

Report
on
End of Project Evaluation
of the “Integrated Response in WaSH, EFSVL
and Protection to the Emergency
in Borno State” of Nigeria

Funder:
La Direction Generale Cooperation au
Development et Aide Humanitaire (DGD)

November 2018

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, Nigeria
Tel: 234.86045264210, 234.8178836612
E-mail: fso8260@gmail.com, fso226@yahoo.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team is most grateful to Oxfam Novib and La Direction Generale Cooperation au Development et Aide Humanitaire (DGD) for the funding of this evaluation. Many thanks go to Oxfam team in Nigeria specifically the Abuja and Maiduguri offices that guided and facilitated the exercise. We thank Kenneth Otieno the Humanitarian Programme Coordinator based in Maiduguri who provided considerable managerial backing and willingly added his voice to the evaluation. Our appreciation goes to Samuel Komakach, Neil Pamcipaci, Shaid Sadiq, David Mwenda, and Abdi Gedi who as coordinators in their respective areas of operation and expertise contributed their own perspective to enrich the evaluation. Special thanks to Gloria Affiku, the MEAL coordinator who interfaced with the evaluation team on logistics and provided technical inputs from the beginning to the end of the evaluation. Many thanks for Jacob Fintan, program quality and development manager, Nienke Hiemstra, Anne-Sophie Winkckelmans, Anke Leflere, and other overseas staff who provided constructive reviews on the draft report. We thank the entire Oxfam/DGD team in Damboa for their warm reception, support and valuable inputs despite the closing-out scenario at the time of evaluation. Notable among the Damboa team are the base manager Grace Mbabazi, Phillip Jatu, Victor Audu, Abdulmajid Mohammed, Lawan Abana konede, Abayomi Abdulazeez, Louis Mapendo, Barka Iliyasu, Sawa Michael, and Zubairu Magaji to name but a few. We thank the project volunteers who provided valuable perspective to the evaluation. And we thank all the lawani, bulamas, members of the various committees, men, women, and children in both the IDP camps and host communities for their rich and insightful discussion of the issues.

PREFACE

Damboia town is the capital of Damboa LGA an epicenter of the Boko Haram conflict that started since 2009. Damboa LGA is one of the 27 LGAs in Borno state Nigeria. According to UNOCHA, Boko Haram attacks on Damboa heightened in July 2014 when they overran and burnt down half of the town before it was recaptured by the Nigerian military after three months, on 21 October 2014. By 2015 Damboa LGA was still highly militarized and was only accessible to humanitarian response in mid-2016. Since then, several billions of United States dollars have gone into meeting basic survival needs and reviving economic livelihoods of peoples displaced as a result of the conflict. Oxfam is one of the few organizations that pioneered and championed humanitarian efforts in Damboa and surrounding LGAs in the North-East. This report on the DGD humanitarian response in eight communities in Damboa and Chibok LGAs provides additional evidence-based information that will be useful for future programs geared to alleviate the sufferings, and improve the quality of life of IDPs and host communities affected by the conflict.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction: According to the OCHA 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) jointly developed by the donor community, the Nigerian Government, International and Local NGOs, Borno State of Nigeria had the majority (69%) of the estimated 4.4 million internally displaced people (IDPs) in the north-eastern region. This prompted the response from Oxfam through the DGD project in Damboa and Chibok towns which housed the worst affected communities in the region. The goal of the DGD project response implemented between October 1, 2017 and September 30, 2018 was to provide needed help in the area of emergency food security and livelihoods (EFSVL), water sanitation and hygiene (WASH), and protection to returnees and host communities affected by the Boko Haram attacks. This evaluation assessed the DGD overall achievements, effectiveness, and impact based on evidence from project documents and stakeholders' insights.

Methodology: We involved all relevant key stakeholders Oxfam staff stationed in Maiduguri, and Damboa at the time of the evaluation, and community beneficiaries including volunteers, community leaders (lawani and bulamas), community-based WASH, EFSVL, Protection committee members, men and women in IDP camps and host communities. The evaluation employed quantitative method extracting data from project documents, and qualitative methods employed focus group discussion (FGD), and key informant interviews techniques to elicit information on project performance from the above listed stakeholders.

Achievements: Findings showed that the DGD project surpassed its planned targets on most of the integrated activities implemented on WASH, EFSVL, and protection. And most indicators, except a few, showed that at least 60% of women who form the bulk of the vulnerable population, and by extension their children, accessed project facilities more than their male counterparts.

Relevance & Appropriateness: Overall the project surpassed planned targets on most of the WASH, EFSVL, and protection indicators. And females who are among the vulnerable were adequately captured on average by about 60% in most of the intervention indicators. Also, the project households reached on many activities was maximized by fronting through community leaders, and WASH, EFSVL, and Protection committees thus, increasing availability and accessibility to a larger member of the community.

Effectiveness & Efficiency: Evidence showed that DGD project met the specific needs of the beneficiaries and added value to their quality of life. With respect to effectiveness and efficiency, (1) planned activities were implemented on-time excepts few instances where security challenges caused delays, and (2) most decisions on daily operations were taken in the field which enabled prompt response to issues. Judicious use of resources was imbedded in the project implementation process through integrated project approach, fund use based on identified needs, and analysis comparing budgeted vs. actual expense. Efficiency may have improved through complementarity of services provided, repair of existing facilities rather than constructing new ones, and providing community based facilities which reached more people than targeted.

Coordination & Feedback Mechanism: The project had efficient feedback mechanism facilitated by complaint desks established at the community level, suggestions box, feedback through volunteers and mobilizers, and monthly meeting of various committees like the WASH, EFSVL, and protection among others. Also, the project exemplified coordination among other implementers. Evidence showed that project staff were very active in coordination meetings at Maiduguri, and in Damboa where it was held at Oxfam office. This had tremendous positive effects on the outcomes of the DGD project as it served as a platform for sharing lessons learned through shared experiences among implementers.

Sustainability: Evidence showed that information and knowledge-based activities that resulted in behavior change on personal hygiene, environmental sanitation, human rights, protection, maintenance of community

facilities, and entrepreneurship spirit may be sustainable for some time into the future. However, aspects of the project that required direct funding like unconditional cash transfer, and engagement of volunteers (with incentives) may not be sustainable unless continued by other implementing agencies.

Challenges & Constraints: Challenges experienced in the implementation of this project may be classified as both internal and external. The internal challenges include insufficient human and material resources considering the needs in the communities, risk of handing large amount of cash in risky security laden environment, and some managerial and administrative issues. While the external challenges include the ubiquitous and unpredictable security treats, lack of service institutions like banks in Damboa, and poor communication facilities.

Lessons Learned & Best Practices: Key lessons learned included the fact that grassroots engagement from the beginning can ensure trust, cooperation, and ownership, and can serve as channel for continuous flow of security intelligence. The strategy of maintaining neutrality at all times reduced hostility and direct target from Boko Haram. Best practices that may be scaled-up in future programming are; (1) the media-based campaign on protection that aired using play lets and soap opera; (2) campaign on household hygiene propagated using local dialects; (3) community sensitization campaign using participatory approach that involved community volunteers; and (4) pro-active rather than reactive coordination among humanitarian response partners.

