41453 (100%)
Unconditional cash transfer (Madagali LGA, Adamawa State)	1046	6773	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. livelihood recovery grants for small businesses and agric. Farming including agric. Techniques training (Pulka)	400	2400	491 (47.5%)	543 (52.5%)	1034 (100%)	236 (24.5%)	729 (75.5%)	965 (100%)
4. Cash grants for agricultural support (Damboa)	1173	7038	1341 (44.5%)	1670 (55.5%)	3011 (100%)	1789 (44.4%)	2239 (55.6%)	4028 (100%)

Note: HH = household. n/a = not available, \* = total population may include children.

The Emergency Food Security and Livelihood (EFSL) support activities as run by Oxfam under the SHO grant comprised of a number of intervention lines; namely (1) unconditional cash transfer, (2) cash for work, and (3) cash for business.

### ***Unconditional Cash Transfer & Cash for Work***

This scheme targeted the highly vulnerable members of the community who could not participate in the cash-for-work scheme. The eligible members of the community include the very old, new returnees who have some malnourished children, child headed households, the disabled and the terminally ill. This intervention was implemented as a one-off grant of varying sums ranging from NGN5000, to NGN20,000 per household. In Pulka, 1000 households benefitted from the cash for work scheme, and 300 received unconditional cash to enable them purchase food and other essential needs. In total 7800 people benefitted from the cash transfer and of the adult population who benefitted, 59.8% were females and 40.2% were

males, and the households had more girls (53.6%) than boys (46.4%). The cash for work intervention which aimed at providing conditional cash assistance to households in conflict affected communities, targeted one person per household who were recruited to work for 18 days in a month and earn NGN18,000 (at NGN1,000 per day). This was done in a number of batches to execute some work adjudged impactful to the communities. Work schemes included clearing of refuse, rehabilitation of water, reservation pond, and rehabilitation of small access roads.

In Rann 10,344 households (approximately 64,469 people) benefited from the unconditional cash grant with more women (59.9%) than men (40.1%) accessing the grant, and more boys (55.5%) than girls (44.5%) were reported in the households. Each household got NGN5000 for food and household needs for two months. Also in Madagali LGA (Adamawa State), 1046 households (approximately 6773 people) received unconditional cash transfer. Each newly arrived IDP household was given a one-off amount of NGN20,000 to meet nutritional needs of malnourished children and to meet basic survival needs of the household.

The following statements support the findings that the most vulnerable were considered for unconditional cash transfer and cash for work.

*“They (Oxfam) selected the very weak ones among us – the very old ones and took their names, they were given NGN18,000 free to help support their livelihood.” (Community Leader, Pulka; 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018.)*

*“When they (Oxfam) came, they consulted with us as community leaders, they started with clearing our refuse, by our own labour, they selected about 70-80 persons in each of our 8 units to participate in refuse clearing, they (the participants) were paid around fifteen thousand naira (NGN15,000) per person. After some time, it was repeated (with a different set of participants) and they were paid eighteen thousand naira (NGN18,000) per person.” (Community Leader, Pulka; 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018.)*

### ***Livelihood Support (Cash for Business)***

Another EFSL activity is the livelihood support (cash-for-business) which is meant to help conflict affected households to start up or support small scale businesses, including agriculture and other trades. The sum of NGN18,000 were disbursed to selected members of households who expressed interest in investing in businesses. In Pulka 400 households (about 2400 people) received grants for small business and agricultural farming. Table 2 shows that more women (52.5%) than men (47.5%) received small business grants, and these households were composed of more girls (75.5%) than boys (24.5%). The funds enabled the households to re-establish small livelihood activities and to purchase equipment, consumables, and recipients were trained in agricultural farming techniques. In Damboa cash grant was provided to 1173 households (approximately 7038 people), and more women (55.5%) than men (44.5%) received the grant. And there were more girls (55.6%) than boys (44.4%) in the recipient households. The cash grants enabled the households to restore destroyed or lost livelihoods. In sum, as presented in Tables 1 and 2, the findings for the two main SHO sectors-- WASH, and EFSL suggest that the project ensured that women who were among the most vulnerable, were well represented in most of the activities implemented.

## **RELEVANCE & APPROPRIATENESS**

Pulka, one of the sites of SHO interventions and where this evaluation focuses, has high influx of IDPs. Since its recovery from Boko Haram, it has served as a point of reception of IDPs in Gwoza LGA probably

because of its relatively plain terrain (devoid of forests and mountains), easy access and security. At the time of this evaluation, there were five IDP camp in Pulka, among which was a transit camp where new IPDs were received prior to their relocation to other camps. Both the IDPs and a large section of host community members were in critical need of emergency response.