Impact & overall Performance: The majority (82%) of evaluation participants gave the project excellent performance based on the live changing interventions through information and capacity building, and the WASH, and EFSVL facilities that made live more meaningful, and boosted economic activities.

Conclusions & Recommendations: In conclusion, the DGD project implemented in eight of the Damboa and Chibok communities were very successful based on evidence of this evaluation in terms of its impact in changing the lives of the people for the better. It transformed the lives of peoples in these communities from inactive to a healthy, vibrant, and economically active sub-groups with potentials to grow in the future. But as of the time that the project exited the communities, the frameworks for enabling institutionalization of project activities were not fully entrenched yet. Hence the need to have a project with longer life span of two years or more to give room for strengthening current weak frameworks in host communities, and perhaps, gradual transition of IDP camps to resettlement scheme.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
PREFACE	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Oxfam/DGD Humanitarian Response Strategy	1
Main Evaluation Purpose/Objective	1
Specific Evaluation Objectives	1
SNAPSHOT OF MAJOR FINDINGS	2
EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	4
Quantitative Data	4
Qualitative Data	4
Data Analysis	4
Limitation of the Evaluation	4
ACHIEVEMENTS	5
Water, Hygiene and Sanitation (WASH) Response	5
Food Security & Livelihood (EFSVL) Response	7
Protection Support Intervention	8
Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning (MEAL)	9
Logistics Team	9
Human Resource Team	10
Security Threats and Management	10
Criteria for Rating Security	10
RELEVANCE & APPROPRIATENESS	11
Response to Specific & Changing Needs	11
Response to Specific Needs of Most Vulnerable	11
Involvement in Project Design & Implementation	12
Added Value Provision	12
EFFECTIVENESS	12
Inclusiveness & Life Saving Intervention	12
Timely Delivery of Planned Activities	13
Decision Making Structures	13
EFFICIENCY	14
Judicious Use of Resources	14
PARTICIPATION, COMPLAINT, & FEEDBACK MECHANISM	15
COORDINATION MECHANISM	17
Extent of Synergy Among Stakeholders & Duplication of Efforts	17
SUSTAINABILITY	17
CHALLENGES & CONSTRAINTS	18
Internal Challenges and Constraints:	18
External Challenges & Constraints	19
LESSONS LEARNED	19
BEST PRACTICES	20
OVERALL PERFORMANCE & IMPACT	20
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	22
APPENDIX I	25
OTHER RELEVANT FINDINGS	25
APPENDIX II	27
Names of Evaluation Participants	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: DGD Project Activities on Clean Water for Households & Population in Targeted IDP Camps & Host Communities	5
Table 2: DGD project activities on latrine & environmental sanitation among targeted IDP camps & host communities.....	6
Table 3: DGD project activities on WASH awareness, knowledge, and capacity building of beneficiaries in targeted IDP camps & host communities.....	7
Table 4: DGD project activities on EFSVL response among beneficiaries in targeted IDP camps & host communities.....	7
Table 5: DGD project activities on protection of beneficiaries in targeted IDP camps & host communities ...	8
Table 6: Overall rating of project performance by project staff and beneficiaries	20

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BH	Boko Haram
CJTF	Civilian Joint Task Force
CRM	Complaints Response Mechanism
DGD	La Direction Generale Cooperation au Developement et Aide Humanitaire
EFSL	Emergency Food Security and Livelihood
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GBV	Gender Based Violence
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)
NCE	National Certificate of Education
ND	National Diploma
NGN	Nigerian Naira
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organization
NHF	Nigerian Humanitarian Fund
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
PHE	Public Health Engineering
PHP	Public Health Promotion
RRM	Rapid Response Mechanism
SHO	Dutch Public Appeal Fund
SMT	Senior Management Team
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
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
WASH	Water Sanitation and Hygiene

INTRODUCTION

Since the Boko Haram (BH) violent conflicts and incursions into communities around the Lake Chad Basins, life have not been the same for most of those affected. The consequences of Boko Haram actions include widespread dislocation of indigenous families from their homes and farmland, trauma and death, destruction of available insufficient infrastructures causing untoward hardships to millions of affected families and individuals alive to absorb the unbearable agony and pain. The Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) of 2017 showed that Borno is the most affected state in the region with over 4.4 million people in need of urgent assistance for survival, and the state's internally displaced persons (IDPs) was estimated at 69%.

Oxfam/DGD Humanitarian Response Strategy

Oxfam started the response in north-eastern region of Nigeria in 2014 and had offices in Maiduguri, Mubi, Gwoza, Pulka, and Damboa. An arm of the response called Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) use to have WASH, EFSVL, and Protection Services. The RRM team moves to communities where the military has just reclaimed from Boko Haram and where there is urgent need for humanitarian assistance. Oxfam is the only one implementing this kind of response. The RRT (Rapid Response Team) move into risk laden environment and prepare the way for more permanent team to operate.

Since 2017, Oxfam along with other international NGOs and the Nigerian government agencies have been providing the needed response in the north-east region. Between 1st October 2017 and 30th September 2018, Oxfam responded to the humanitarian emergency situation in Damboa and Chibok Local Government Areas (LGAs) focusing on eight selected communities namely: Abori, Wuyaram, Kachalla, Gumsuri, Gridjan, Bulari Kura, Wovi, Chibok, and Mbalala with DGD funds. The three key service areas of focus were water sanitation and hygiene (WASH), emergency food security and livelihood (EFSL) and protection.

Main Evaluation Purpose/Objective

The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the DGD project overall achievements, effectiveness and impact based on the empirical evidence from stakeholders including; the beneficiaries, service providers, implementing agencies and the government.

Specific Evaluation Objectives

Specific evaluation objectives of the DGD project represented below:

- Evaluate Oxfam DGD project based on the MEAL plan using the multisector assessment study conducted earlier as a baseline.
- Based on evidence establish the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the DGD project to their 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 mainstreaming protection in the emergency projects.
- Assess the complaint and feedback mechanisms
- Assess the extent of involvement of affected communities in the project activities design and implementation.

- Document and share findings, lessons learnt and recommendations to management teams
- Provide post evaluation plans to help ensure that findings inform institutional learning and future project outcomes.

SNAPSHOT OF MAJOR FINDINGS

1. Evidence of this evaluation showed that the WASH platform of the project provided safe water in the intervention communities through repair and rehabilitation of 10 wells, drilling and installation of two new hand-pumps, rehabilitation of two shallow wells with solar pumps installed, supplied materials and technical support to Damboa LGA for maintaining boreholes and overhead tanks, provided technical and financial support for developing and protecting water source, and water treatments for households.

2. Another major achievement of the DGD project through WASH platform was improved sanitation and hygiene in the IDP camps and host communities. Communal latrines and latrines with showers were constructed, existing sanitation facilities in institutional shelters were rehabilitated, and the project provided materials and training support to 15 individuals involved in 3 desludging enterprises and reuse of waste. Also, improved sanitation and hygiene were achieved through supply of environmental cleaning kits, and provision of hygiene and NFI items in households.

3. Findings showed that the project increased awareness and knowledge of intervention communities on safe water hygiene and sanitation, and the skills of WASH committee members were enhanced through training. Twelve community mobilizers were paid incentives to reach 35,095 households, and 149 households received community focal point kits, and equipment for participatory dialogue sessions were provided to 35,095 households. Also, the project established/supported existing WASH committees, facilitated capacity building of 63 community members, and provided training at two focal points for 149 households.