## Specific Needs of Different Sub-Groups

Pulka had a long history of water scarcity and even before the insurgency some community members travelled long distances to other neighbouring communities to access water for their daily needs especially during the dry season. With the influx of returnees and IDPs after the recapture of the town, water became one of the most critically scarce commodities in the town. A 20-liter jerry can of water which is usually sold at about NGN 15 in neighbouring communities was sold at NGN100 during scarcity. Nothing could have been more desired by the hosts and IDP communities in Pulka than Oxfam's WASH intervention which sought to address the problem of water scarcity. Under the SHO project, Oxfam embarked on trucking of water from other communities to Pulka and it worked on the upgrade of the only three boreholes in the town and drilling of new ones.

Findings of this evaluation suggest that the repairs of existing boreholes and the drilling of new ones improved accessibility to safe water. However, the impact may be less felt by the host communities partly because of the rapid increase in population and the sharing of access with a huge increasing population of IDPs. Given this situation, it is not surprising that host communities still consider water as a critical unmet need. Despite the existing gap in water supply, many community members acknowledged substantial improvement in the availability of water as a result of Oxfam's interventions. The IDPs on their own were appreciative of Oxfam's effort in making water available to them within their camps.

*"We thank God that there is water now because Oxfam has upgraded our borehole, last year, I spent about two months during the dry season without sleeping in my house, I always pass the night at the borehole fetching water because it was too difficult to get the water during the day time. Our fear now is that with the increasing population and the dry season is coming, we may experience scarcity again especially if Oxfam leaves." (Male community member, Pulka; 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

Other interventions in the WASH platform include provision of sanitation facilities and hygiene promotion. Hitherto, host community members described their community as "refuse dump sites", "adults move about while smelling", open defecation was normal and diarrheal diseases were rampant. They clearly remember how they looked like when they see current new returnees and new IDPs. Many of the new IDPs do not think of washing themselves or their clothes because there was no soap, or water and some had only the old rag they wore and no replacement. Oxfam's response effectively addressed these issues directly through the WASH interventions and also indirectly through the livelihood interventions. The construction of latrines and hygiene promotion through the campaigns by Oxfam-trained community volunteers have greatly improved the sanitation and hygiene situation and have significantly reduced incidence of diseases.

Excerpts from a female beneficiary buttresses this point.

*"In the past we were in dirt, communities tuned to refuse dump sites, adults move about while smelling, but now people and communities are clean, people have more money. The aid for the small scale business was helpful." (Female community member, Pulka; 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

Another most important need that cut across all community groups was the improvement of livelihood. The town was more of a ghost town as at the end of 2017. Everyday commodity like razorblades which sells at NGN10 or NGN20 a piece was at a point sold NGN100 and even at that, it was difficult to get except on market days. Virtually all businesses halted. Livelihood support interventions in their various forms helped address these needs both at household and community levels.

*“You cannot compare. In the past, people were in severe need, people didn’t have what to eat, even if you have corn, the cost of grinding the corn is the same as the cost of the corn, some do not have anything to wash themselves or their clothes, latrines have collapse... All these have changed now” (Male community member, Pulka; 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

### ***Unmet Needs for Water***

Despite interventions in water supply, water remains foremost in the concerns of host community members as opposed to IDPs. Some community members feel that their water ration is being diverted to the IDPs who should be second priority after the host community. Although evidence suggest that underground water is difficult to reach in Pulka, some community members claim that Oxfam and other organizations are not interested in drilling enough to reach the water level.

*“They didn’t increase any of the water sources... Now, before the rest of the community gets water each day, we have to wait for Oxfam to take enough for their need and for the IDPs. And even after that, we pay (to the care taker of the borehole) to get water for our houses.” (Vigilante (CJTF member, Pulka; 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

### ***Unmet Need for Livelihood assistance***

In spite of the different impactful interventions, the need for livelihood assistance still persists to some extent and it is not likely to end in the near future due to its relative nature. Since there have always been people who are in need of such assistance in the community, emergency interventions could only achieve a considerable relative impact. Moreover, beneficiaries will always like to benefit multiple times as long as they could access such interventions and even when their situations have improved considerably. A community leader who narrated his past pathetic experience of not having a single garment to wear during the peak of the conflict is currently soliciting for Oxfam to assist and construct a shade at the District Head’s palace where dignitaries could sit during community gatherings and festivals.

*“We are grateful for what we got. However, you know the need is much, for example, when I got N18,000 support, at that time I didn’t have even a good short to wear, not to talk of garments. So that was why the money didn’t last long. We need more... “(Community leader, Pulka; 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

*“Everyone has something to do now- some are knitting caps, others fry beans’ cake (akara) while others engage in agricultural activities. The old and the disabled also got some help... those who do not take bath, got to take bath now.” (Oxfam official, Pulka, 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

Other unmet needs (outside the SHO project objectives) reported by interviewees include the need to have more drainages and roads in the community as well as more teachers in schools.