4. On the EFSVL front, findings of this evaluation showed that the project improved nutritional intake, and better livelihood and economic activities of the eight intervention communities. A total of 2682 households received cash transfer for agricultural inputs, 2555 new arrival/returnee IDPs received cash transfers, and 175 individuals each representing a household, received in-kind support for dry season kitchen gardening. The project provided 7040 households with information on cooking practices, post-harvest advice, and grain storage, and conducted 104 food security and projection monitoring visits to 1,800 households.

5. Findings on the protection intervention showed that gender based violence were minimal, the communities became more sensitized about gender issues. Findings suggest that 1000 household received safety support kits, 160 individuals were trained and included in protection committees, and were involved in protection and vulnerability power analysis. Protection activities included training 120 local authorities on protection issues, training service provider in one community, and 160 individuals trained in advocacy at the local level.

6. Findings showed that the project surpassed planned targets for the majority of activities, a few reached the same planned targets, and only one activity did not reach planned target. And at least 60% of women who form the bulk of the vulnerable group and their children accessed the project facility more than the male sub-group.

7. Evaluation evidence showed that the project responded to the needs of IDPs in camps and host communities, the community key players were involved in activities planning, and decision making evident from the involvement of the traditional rulers, women leaders, committee members, and volunteers/supervisors. And the project added value to the lives of the beneficiaries based on their responses on this issue.

8. The DGD project was effective in its delivery of the stated objectives with respect to planned targets, averting outbreak of diseases, access to clean water, better sanitation and environment, reduction in malnutrition and improvement in livelihood activities. However, findings showed that activities were not evenly implemented across the life-span of the project.

9. Project efficiency was achieved through initial assessment of potential beneficiaries to ensure that vulnerable sub-groups were adequately included, analysis of budget vs. actual expense, complementarity of services provided, repair of existing facilities rather than constructing new ones, and providing community based facilities which reached more people than were targeted.

10. Findings of this evaluation showed that complaint response mechanism operated by the project reduced obstacle in receiving or responding to complaints. Also, findings showed that program staff were involved in coordination meetings both at Maiduguri and Damboa and this helped to foster closer working relationship, and reduced duplication of efforts.

11. Findings of this evaluation showed that project sustainability with respect to information, knowledge enhancement and behavior change may continue into the near future, likewise community based facilities like water boreholes, and latrines which may involve little funding to maintain but project activates that require continuous funding like cash transfer may not be sustainable.

12. Key challenges identified were security situation which had paramount effect on implementation of project activities, inadequate protection actors due to increased demand, and risky environment to implement cash transfer.

13. Overall, the majority of participants rated the project performance excellent and this rating skewed largely to beneficiaries (89.9%), compared to project staff (63.2%). It was clear from the findings of this evaluation that beneficiaries compared their situations before and after the project intervention in their rating, while project staff used their experience during the project implementation process.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Key Oxfam staff was consulted in every step of the evaluation process. Oxfam staff through every step of the process. The process included review of evaluation design, tools development, and logistics of the evaluation. The evaluation employed mixed methods combining both quantitative and qualitative techniques.

Quantitative Data

Quantitative data was obtained from existing project documents. The evaluation team reviewed project proposal, budget, financial report, Gantt chart, initial assessment reports, monthly and bi-annual reports on the DGD project.

Qualitative Data

Qualitative data were collected from Oxfam staff who worked on the DGD project in both Maiduguri and Damboa offices, beneficiaries in IDP camps and host communities. In total, seven key informant interviews (KIIs) and 10 focus group discussions (FGDs) were conducted during the evaluation. The seven key informant interviews were conducted with project staff in Maiduguri, five FGDs were conducted with Oxfam staff in Damboa, while five FGDs were conducted with beneficiaries, three in host communities, and two in IDP camps.

Oxfam staff who participated in KII ages ranged from 29 to 54 years, and all had a bachelor's degree and some had master's degree in addition. The ages of volunteers and supervisors interviewed ranged between 24 to 42, and the highest level of education was National Certificate of Education (NCE). While beneficiaries who participated in this evaluation aged between 20 and 66, and the highest level of education was National Diploma (ND).

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were extracted from projects documents and summarized into tables, while qualitative data were transferred from field notes into Excel Spreadsheet and analyzed. Key findings were reported in subsections of this report below under achievements, relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency, feedback mechanism, coordination mechanism, sustainability, challenges and constraints, lessons learned, best practices, overall performance and impact, suggestions for the future, and conclusions.

Limitation of the Evaluation

This evaluation did not conduct quantitative survey to elicit information from the host communities and IDPs. This could have provided statistically representative results on indicators of project achievements, challenges and constraints, and impact of the DGD project in the targeted communities.

The evaluation team did not have the opportunity to clarify some issues and get feedback from Oxfam staff who participated in the evaluation because they were all disengaged at the time the report was drafted. Such feedback could have provided more insight on the findings especially on the process questions of the evaluation.

ACHIEVEMENTS

Achievements are presented on WASH, EFSVL, and protection which were the three areas of the DGD response in the eight communities in Damboa and its surrounding areas. The intervention communities were Abori, Wuyaram, Kachalla Bulari, Kura, Gumsuri, Gridjan, Wovi, Chibok, and Mbalala.

Water, Hygiene and Sanitation (WASH) Response

Achievements in the WASH response are presented in Table 1 in three dimensions; (1) provision of potable water, (2) provision of latrines and environmental sanitation, and (3) WASH awareness, knowledge, and capacity building.

Provision of Potable Water

Activity	Households (HH)			Population Reached		
	Target	Reached	Reach vs. target (%)	Male	Female	Total
1. Repair and rehabilitation of hand-pumps and protection of open wells (10 wells)	700	717	102.4%	1720 (40%)	2580 (60%)	4300 (100%)
2. New mid-aquifer drilling & installation of handpumps (2)	167	200	119.8%	400 (33.3%)	800 (66.7%)	1200 (100%)
3. Rehabilitation of shallow well & equipping with solar pump and solar (2 sites)	350	833	238%	1800 (36%)	3,200 (64%)	5000 (100%)
4. Material & technical support to LGAs for repairs & operation of boreholes, pumps with overhead tanks (1 LGA)	4167	4167	100%	10000 (40%)	15000 (60%)	25000 (100%)
5. Supported 3 selected water vendor groups through technical and financial support in developing and protecting water source (48 individuals)	4167	4167	100%	10000 (40%)	15000 (60%)	25000 (100%)
6. Support with household water treatment (200 HH)	200	500	250%	2302 (28%)	5921 (72%)	8223 (100%)

As Table 1 above shows, the project reached and surpassed planned targets in 4 of the 6 activities, and reached planned target in the remaining two. The high performance in activity three of the table could be due to more people moving to the communities where the water pumps were installed, and over performance on activity six could be due to favorable currency exchange rate which made it possible for the purchase of more water treatment materials using the same amount budgeted. Also, more females at least 60% than males benefited from the potable water activities implemented in the communities. Thus confirming effort by the project to include vulnerable sub-groups of the communities.