*“Our current problem is education for our children, there are no teachers and no teaching going on in schools. My children go and do nothing, sometimes they return at 9.00am.” (Host community members, Pulka, 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

### **Added Value Provision**

Interventions have generally had obvious positive impact on both host communities and IDP camps. Specific manifestations of value addition include the emergence of a new market in the transit camp. A vibrant market spontaneously emerged in the transit IDP camp where groceries and other convenience good are retailed to camp and community members. Both community members and Oxfam staff confirmed that most of the traders in the market started or improved their business using SHO project’s EFSL funds.

*“Like the transit camp market, it started with only one woman selling some onions and seasoning. With the introduction the cash interventions, the market has rapidly grow to a big grocery market with meat sellers and all sorts of stuff.... In fact, the time we came to Pulka, there was only one shop and a wood seller. It was when we started intervening that traders came from Maiduguri and started opening shops. Months later, the community members also started opening their own shops.” (Oxfam official, Pulka, 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

Before the SHO response, most community members were dependent on monthly rations of food and without cash, now this is not the case; some community members engaged in livelihood activities like making beans cakes (Akara). A number of beneficiaries in the community also were able to get married as a result of these interventions.

In Pulka community members reported that their communities are now cleaner with no open defecation. Community members, who seldom take bath in the past, now take their baths regularly. Incidence of diseases like malaria has decreased and cholera no longer occurs. The quote below by a volunteer buttresses this point.

*“With regards to hygiene, open defecation has stopped and there is general cleanliness in our communities which helped to prevent the communities from diseases. Cases of malaria have decreased and that of cholera has stopped as a result of Oxfam’s intervention.” (Female volunteer, Pulka; 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

Evidence from this evaluation suggest knowledge and skill acquisition as an added value of the SHO project. Many volunteers and participants in the cash for work schemes have been trained by professionals on various skills set. Some participants learnt construction works and others were taught borehole maintenance which they used to serviced their community boreholes. Since most of the interventions specifically sought to address vulnerability of which women are disproportionately affected, the EFSL and WASH interventions, have increased awareness and uplifted the status of women. Women currently demand for recognition in decision making processes in their communities. A female participant in the focussed group discussions conducted for the project evaluation buttress this point thus.

*“One or two females should be selected to work with the community leaders next time so the women can also take part in decision making. You know it is women who know women’s problems” (Female host community member, Pulka; 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

With respect to effectiveness, evidence in Tables 1 and 2 and from the qualitative data collected suggest that the SHO project achieved planned objectives based on the outputs reported and improved access to safe water, sanitation, and improved livelihood of the people. All planned activities of the project were implemented within the lifespan of the project and were still functional at the time of this evaluation. Evidence of this evaluation showed that the SHO project response saved lives through the reduction of cholera and other diseases, reduced substantially the effects of malnutrition in the intervention communities, and economic activities improved boosted by the livelihood support activities of the project. In general, it was reported that planned activities were delivered on time. However, there were instances where some activities were delayed due to some insurmountable logistics reasons. Conveyance of materials to site after procurement has caused some delays in implementation of some activities since the process was cumbersome. Security clearance need to be obtained for passage of goods to intervention site and even after security clearance, there was a need to wait for the next available convoy of military escort. The UNHAS

flight was a source of delays at times because its schedule depended on a number of factors including security, weather and other logistics.

Internally, the fact that base manager took decision on most daily operational issues helped to save time in the delivery of activities. In addition, the base manager is responsible for community dialogue through the community leaders in coordination with other actors. This enable timely and effective decision making. However, for accountability purpose, there is a threshold of expenditure beyond which the base manager cannot approve and he will therefore require approval from the humanitarian response coordinator.

## **EFFICIENCY**

SHO project operated with a team of less than 15 Oxfam staff, and volunteers. Members of the field team at the time of this evaluation reported that item and materials were usually procured in bulk which saved cost, and enabled timely supply of the materials to the communities. Also, evidence suggest that initial MEAL assessments were conducted in the communities using Oxfam guidelines to ensure that those who need the services the most were served. Demonstration of efficient use of resources was the repair of existing boreholes (when possible) rather than construction of new ones, and the setting up of hand washing stations near latrines in Maidugiri which enabled hand washing. Also, efficiency was implicit in the programming of integrated and complementary services like WASH and EFSL. Community based facilities like boreholes, and latrines synergize well with EFSL activities like unconditional cash transfer, cash for work, and cash grants for agricultural support or small business to produce efficiency of inputs since same households could benefit from the WASH and EFSL services at the same time thus, strengthening reduction in outbreaks of diseases, improved health conditions, and improved livelihood and economic activities of the communities.