Table 2: DGD project activities on latrine & environmental sanitation among targeted IDP camps & host communities

Activity	Households (HH)			Population Reached		
	Target	Reached	Reach vs. target (%)	Male	Female	Total
1. Construction of communal latrines in IDP camps & settlements (20 doors)	160	162	101.2%	583 (59.9%)	398 (40.1%)	981 (100%)
2. Construction of HH latrines and showers (250)	250	250	100%	951 (51%)	915 (49%)	1866 (100%)
3. Rehabilitation of existing sanitation facilities in institutional shelters (43 doors)	251	602	230%	602 (40%)	903 (60%)	1505 (100%)
4. Materials & training support to 3 desludging enterprises & reuse of waste (15 individuals; 6 pumps; 3 tricycles)	15	n/a	n/a	15	n/a	n/a
5. Environmental cleaning kits (30)	35095	35095	100%	57252 (43.7%)	73888 (56.3%)	131140 (100%)
6. Latrine cleaning kits (30)	250	250	100%	951 (51%)	951 (49%)	1866 (100%)
7. HH hygiene & NFI items for most vulnerable HH (500)	500	800	160%	1949 (39.8%)	2949 (60.2%)	4898 (100%)

Note: n/a = not applicable, HH = household.

As Table 2 shows, the project met and surpassed planned targets in three activities, and reached planned targets in the remaining four. With respect to activity number four, the project trained 15 individuals in dislodging enterprise who then commenced work with six pumps and three tricycles. The 230% performance in activity three could be due to more people moving into the intervention communities. Community members who participated in the focused groups conducted reported that they accessed the dislodging pumps to dispose their waste. Also, Table 2 showed that more female (60%) than male (40%) beneficiaries were involved in rehabilitation of existing sanitation facilities in institutional shelters, more females (56.3%) than males (43.7%) got environmental sanitation kit, and more females (60.2%) than males (39.8%) accessed hygiene and NFI items for most vulnerable groups.

IDP camp beneficiaries who participated in the focus group discussion reported that they received hygiene kit, replenishment kit, and buckets among others items. A key finding that touched on optimal use of resources is that households in IDP camps shared some of their items with neighboring households who did not receive such items.

Activity	Households (HH)			Population Reached		
	Target	Reached	Reach vs. target (%)	Male	Female	Total
1. Incentives to community mobilizers (12)*	55	35095	63809%	57252 (43.7%)	73888 (56.3%)	131140 (100%)
2. Community focal point kits (100)*	149	149	100%	80 (53.7%)	69 (46.3%)	149 (100%)
3. Equipment for participatory dialogue sessions i.e. IECs, samples, media production etc. (8)*	35000	35095	100.3%	57252 (43.7%)	73888 (56.3%)	131140 (100%)
4. Establish or support existing WASH committees and facilitate capacity building (8)*	63	63	100%	31 (49.3%)	32 (50.7%)	63 (100%)
Training community focal points (2)*	149	149	100%	82 (55.1%)	67 (44.9%)	149

Note: n/a = not applicable, HH = household, * = number of individuals/equipment/activity planned

In sum, the project accomplished all planned activities, surpassed targeted number of households in two activities, and met targets in two others. In table 3, project statistics on activity 1 suggest that 12 mobilizers were trained and given incentives, and they in-turn mobilized 35,095 households (about 131,140 people) who received WASH information. This upshot in performance was most likely due to new IDP returnees to the host communities, and new arrivals at IDP camps during the project lifespan. Likewise, report on activity 3 showed that eight equipment were procured for participatory dialogue sessions and these were used to reach 35,095 households (about 131,140 people) with IEC messages. The linking of planned activity with intervention communities is quite insightful and it suggest the level of penetration of these knowledge-based activities. Also, statistics in Table 3 show that female involvement was over 50% in at least three activities implemented suggesting fairly good access of this vulnerable sub-group to WASH activities.

Food Security & Livelihood (EFSVL) Response

Activity	Households (HH)			Population
	Target	Reached	Reach vs. target (%)	Population reached
1. Agricultural input support through cash transfer	1500	2682	178.8%	16,092
2. Cash transfers (cash or vouchers) to new arrival, returnee, host or IDP HHs	2000	2555	127.7%	15,330
3. Cash for work (cash transfer)	1500	1628	108.5%	9768
4. Kitchen dry season garden (in-kind)	200	175	87.5%	1050
5. Information sessions on; cooking practices, post-harvest advice, and grain storage	600	7040	1173%	42,240
6. Integrated food security and protection monitoring (104 visits)	none	1800	n/a	n/a

Note: n/a = not applicable, HH = household

Table 4 above shows planned targets and actual figures reached by the project on EFSVL. Except for kitchen dry season gardening where target was not met, the project surpassed planned target on agricultural cash transfer which beneficiaries used to purchase seeds for their maize, groundnut, guinea corn, and rice farms or used for animal husbandry (178.8%), cash transfer for new IDP arrivals (127.7%), cash for work (108.5%), and provision of cooking and agricultural information to beneficiaries (1173%). The low performance in activity four could be due to lack of gardening space for those who might have participated and the seasonal nature of the activity also affected the performance. The high performance in activity six could be the result of increased population in the intervention communities during the life of the project. The cash for food was provided to the most vulnerable in the communities (minimum 20,000 kilo calories) followed with a three-month food surveillance. Cash ranging from 17,000 to 34,000 Naira were given to IDPs at the camp. Recipients during FGD sessions reported that the money was used to purchase food items such as maize, firewood, soup ingredients, mat which lasted for between 2 to 4 months depending on household number.

Protection Support Intervention

Table 5: DGD project activities on protection of beneficiaries in targeted IDP camps & host communities

Activity	Individuals/Household (HH)			Population		
	Target	Reached	Reach vs. target (%)	Male	Female	Total (Male & Female) Total reached
1. Distribution of safety support kits*	1000	1000 (3777 people)	100%	373 (37.3%)	627 (62.7%)	1000 (100%)
2. Training & establishment of protection committee	160	160	100%	80 (50%)	80 (50%)	160 (100%)
3. Protection and vulnerability power analysis (8 communities)	160	160	100%	80 (50%)	80 (50%)	160 (100%)
4. Training of local authorities (8 communities)	120	120	100%	74 (61.7%)	46 (38.3%)	120 (100%)
5. Training session for service providers (only 1 community)	25	25	100%	16 (64%)	9 (36%)	25 (100%)
6. Training of local level advocacy training (8 communities)	160	160	100%	80 (50%)	80 (50%)	120 (100%)

Note: * shows number of household (HH), and total population reached

Table 5 shows that on protection of beneficiaries at the IDP camps and host communities, all planned activities with respect to; (1) distribution of safety support kits, (2) establishment and training of protection committees, local authorities, and service providers, (3) protection and vulnerability power analysis, and (4) advocacy training, were all achieved. It is important to note that activity one was reported on number of household and total population reached, while other activities were reported on number of individual community members that participated. Statistics in the table shows that females were equally represented in at least four of the six activities suggesting the inclusiveness of women in these crucial gender based activities. Beneficiaries reported that the protection support kit given to them included wrappers (12 yards), solar lamps, padlock, radio, pairs of slippers (for children), bicycles, and umbrella.