However, evidence from the KII conducted suggests that there was no proper documentation in place during the project implementation. Procurement were not properly documented at the beginning of the project, no supply plan in place, and there was no monitoring and evaluation framework to guide implementation. These documentation issues may have affected project efficiency.

There were allegations that community leaders and volunteers who directly interface with community members sometimes included close relatives or outsiders in the list of potential beneficiaries for personal gains. e Extent of this misconduct may be difficult to ascertain in a situation where there was no tracking system in place. It is therefore, quite challenging to justify judicious use of resources based on evidence. However, evidence from the focus group discussions suggest that the majority of beneficiaries identified (based on their vulnerability) to receive services from the project were served. Below is a quote from a female community leader vaguely suggesting judicious resource allocation.

*“They (Oxfam staff) follow through community leaders, and community leader gives them names of potential beneficiaries for aid.” (Community leaders, Pulka, Female host member 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018.)*

## **FEEDBACK MECHANISM**

For the purpose of feedback, Oxfam established a complaint and response mechanism which was reported to have worked well especially because complaints were attended to and addressed promptly. This builds trust and confidence between the SHO project team and the communities. Evidence based on the focus group discussions conducted among beneficiaries, community leaders, committee members, volunteers totally 44 participants and Oxfam staff interviewed suggest that complaints were addressed in a timely fashion. In general, the response time was usually with 2 working days. However, some matters, especially those that have to do with coverage of services takes longer time and were usually discussed during monthly

coordination meetings. The following buttresses the findings about the feedback mechanism that was in place.

*“One good thing about them (Oxfam staff), if you complain, they will respond. In the beginning, none of their aids reached us because our community leader is old and everything is being controlled by community leaders. At some point we complained through Oxfam volunteers, they heard us and brought the aid to our community.” (Male host community member, Pulka; 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

## **COORDINATION MECHANISM**

Humanitarian actors in Maiduguri meet fortnightly and shared information with the view of identifying and filling gaps in their activities. This is in addition to local coordination committee meetings which Oxfam does with community leaders and other stakeholders including UNHCR, UNICEF, MSF and IOM, among others. Oxfam works in synergy with other actors and receive referrals from them. Where other actors working on protection encounter needs for livelihood interventions, they referred to Oxfam, who did same in return. Statements suggesting collaboration is evident from the quote from a project stakeholder below.

*“We consult with other actors to show us some of the priority projects we undertake during our cash-for-work scheme. Like the culvert that was rehabilitated under the Oxfam cash-for-work scheme was shown to us by IOM.” (Oxfam official, Pulka, 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

One of the critical stakeholders in Oxfam’s approach to humanitarian response is the community leaders. Community leaders were constantly consulted and engaged properly before the commencement in intervention activities. However, working with community leaders does not substitute Oxfam independent MEAL activities.

Evidence of this evaluation showed that because of the do no harm policy, the Oxfam response team, did not establish formal collaboration with some stakeholders like the civilian joint task force (CJTF). This did not go well with the CJTF leadership in Pulka, and their view is that regardless of the fact that they benefited from Oxfam’s aid as community members, Oxfam should have contacted them as an organization and seek collaboration with them especially in the area of security. The following quote buttress the point on exclusion of CJTF.

*“We don’t really know the reason why Oxfam did not consult us when they came. MSF consulted us and we even gave them some of our men to work with them. However, in the case of Oxfam, they never consulted with us and didn’t even ask us for security backing. Recently, they shared some bicycles but they didn’t give us even one.” (Vigilante (CJTF) member, Pulka; 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2018)*

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

Based on the evidence of this evaluation, one may be able to deduce that some of the activities of the SHO project may be sustainable in the short-term while others are inherently not sustainable. Among the most sustainable interventions were the training and skills imparted on volunteers and other community members. Beneficiaries opined that these knowledge and skills were sustained and might even be transferred to others within the community. For example, some volunteers were trained in the maintenance and repair of boreholes. They were given tools that they (at the time of evaluation) used to repair and maintain the boreholes. The impact of public health promotion campaigns on hygiene and sanitation activities is also likely to be sustained for some time to come.

However, some activities of EFSL like unconditional cash transfer, and cash for work may not be sustainable unless other stakeholders in the humanitarian response were able to continue. Although many beneficiaries reported life changing impacts, the cash aid in itself was not geared towards sustainability and some of the cash grants were reported to have been used in an unsustainable manner. Other interventions like the provision of water from motorized boreholes need to be continuously supported with funds since community members may find it difficult to provide the fuel that will power the borehole. Although the capacity of the solar energy to motorize the boreholes would help but certainly will not be sufficient in the absence of fuel to power the generators.

## **CHALLENGES & CONSTRAINTS**

- Although implementation was generally successful, it was not without challenges and constraints. Chief among the challenges is logistics. Because Pulka is a landlocked settlement, the only means of transportation to and from there was by road and by air. Due to security concerns, road was used to move heavy and large project materials while the UNHAS Helicopter was used by project personnel.
- Haulage of supplies and even travel of personnel were often hampered or delayed by logistic issues. Most part of the roads to Pulka were not safe and haulage was usually accompanied by military escort which will take a good number of days to obtain approval from the military. Also, consignments need to be submitted for thorough checking by the military before they are allowed for join the next batch of haulage.
- Only four UNHAS helicopters facilitates movement of officials in Borno state, and travel from one place to the other using the UNHAS was necessary due to insecurity of the roads. Personnel travelling to or from Pulka were booked with the UNHAS days ahead of their travel date and the flight schedules were often unpredictable due to security and weather factors. Besides, the UNHAS limited number of personnel per organization that can board per trip which implies that staff from the same organization may not be able to travel at the same time, which caused some activities to be temporarily delayed.
- Another constraint is the security volatility within the communities. When there is any sign of security breach, the Military will instruct all humanitarian response to halt activities until normalcy is restored, and this results in delay of activities.
- Often times there were high demand for help from the communities which the project was not able to accommodate due to budget constraints and limitation of resources to propagate response.
- Oxfam work with the communities through community leaders and volunteers, some of which gave undue preference to acquaintances to the detriment of those who were most in need and this has been a cause of concern among potential beneficiaries. In some cases, some community leaders connive with member of other community to be listed as potential beneficiaries and the leaders get something in return. In a number of instances Oxfam team had to intervene and resolve a number of similar issues among community members and leaders.

## **LESSONS LEARNED**

Among the lessons learned in the SHO project is the effectiveness of integrative programming. Many of the activities were implemented in a manner that is complementary to each other. This helped in achieving greater impact. For example, the WASH activities synergize well with EFSL activities since they are all essential life-saving activities. Oxfam's unconditional cash distribution took care of household food security while distribution of menstrual hygiene kits, soap household, aqua tab for water purification, jerry cans and buckets took care of hygiene and sanitation security. These sets of interventions especially community based facilities like the WASH boreholes, and latrines complement well EFSL for households that received unconditional cash transfer, cash for work or cash grant for small businesses which makes them more efficient and impactful.

Other lessons learned included the ability to share ideas across implementation teams and gain knowledge and skills from each other. The implementation teams (both WASH and EFSL and respective local committees) worked together as a team which enabled cross fertilization of information and skills exchange. For example, some members of the EFSL committee acquired some knowledge and skills in WASH activities due to their involvement in the construction of boreholes and latrines.

Implementations teams learnt that community may reject good projects if the benefits were not well explained or understood. For example, there was stiff resistance from community members when Oxfam wanted to upgrade one of the Pulka township boreholes. The resistance was so stiff that the district head could not convince the community members until a state government official intervened, and some of the community youth were engaged in cash for work to dowse the tension. The reasons for the resistance may be that the community leaders were afraid of; (1) losing revenue from the boreholes, (2) losing the advantages of using control of the boreholes to manipulate the people, (3) they did not fully understand the benefits offered by the borehole upgrade or a combination of these reasons.

In addition, the speed of recovery of Pulka town was quite an unexpected positive outcome of Oxfam's interventions which to a large extent is indicative of the efficiency of the integrated programming approach. This can't be attributed solely to Oxfam-SHO project activities nor can the impact of the project be measured in isolation. However, the SHO project was key to this transition since it focused and addressed the most critical issues through WASH and EFSL activities.

## **BEST PRACTICES**

Integrated approach to project implementation has been one of the most impactful strategies in the implementation of Oxfam/SHO project. In a humanitarian emergency setting, the integration and synergy between WASH and EFSL activities complemented by the spirit of team work deployed by the Oxfam team can be referred to as a best practise because this may have produced the quick turnaround in the lives of IDPs in the intervention communities. The overall impact of this integration was a transition from a refuse dump-like and non-functioning communities occupied by largely dejected people to a vibrant community with shops, market and healthy people.

Community engagement strategy during implementation is another example of best practices, The Oxfam/SHO project engaged the community through its leadership structure right from problem identification and definition to the point of implementation of project activities is one of the best strategies that produced the overall successes of the project.

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE & IMPACT

Evaluation participants were asked to rate performance of the SHO project based on four levels of satisfaction about project impact-- not satisfactory, satisfactory, very satisfactory, and excellent. For beneficiary performance is with respect to impact of the project on their lives, while for Oxfam staff, it was about their perception of project performance based on their experience of the implementation process.