Statistics in Table 5 shows that 8 protection committees were formed composing 50% male and 50% female, and they were trained using materials on child management mainly by visualization (flip charts and other IEC materials). Modalities for dealing with abuse cases started with identifying cases at the community level

which were dealt with by the traditional leaders and severe cases of abuse were transferred to Oxfam staff which may be transferred to Oxfam Maiduguri office depending on who is involved and severity of the case.

Findings from the FGD sessions with protection committee members and beneficiaries showed that the committee members had more demand for their services than they could respond to. This may be due in part to dynamics in scope of protection roles which the community expanded to include negative behaviors of children such as smoking, absenteeism from school, or non-school attendance, children indulgence in playing at night, watching out for strangers, children street hawking, and even settling dispute arising from misuse of community facilities.

Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning (MEAL)

Oxfam MEAL team provided evidential vehicle for the attainment of DGD project achievements, and overall performance of the project. The MEAL team led by the coordinator based in Maiduguri coordinated baseline assessments on all activities, conducted post-response survey, championed the feedback response from the communities, and designed tools for collecting evidence on all aspects of the project. In order to achieve effective monitoring, the MEAL team worked with the programme team on data verification in the communities to ascertain how inclusiveness of the target beneficiaries was achieved, and/or how exclusiveness occurred during project implementation. A vital function of the MEAL team was the coordination of complaint desks set-up during activities which was a major platform used to obtain real time feedback from project beneficiaries.

Logistics Team

Logistics is an essential component of most DGD project activities. According KII findings, it is the “wheel that runs the project.” Or it may be described as the project “pillar.” Logistics contributed to the achievement of the DGD project from its strategic importance supported by well-developed supply plan, no financial gaps or missing procedural documents. Oxfam procurements policies were operationalized through four financial thresholds; (1) direct purchase—for items less than 500 Euro (with a general request note and an invoice, supplies can be sent directly to the beneficiaries), (2) single quotation is between 500 and 1000 Euro (get only one quotation, and prepare a purchase order), (3) competitive bid between 1001 and 49999 Euro (at least three quotations, do competitive bid analysis using criteria to choose the best), and (4) open tender is required for amount 50,000 Euro or more (similar to competitive bid except that there is no limit to bidders).

Contributing to the success of the DGD project is the warehousing process in Maiduguri which enabled two types of stocks i.e. (1) transit stock, and (2) contingency stock. The transit stocks were temporarily in the warehouse bound for delivery at the field offices, while contingency stock were items procured to be delivered as required. With respect to asset management (which is another important aspects of the project), donor and Oxfam definitions are reconciled to eliminate confusion. Oxfam definitions classify assets using three parameters, (1) cost more than 500 Euro, (2) has a unique serial number or identification, and (3) has a lifespan of two years, and items that has two of these requirements qualifies for an asset. The implication of this is that items that qualify as an asset are tracked using their date of purchase throughout the lifespan of project and their usefulness for project delivery.

In sum, logistics for DGD followed standard protocols and due process in procuring materials and services for WASH, EFSVL, and protection activities. Thus, resulting in timely and good delivery of the project activities in the communities. Needs were made by the beneficiaries, verified and procured by logistics and became stocks once delivered to the warehouse, and were dispatched to the beneficiaries in communities.

Human Resource Team

Findings from this evaluation suggest that the “do no harm policy” underlines the human resource policy i.e. do what you are expected to do and expect nothing in return. This enabled the human resource team to recruit the right staff without appeal to sentiments. Another principle that guided recruitment of project staff was employment based on needs and budget to back it up. This evaluation evidence suggests that the human resource team in Damboa was very sensitive to gender matters and the culture guided recruitment of local staff, giving everyone equal level playing field.

Security Threats and Management

Evidence from the KII conducted showed security concern permeates all decisions and actions during project implementation and this was updated often. The security team provided sound security intelligence apparatus following security plans and systems put in place to ensure that project objectives were achieved. With the involvement of Oxfam security team in security cluster meetings composed of representatives of all implementing partners and the government (where extensive discussions on security took place), information were shared with project staff to guide implementation of project activities. At the field level a roving security officer cover the DGD project in Damboa, a sister project in Pulka.

Sources of information on security situation came from Oxfam staff on ground (over 40%) who got real time information directly from the community, and military clearance dictates what we do. Also, information comes from the intervention community trusted members, and civilian joint task force (CJTF). Other sources of security information included the newspapers, social media i.e. twitters etc. The security team engaged in security management, carryout risk assessment on any staff moving from one location to another. Indicators used to assess risks include demographics of those moving (nationals, relocatable vs. local staff etc.), distinguishing external vs. internal risks, simulate what could happen during project activity, the fitness of the vehicles to be used, whether there is need to have satellite or cell phones. The security also had constant comparison of risks during meeting of the senior management team (SMT).

Criteria for Rating Security

Evidence from this evaluation suggest that security concern is of prime importance in Damboa and the security team tried to be as proactive as possible. The situation may be discerned from the fact that risk of Boko Haram attack was just two kilometers away, and some communities that were initially identified to receive DGD assistance were not accessible for security reasons provided by military intelligence. The security team based on experience working in the context listed criteria for classifying security situation as: (1) number of incidence and recurring of attacks from Boko Haram which may suggest a trend. (2) Whether incidence of attacks was for food only or whether it also results into killing of people among others.

RELEVANCE & APPROPRIATENESS

Response to Specific & Changing Needs

A key approach employed by Oxfam from the beginning was visibility which involved Oxfam staff meeting community members in their location with Oxfam logo and trademark openly displayed. This is accomplished by providing information on what the organization had to offer. Thus, reducing over expectations, to a large extent, from the intervention communities. Evidence of the FGDs and KIIs conducted showed that the project was a great help and relief to IDPs both in the camps and host communities. When Oxfam entered the community, a beneficiary described the situation as "you don't see life, you just see people,' (i.e. people were not alive and vibrant) but the situation was the reverse at the time of evaluation. The project increased knowledge and capacity of beneficiaries, increased access to WASH, EFSVL, and protection facilities thus, restored life to the people. Evidence from FGDs conducted with beneficiaries showed that the Oxfam humanitarian response changed their perception and thinking, and introduced them to new and better ways of doing things. Quantitative evidence on achievements (Tables 1 to 5) buttressed by qualitative evidence showed that the DGD project responded to changing need and priorities of different categories of the beneficiaries. A beneficiary during focus group discussion session succinctly puts it this way, "it (the project) opened our eyes to different kind of levels to aspire to in life."

Response to Specific Needs of Most Vulnerable

Evidence from focus group discussion sessions that included elderly men and women, and the physically disabled showed that at the advent of the project open indiscriminate defecation was common, there was no potable water in the communities, and the environment were dirty, inhabitable, and outbreak of diseases was rampant. Also, evidence showed that at the beginning of the project, community members experienced hunger and malnutrition but the distribution of sanitary and protection kits, and voluntary cash transfer enabled them to take care of their household members, and provided access to basic food need for survival.

Excerpts below are from evaluation participants on meeting the needs of the intervention community members.