<b>Rating of Project Performance</b>	<b>Beneficiaries (%)</b>	<b>Project Staff (%)</b>
Not satisfactory	-	-
Satisfactory	5 (11.4%)	4 (66.7%)
Very Satisfactory		2 (33.3%)
Excellent	39 (88.6%)	-
<b>TOTAL number (%)</b>	<b>44 (100%)</b>	<b>6 (100%)</b>

Findings in Table 3 above shows that the major (88.6%) of beneficiaries rated project performance i.e. impact on their lives as excellent, while 11.4% rated it as satisfactory. Project staff were probably more critical of project performance because of their knowledge of the implementation process vis-a-vis inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact. Of the six Oxfam staff that participated in the rating, four (66.6%) rated project performance as satisfactory, and two (33.3%) rated it very satisfactory. Some of the reasons provided by beneficiaries for rating the project excellent were; (1) “we were given most of the things we needed badly,” (2) “Oxfam is next to God because they brought us out of misery and poverty, some of our people are insisting that some of their staff, like this woman, should stay back here with us,” and (3) “because none of the organizations working here does as much and as good as they, Oxfam do.” Main reasons provided for rating the project satisfactory are; (1) “It has helped community members but also, they prefer to focus on camps than other community members,” and (2) “couldn’t say excellent because respondent feel they could have done more except for the limitations presented by the environment, processes and limited manpower.”

Some of the reasons given by staff for rating the project satisfactory were; (1) “the response was more of life saving assistance with about 90% IDPs in camps.” (2) the project was set to meet specific needs which were met according to our abilities,” and the reason for rating the project very satisfactory was, “the project met set targets and closed on time.”

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Oxfam’s SHO interventions through the two sectors of WASH and EFSL were successful based on evidence from both implementers and beneficiaries. Specifically, the EFSL interventions on cash-for-work, unconditional cash transfers, reduced malnutrition and improved nutritional intakes of recipients and their households. And the livelihood supports through cash for business, contributed to economic activities in the intervention communities. The WASH interventions, through water boreholes, chlorination of hand pumps and latrines improved hygienic conditions of the households and communities and averted cholera and other diseases. Future programming should include protection services to take care of sexual and other human abuse.

The project was effective in meeting the planned targets set both for the WASH and EFSL services, and these were accomplished within the time set for the project. Efficiency was attained to some extent based on the complementarity of services and synergy of programming of the two services, and the team spirit deployed by project staff. Future program may achieve more efficiency in the use of resources if some household based EFSL services are converted to community based ones. For example, making livelihood ventures to be joint ventures or community ventures so that earnings from such ventures can be shared among more households and more people.

Effective decision-making structure and coordination among stakeholders were instrumental to the overall success of the interventions. The impacts of a good number of the interventions, especially those that have to do with knowledge and skills development, behavioural changes and general community resuscitation may be sustained in the long-term. However, interventions that relied on continuous supplies, like soap, sanitary kits, and cash transfers were transient and require continuous interventions to sustain them. To increase sustainability of services future programming may be designed to last for a longer period of time, between two to three years to enable communities imbibe and implement on their own services provided by the project with mentorship from project staff.

During implementation, Oxfam team had to deal with a number of challenges which include logistic challenges as caused by restrictions due to security concerns, rapidly increasing demands in the face of limited resources and dealing with some unscrupulous community members and leaders who resort to dubious practices for their selfish interests. Although the role of community leadership is critical to implementation of interventions in the intervention sites, many community members have expressed concerns that Oxfam has given too much powers to the community leaders and some of the leaders abuse such powers by fraudulently nominating non-eligible associates for grants to the detriment of the eligible members of their communities. Future projects should find a way to balance the powers of community leaders with those of other significant figures in the communities. For example, female community leaders should be integrated into the process of identifying beneficiaries and project decision-making process at the community level.

Integrated approach to programme implementation has been one of the most impactful strategies in the implementation of Oxfam/SHO project. Effective coordination and community engagement have played key roles in the speedy realization of project's objectives. This should be continued and perhaps expanded in future programming targeting the IDPs. In order to increase community involvement evaluation participants suggested rotating project volunteers so that more members are involved in the project implementation process.

The impact of SHO interventions along with other similar interventions have demonstrated that communities could recover rapidly if the appropriate aid is provided. In the light of the ongoing resettlement in the Northeast region of Nigeria, there is the need for continuous reinvestment into recovery activities to support livelihood and restore community systems and services.

Other suggestions focused on interventions needed by community members which include: more financial aid, more water supply, road construction and rehabilitation, construction of shade in the District Head's palace and employing additional teacher in schools.

Like most rural communities, firewood is the predominant cooking fuel in Pulka. However, community members who go into the bush in search for firewood have often been attacked or abducted by Boko Haram. Charcoal, which is supplied by another NGO is really expensive and its procurement may not be sustained in the long run. Future intervention should explore tree planting and replacement strategies, and firewood or other sources of fuel to meet their energy needs.

## APPENDIX I

### List of Evaluation Participants

SHO EVALUATION FGD PARTICIPANTS - PULKA				
S/No	NAME	AGE	SEX	COMMUNITY
1	BULAMA SHUAIBU ABUBAKAR	36	M	IDP CAMP
2	SANI AHMODU	38	M	IDP CAMP
3	ABBAS USMAN	27	M	IDP CAMP
4	IBRAHIM DUGJE		M	IDP CAMP
5	ISA BUDUWARA	47	M	IDP CAMP
6	ALHAJI ALI	50	M	IDP CAMP
7	MUSA GAWUYA		M	IDP CAMP
8	MAIRO ADAMU	35	F	IDP CAMP
9	FADI ADAMU		F	IDP CAMP
10	ADAMA MOHAMMED	50	F	IDP CAMP
11	MAIRO GIRIMA		F	IDP CAMP
12	FATI ABBA	30	F	IDP CAMP
13	FATI YAKUBU	35	F	IDP CAMP
14	UMAR IBRAHIM	30	M	VIGILANTE
15	IBRAHIM GARAKE	52	M	VIGILANTE
16	MUSA USMAN	35	M	VIGILANTE
17	MUSA AHMADU	40	M	VIGILANTE
18	BUKAR KAUWO	42	M	VIGILANTE
19	GENTLE ARDO		M	COMMUNITY LEADERS (LAWANS AND BULAMAS)
20	USMAN NDAWARE		M	COMMUNITY LEADERS (LAWANS AND BULAMAS)
21	GARBA DAN AUTA		M	COMMUNITY LEADERS (LAWANS AND BULAMAS)
22	LAWAN IBRAHIM		M	COMMUNITY LEADERS (LAWANS AND BULAMAS)
23	LAWAN GALADIMA		M	COMMUNITY LEADERS (LAWANS AND BULAMAS)
24	LAWAN GAYE		M	COMMUNITY LEADERS (LAWANS AND BULAMAS)
25	BABA JOHN NAGA		M	COMMUNITY LEADERS (LAWANS AND BULAMAS)
26	MOHAMMADU MUSA	42	M	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
27	UMARU DAUDA	41	M	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
28	SALEH MENYE	43	M	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
29	HARUNA WAERA		M	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
30	LAWAN MAHAMA		M	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
31	BLOODY UMURU		M	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
32	ADAMA IBRAHIM		F	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY

33	BIYE KUJANI		F	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
34	MAIMUNA YAKUBU	70	F	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
35	MAIRAMA SAMAILA		F	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
36	KATALE NDARA		F	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
37	HAJA BULAMA UMETE		F	ZARAYAGA COMMUNITY
38	CHARITY	28	F	VOLUNTEER
39	MONICA	40	F	VOLUNTEER
40	AISHA	20	F	VOLUNTEER
41	EZEKIEL	40	M	VOLUNTEER
42	RIFKATU	40	F	VOLUNTEER
43	RAMADAN	29	M	VOLUNTEER
44	DAHIRU	31	M	VOLUNTEER
45	ROBERT EKEMINI		M	OXFAM BASE MANAGER, PULKA
46	HAUWA KYARI	35	F	Implementing Partner (IP) WITH OXFAM
47	IKWEBE SUNDAY	38	M	MEAL OFFICER, PULKA
48	KENNETH OTIENO		M	HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMME COORDINATOR/WASH COORDINATOR
49	NEIL PANZIPANZI		M	EFSL COORDINATOR
50	GLORIA AFFIKU		F	MEAL COORDINATOR
51	ABDI GEDI		M	LOGISTICS COORDINATOR

## APPENDIX II

### Evaluation Instruments

#### Oxfam SHO End-of-Project Evaluation

##### FGD Guide for Beneficiaries (IDPs, their Leaders, Traditional Leaders/Vigilante groups)

###### A1. Introduction

Moderator: follow the steps below to enable participants relax and get involved in the discussion.

- Give an introductory welcome to all participants
- Introduce yourself and members of your team
- Explain the usefulness of the information that they will be providing
- Ground rules: Participants speak freely, no right or wrong answer, need for frank and honest responses, one person should speak at a time etc.

###### Confidentiality & Consent

**Moderator:** Go through the following statements before starting the discussion.

1. The information you provide during this discussion will not be traced back to you nor used against you in any way.
2. Please do not mention your name during the discussion.
3. Note that your participation in this discussion is completely voluntary.
4. You may decide to stop participation at any time during this discussion, and you may decide not to respond to any specific question.

**Moderator:** ask and record the age, level of education, ethnicity, years involved in IDPs.

###### 1. Introduction

- How long have you been involved with this (Oxfam) project?

**Probe: in what capacity? (as IDP, leader, etc.).**

###### 2. Information/Services Received from the Project (DGD/SHO)

- What types of services have you and your household received since this project came to your community?