"Before Oxfam came, no drinkable water, and there was open defecation everywhere, the place was overcrowded and diseases like Cholera was everywhere. Now we have drinkable water, many latrines where people can go to. Some community members got money to start their own business like trading, and tailoring. Some women did not have clothes to wear, but now they have for themselves and their children." (female volunteer, Damboa, 7th September, 2018).

"... (The project provided) food water and sanitation education, provided cash, allocated cash, which can be used for other assets, and additional source of income as a result, and increased access to nutritional food." (Oxfam staff, Maiduguri 4th September 2018)

"the difference is clear between intervention and non-intervention communities with respect to open defecation, and improved hygiene. Some non-intervention communities have come requesting to be part of the project and even copied aspects of it such as environmental sanitation." (Oxfam staff, Damboa, 6th September, 2018)

Involvement in Project Design & Implementation

Evidence from the focus group discussion showed that the beneficiaries were involved in the planning and implementation of project activities. The traditional leaders and other key community members meet with Oxfam team to deliberate on who an activity should be implemented. The DGD project had a well outlined operational structure which was established from the beginning. This included the community leaders (Lawan and Bulama), the committees on EFSVL, WASH, and protection, who were community members, volunteers/supervisors which interfaced frequently with community members, and Oxfam staff.

The project activities at the community level started with initial assessment survey to ascertain needs and identification of most vulnerable sub-groups. Community leaders and WASH, EFSVL, and Protection committee members work with volunteers and Oxfam staff to identify households and individuals that should be provided with needs and are involved in the distribution of hygiene items and protection kits. Evidence showed location of community based items such as public latrines, and water pumps were decided with community leaders. Aside, complain desks were set-up during distribution of items to get immediate feedback and complaints. And the desk was successful in providing on the spot information from the beneficiaries on the items received.

Added Value Provision

The principle employed in the project was to ensure that beneficiaries get value for the money spent by (1) ensuring that most decisions are taken jointly with the community so they make the choice of what they want, and they confirm or validate what was supplied. Evidence that confirmed added value can be drawn from the principle of community engagement employed by the project. Excerpts from different stakeholders presented below buttress the fact that project beneficiaries had value for money.

- *“Oxfam built bridge which helped us to access our farms, they built latrines and open defecation is no more, they provided water, they provided cash which brought trade to our community, they provided cash for work which created jobs for our people.... all NGOs are good but Oxfam is the best.” (community leader, Damboa, 7th September, 2018)*
- *“Before we used to have sexual harassment but now it has stopped. An example that teach many lessons was a girl that was forced to have sex, and human rights were brought in to deal with it and the girl returned back to school.... the coming of Oxfam has brought community change.” (member, protection committee, Damboa, 7th September, 2018)*
- *“...the project helped to solve hunger problem, sensitization helped to change the behavior and hygienic lifestyle of the people. At the beginning of the intervention the IDP camps were in a mess but with substantial sensitization the people have changed for the better.” (Oxfam staff, 6th September, 2018)*

EFFECTIVENESS

Inclusiveness & Life Saving Intervention

Evidence from this evaluation suggest that intervention in the eight project communities saved lives and was inclusive of vulnerable sub-groups. Outbreak of Cholera and other water borne diseases were common before DGD response but these were non-existent at the time of evaluation. FGDs conducted with IDPs included elderly, middle-aged, disabled, and young men and women who confirmed that the Oxfam project saved their lives from diseases, hunger and malnutrition. FGD participants in host communities reported that funds from EFSVL activities enabled them to engaged in economic ventures such as farming and animal husbandry which increased economic activities in their community and enabled them to meet basic needs.

Excerpts below buttress the findings on aversion cholera outbreak, infection, sexual violence, hunger, and malnutrition.

“We were chased from our homes which is about two hours’ journey..... they (Oxfam) gave us cash twice one 17,000 Naira and another 34,000 Naira which we used to buy maize, soup, food items, firewood, which last for about two to four months depending on the size of the family.” (female beneficiary, IDP camp, 7th September, 2018)

“Before you hear of big cholera outbreak but this is now reduced or eliminated completely in the eight intervention communities. Also, diarrhea is reduced as well, with re-useable pads, infection has reduced among the women; open defecation is zero percent; reported cases of sexual violence has reduced, and host communities give IDPs land to farm.” (Oxfam staff, Maiduguri, 4th September, 2018)

The DGD project reached and even surpassing targets in most of the activities earmarked for it. Evidence presented in Tables 1 to 5 of this report summarized targets and outputs and outcomes reached. As the tables show, the DGD project reached planned targets in 28 of the 29 activities. Of the 17 activities implemented under WASH, the project reached planned targets in eight (47%), and surpassed in nine (53%); it surpassed targets in five of six activities on EFSVL (83%); and reached targets in all 6 activities on protection.

Timely Delivery of Planned Activities

Evidence from qualitative data showed that in general, project activities were delivered on time except in few instances caused by external constraints mainly security challenges. Most planned activities were implemented on time enabled by supply activity plan employed, bulk procurement, and warehousing facilities. However, evidence suggest that some activities were clustered towards the tail end of implementation due largely to internal factors.

Based on delay in the project implementation process, some activities were clustered in August, 2018. In addition, some items that should not take more than two to three days to get to the communities took between a week to two weeks. Reasons for the delay in timely delivery of project activities may be explained as follow.

- Delay in food supply occurred sometimes due to external logistical problems i.e. bad roads, and security issues. This unforeseen logistics challenges may have caused delay in supplying some items, but this was reduced by providing "buffer stock" which accommodated extra items in case of unforeseen circumstances or changing dynamics in logistics.
- Inappropriate inclusion or exclusion of beneficiaries in the distribution of products and services sometimes coursed the entire process of identifying and selecting vulnerable beneficiaries to be repeated thus resulting in some delays in the delivery of services.
- The DGD project was supposed to end in September 2018 but many activities were implemented closed to the end due to unexpected notice of project closure.

However, the delays experienced did not substantially impact on the beneficiaries in the targeted communities.

Decision Making Structures

A major advantage of the DGD project was that the existing managerial and operational structure of OFDA (Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance) transitioned easily into it. In addition, experience of staff who worked on a grant that Oxfam received from OFDA benefitted and enabled the smooth take off of the DGD project. Thus, all managerial and technical structures were fully autonomous and operating from the start of project. The base managers in Damboa handled day-to-day decisions on activities in the intervention communities based on a budget limit of 2000 Euro. While Maiduguri office, and Abuja country head office made decisions on a given threshold as well and deferred when it is higher. Threshold of approval may cause delays at times but not major. In general, the structure in place enables faster decision making and quicker response. Aside that base manager makes decisions with threshold of 2000 Euro, other medium of payment such as cheques and e-transfers were referred to Maiduguri office.

Thus, decision making was based on funding limits at every level of operation. Likewise, procurement starts with the person making the request, goes to logistics/procurements to confirm that item can be bought, then to budget order in finance division for verification before approval to purchase by the budget holder (e.g. base manager). Although it is impossible to entirely eliminate financial loopholes, the risk of its occurrence was managed to the lowest level possible. Because of the checks put in place at every level of decision making, there were no duplication of efforts.

Gaps in decision making may have occurred as a result of high staff turnover at some point during project implementation but this did not seem to have affected financial and managerial decisions. In addition, autonomous decision making with threshold limits in the field operations contributed to efficient implementation of the DGD project. Management related delays highlighted below were not major but may be informative for future implementation of similar projects.

- Evidence suggest that delays in inception of the project i.e. actual implementation was supposed to start in October 2017 but did not take off effectively until January 2018. This may have caused the project team to work under pressure to deliver outputs at the later part of the project life.
- Evidence suggest that administrative procedures may have affected payment of businesses that supplied items or worked for the project. Payment for work done takes 3 to 7 days but may be extended due to external factors like client's lack of understanding of the project's procedures.

EFFICIENCY

Judicious Use of Resources

Evidence from this evaluation suggest that in general, the project used resources judiciously and activities were implemented in a cost-effective manner. Major indicators of judicious use of resources were evident in the over performance on (Tables 1 to 5) planned targets of the project. Judicious use of resources may have resulted from the following; (1) the use of integrated programming that makes it easy to leverage on resources, manage and track activities. (2) funds were used based on identified needs, (3) resources were used based on a technique called budget vs. actual thus, efficiency is attained by comparing budget vs. actual expense. Analysis of budget vs. actual gives financial data on status of activities, and helped to make decisions quickly. Activities that were not implemented were easily identified and discussed to reduce delay in implementation.

Through financial analysis forecast were done ahead on the implementation of project activities. Enough time was put into planning to make sure that the activities were implemented on time. Commitment at the beginning to financial discipline made it possible to use funds in a timely fashion. Coupled with this is quality verification of supplies, and an efficient feedback mechanism that ensured right quality of products

were supplied to beneficiaries. During the course of the project, there were reported cases of poor-quality products from suppliers but were returned back before delivery. Thus, defective or poor-quality items were not transferred to beneficiaries in the field.

Another dimension to ensuring judicious use of resources was the baseline assessment done to answer the verification question of who is entitled to get what, and re-validation done anytime new arrivals come to the IDP camps or host communities. Key indicators employed to ensure inclusion of disadvantaged sub-groups in the communities were; disability, widowhood, elderly, child harassment cases, source of potable water etc. To buttress judicious use of resources, MEAL team checked quality of training provided to staff and community volunteers and beneficiaries, and the number of persons trained per time. The gradual replacement of many international experts with local staff may have enhanced judicious use of resources in some ways. However, the project had no mechanism for ensuring judicious use of resources by the beneficiaries. For example, it was revealed during FGD session that cash given to some beneficiaries may have been used for purposes not beneficial to them.

Project efficiency benefited from the complementary services provided. For example, access to safe water complemented increased nutritional intake, and better hygienic environment to prevent outbreak of disease. Also, many project activities focused on repairing existing facilities rather than constructing new ones which most likely saved cost. The other aspect of efficiency comes from WASH community based facilities, information and knowledge transfer which reached more people than the project planned for.

Instances of decisions made during the life of the project that suggest judicious use of resources are provided below.

- Decision was made to use the same amount budgeted for 250 showers, and 50 latrines to construct 250 facilities with both shower and latrines, thus increasing access to both latrines and showers.
- Favorability in foreign exchange boosted judicious resource use as reflected in the achievement sections of this report. For example, cash or vouchers planned for 1500 agricultural support was used for 2682 recipients.

Report suggest that a few items were not well received by the beneficiaries. For example, Ghana-Must-Go bag (customized Nigerian bag) was well received by beneficiaries in IDPs camps, but not well received by those in host communities.

PARTICIPATION, COMPLAINT, & FEEDBACK MECHANISM

This evaluation showed that feedback mechanism was one of the strengths employed in the DGD project. Complaints desks were opened during provision of services at the community to harvest complaints which serves as feedback. Other ways of obtaining feedback used in the project were suggestion box, volunteers/supervisors, mobilizers, and monthly meeting with the WASH, EFSVL, and Protection committee members. The MEAL team anchored the complaint desk and collated complaints which were transferred to the quarters for response.

Aside, complaints response mechanism (CRM) was set-up with participation of community members. This involved meeting with community members monthly on issues bordering on their daily lives. Issues discussed may be categorized into (1) request for service assistance, and (2) minor dissatisfaction with programme activities or dissatisfaction on structures that were built, and/or complaints about staff. Request for service assistance usually took the majority of complaints (about 90%).

The MEAL team regularly collated all complaints and channeled them to the program officer/s responsible. Evidence showed that most complaints were responded to promptly since daily operational decision making resided in Damboa close to the communities. The response and feedback mechanism process was efficient but quite challenging. None of the beneficiaries who participated in the evaluation reported any complaints any complaints not addressed by the project team except request for more assistance from Oxfam.

Efforts were put in place by the project team to make complaints response mechanisms more efficient by digitalizing the process such that complaints logged in the communities are were received in Maiduguri were collated easily in real time but this was yet to be tested for efficiency.

COORDINATION MECHANISM

Extent of Synergy Among Stakeholders & Duplication of Efforts

In general, evidence suggest strong coordination among emergency response program implementers. Throughout the life of the project, coordination meetings were organized on security, protection, and EFSVL, WASH. Key highlights on coordination are presented below.

- Government participation in coordination meeting was more in Maiduguri than in Damboa where most of LGA officials were more often not around. For example, protection committee coordination in Maiduguri was through the protection cluster chaired by UNHCR and Co-chaired by ministry of women and social affairs with active involvement of other local and international NGOs. Also, WASH coordination meeting in Maiduguri was held at the ministry of water resources and chaired by a UNICEF representative.
- The various intersectoral task force created helped the coordination of implementing agencies' activities at the intervention communities. Oxfam was very active in the task force created thus benefiting from information exchange, advocacy and technical advice on issues arising from the response.
- In Damboa, the DGD project office served as the fulcrum for coordination meetings involving all response agencies. An LGA official was always in attendance at the meetings where operational issues bordering on strategies, logistics, service realignment (including referrals) were frequently addressed thus eliminating duplication of efforts. The following excerpts corroborates the importance of coordination meetings and the role Oxfam played in the process.

"..... coordination meetings were done at this office (pointing towards a rotunda outside the office block). Most of the organization that come here for initial assessment come to Oxfam office first and even stay here (lodged facilities) before going about their work. We discuss referrals from other organization, and coordination meeting did not give room for duplication of efforts in the communities because we know where everyone is working and what service is provided." (Oxfam staff, Damboa, 6th September, 2018)

SUSTAINABILITY

Evidence suggest that the issue of sustainability may not be sufficiently dealt with without breaking down according to the type of activity implemented. Knowledge based and behavioral change component of the project may have the longest sustainability life span. This is because evidence suggest that knowledge transfer had taken place and internalized in most of the activities. The excerpts below buttresses the findings on knowledge transfer.