**Probe: with respect to: drinkable water, hygiene, sanitation, nutrition, and livelihood support, protective facilities, who provided the services (name of contact person if possible).**

- What types of information have you and your household received since this project came to your community?

**Probe: with respect to: drinkable water, hygiene, sanitation, nutrition, and livelihood support, protective facilities, who provided the services (name of contact person if possible).**

- What role/s did you play in ensuring that your family and communities have access to the services/information provided by this project?

**Probe: role/s with respect to specific services/information received.**

- Think back in time, could you describe your situation before this project came to your community?

**Probe: with respect to: drinkable water, hygiene, sanitation, nutrition, and livelihood support, protective facilities, who provided the services (name of contact person if possible).**

### **3. Usefulness of Project**

- In your opinion, to what extent did this project meet specific need/s in your household and community?

**Probe: specific needs met, and specific need/s unmet.**

### **4. Key Challenges & Constraints**

- Explain specific challenges/constraints that your family or community experienced in accessing the information/services provided by this project?
- How were the challenges/constraints resolved?

**Probe: specific roles played by beneficiaries, providers, or government agencies.**

### **5. Overview of Project Performance**

- In your opinion, how would you rate the performance of this project in your community?

**Probe: whether excellent, satisfactory, not satisfactory, reasons for your rating.**

### **6. Suggestions for the Future**

- What are your suggestions for improving the quality of information/services provided to you by this project in the future?

THANKS FOR SPENDING YOUR VALUABLE TIME WITH US TODAY!

## Oxfam SHO End-of-Project Evaluation

### KII Guide for Service Providers (Volunteers, Supervisors, Oxfam Staff)

#### A1. Introduction

##### Confidentiality & Consent

**Interviewer:** Go through the following statements before starting the interview.

5. The information you provide during this discussion will not be traced back to you or used against you in any way.
6. Please do not mention your name throughout this interview.
7. Note that your participation in this interview is completely voluntary.
8. You may decide to stop the interview at any time and you may decide not to respond to a question.

**Interviewer:** ask and record the age, level of education, and years involved in this project.

#### 1. Introduction

- How long have you been involved with this (Oxfam) project?

**Probe: in what capacity? (as volunteer, supervisors, Oxfam staff etc.).**

#### 2. Information/Services Provided by the Project (DGD/SHO)

- Since you joined Oxfam, what types of services have you provided to the household and other members of this community?

**Probe: with respect to: drinkable water, hygiene, sanitation, nutrition, and livelihood support, protective facilities, who provided the services (name of contact person if possible).**

- Since you joined Oxfam, what types of information have you provided to households in this community?

**Probe: with respect to: drinkable water, hygiene, sanitation, nutrition, and livelihood support, and protective facilities.**

- What role/s did you play in ensuring that households in this community receive the services/information provided by this project?

**Probe: role/s with respect to specific services/information provided.**

#### 3. Relevance & Appropriateness

- In your opinion, to what extent did this project meet specific need/s of households in this community?

**Probe: response to changing needs, specific needs of different groups, involvement in project, added value provided by the project.**

#### 4. Effectiveness & Efficiency

- From your own perspective, explain how planned activities were accomplished?

**Probe: timely delivery, response to life threatening situations, and decision making structures.**

- In your opinion, how judicious were the resources (both human and material) used in the implementation of project activities?

**Probe: necessary capacity (human and material), structures, and systems in place.**

#### **5. Challenges/Constraints & Feedback Mechanism**

- Explain specific challenges/constraints or complaints that occurred during the implementation of this project?
- How were the challenges/constraints or complaints resolved?

**Probe: specific roles played by beneficiaries, providers, or government agencies, and timeliness in responding.**

#### **6. Coordination Mechanism**

- Explain the extent of synergy and coordination of this project with other humanitarian response in the state?

**Probe: with government, other aid agencies, duplication of efforts.**

#### **7. Sustainability**

- In your opinion, what are the successes and achievements of this project, and how are they sustainable in the long-run?

**Probe: effects due capacity increases, skills and knowledge of target population, results achieved.**

#### **8. Lessons Learned & Best Practices**

- What are some of the most efficient and impactful ways of doing things that you now know based on your experience on this project.
- What are some of the unexpected outcomes of this project?

**Probe: on specific WASH, EFSVL, & Protection support.**

#### **9. Impact & Overall Performance**

- In your opinion, what are the effects of this project on the household and communities in the short-run and long-run?

**Probe: effects on households, community, and institutions.**

- How would you rate the performance of this project in this community?

**Probe: whether excellent, satisfactory, not satisfactory, reasons for your rating.**

#### **10. Suggestions for the Future**

- What are your suggestions for improving the quality of information/services provided by this project to this community in the future?

THANKS FOR SPENDING YOUR VALUABLE TIME WITH US TODAY!