"This project is key to our welfare, the activities involved are constant.... even 5 years (from now) we will continue. On our own part we do not like Oxfam to leave this community, but we can do the protection activities even without Oxfam." (member, protection committee, Damboa, 7th September, 2018)

"I can give hygiene promotion information, also I can give menstrual promotion information. I may not come out personally for these activities as we use to do before, but I can talk to some people on my way to somewhere, and can do demonstration of the materials that we use once cost of materials are not included." (member of volunteer team, Damboa, 7th September, 2018)

“it is evident that local staff have been transformed, all Oxfam security guard have moved to their personal houses, the project has created sense of belonging (the skype group in Damboa includes everybody), coupled with numerous capacity building opportunities, (local) staff now understand work ethics in a professional environment, and how to conduct themselves.” (Oxfam staff, Damboa, 6th September 2018)

Likewise, project components that dealt with community facility maintenance like the water boreholes, and sewage disposal, and latrines may be continued for some time. Also, other activities like cash transfer for entrepreneurship activities were already yielding dividends and may be sustained as well. However, voluntary cash transfer for food or for work may not continue after Oxfam unless other NGOs take-up these activities. Key initiatives by the DGD project that may continue in the future are highlighted below.

(1) Activities managed by volunteers like the women friendly spaces, repair of water pumps, and volunteer activities carried out by community committees. Excerpt below from an evaluation participant supports this conclusion.

“the boreholes are maintained by us, we have been trained on how to do the repairs, and we were given tool box with some spare parts. Oxfam built overhead tanks to store water as well.” (member, WASH committee, Damboa, 7th September, 2018)

(2) Strengthening of existing structures on ground and local authorities were trained to build and maintain facilities. Community leaders are likely to continue to follow-up and supervise maintenance of community facilities which they have now taken as part of their responsibilities. For example, members of WASH committee have started repairing and managing water pumps with the tools provided by Oxfam.

(3) Entrepreneurship activities were a form of economic empowerment and strengthening that may be sustained for some time. Examples of money-making ventures like manual dislodging pumps which is used to dispose waste, and fabricated pushcarts are income generating activities that may self-motivate continuation of such activities. The following quotes from evaluation participants buttress this point.

“...Our activities were implemented with sustainability in mind. We had several trainings both external and internal on how to maintain the facilities.... book keeping and accountability were taught the water vendors to ensure sustainability in the future. Another example of sustainability is the rehabilitated wells which need minor maintenance to continue the service. We provided lots of community engagement both formal and informal training were provided and so some community members have the knowledge, and these are their people.” (Oxfam staff, Damboa, 7th September 2018)

“....and the economic situation is now coming alive. Most of the small businesses dealing with us (Oxfam) now know standard ways of doing business e.g. tax payment, logistical procedures, financial requirements i.e. maintaining a bank account. Oxfam has enabled small business in the area to be more professional in their dealings with organizations similar to ours.” (Oxfam staff, Damboa, 6th September 2018)

However, volunteers and supervisors who interface directly with beneficiaries may not be able to provide the same level of commitment without the financial incentives received which was instrumental in taking care of their needs and that of their families.

CHALLENGES & CONSTRAINTS

Challenges and constraints may be categorized into internal and external.

Internal Challenges and Constraints:

The following were reported to have affected the activities implemented during the course of the project:

On protection: Evidence suggest that protection committee members at the community were not sufficient after increased awareness and knowledge about protection issues sensitized community members to be more vigilant thus increasing demand for actors at that level. Other challenges raised were insufficient safety support kit estimated at ratio 6:10 of eligible households. Also, the culture of silence may have reduced reported incidence of gender-based violence (GBV), and late reporting of cases. In addition, evidence suggest that rehabilitation of GBV cases need review and strategizing as is currently not comprehensive enough. The strategy may include detailed counselling which should include advise on self-defense, and relocating the victim to a trusted relative elsewhere for a period of time before going back to their family if necessary.

On EFSVL: Evidence showed that project team experienced challenges in the distribution of large amount of cash in the intervention communities. There were no banking institutions in Damboa which implied that cash had to be brought from Maiduguri. Also, distributing cash posed major security risk considering the nearness of the Boko Haram bandits to the intervention communities.

On project management and administration: Evidence suggest that there was not enough effort to attenuate anxiety by preparing the minds of staff and beneficiaries on the sudden pull out of Oxfam from the emergency response programme in the north-east. Also, the response team had to deal with the pressure of wrapping up remaining project activities within a short period due to project closure which affected the implementation plan.

Tied to administrative challenges was the financial implications of beginning a project with large number of international staff which probably reflected later on funding. And reported high turnover of staff which occurred about the middle of the project life which somewhat may have affected the project implementation process.

External Challenges & Constraints

1. A major challenge was the charged security atmosphere which demanded constant clearance from the military before embarking on major project activities. For example, during the course of the project, Boko Haram once attacked in Damboa and this led to temporary closure of the office and inactivity for two weeks.
2. Lack of institutional services like Banks, and other services presented logistical challenges in cash transfer and handing and put undue stress and pressure on the team on ground.
3. Other logistical challenge was the unpredictable UNHCR Helicopter bookings, and information on this usually at short notice thus, disrupting planned project activities.
4. Damboa and the suburbs lacked inadequate communication facilities to aid timely project implementation. This is a common denominator for all humanitarian efforts in the region and would take concerted efforts championed by government agencies to address this situation.

LESSONS LEARNED

Some unexpected outcomes of this project based on evidence from this evaluation are presented below:

- (1) The Oxfam at the beginning of the project established commitment by been transparent on what the project aimed to achieve and what is outside their scope. This ensured acceptance and trust over the life of the project.

(2) Eliciting community trust resulted in getting real time security intelligence on a continuous basis which were valuable information necessary for decision-making on programme activities.

(3) The security intelligence over time suggest that to be perceived as neutral by both sides of the conflict reduces the risk of been targeted. This is because intelligence gathered suggest that some community members who were Boko Haram sympathizers may serve as their informants.

(4) Transparent selection process of community members who benefited from project activities resulted in better cooperation and community actions.

BEST PRACTICES

Evidence of this evaluation suggest that the following activities produced impactful results.

- Media-based campaign on protection was a best practice because it was very effective in reaching over 130,000 community members (see Table 3 above). The campaign educated people on their rights using playlets or soap opera during meetings and discussions centered around them. This approach provided opportunity for instant feedback on clarity of messages, acceptance, and knowledge gained.
- A best practice of the project was the campaign targeting mothers and the role they played in household hygiene. The campaign was captioned “*Matam Kwarai*” or “*Matan Sapta*” in the local dialect meaning “*mother’s magic hand,*” and the message was that real women are those that kept hygiene. The campaign rapidly cascaded within and outside the intervention communities and many households internalized the message which reflected in their behavior. Women groups decided to form their own sub-groups (outside the intervention activities) using similar strategy and concepts. The campaign made women the fulcrum for ensuring that children and the environment are kept clean.
- Another best practice was community engagement and sensitization using participatory approach from the beginning of the project. Community involvement engendered collaboration on certain activities, e.g. cash for work during construction of water pumps, bridges and dams. Working directly with community leaders (Lawan and Bulama) who knew that their views were respected and factored into decision making process enhanced community ownership and continuity.
- Evidence suggest that another key best practice was proactive rather than reactive coordination among partners. National level coordination meetings reduced duplication of efforts, and during meetings, some partners were critical of each other on procedures, and proffer suggestions on how gaps and weaknesses treated thus, strengthening the impact of the humanitarian response in general.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE & IMPACT

During qualitative data collection of this evaluation, stakeholders were asked to rate performance of DGD project with respect to impact on the lives of intervention communities. The ratings were in four categories i.e. not satisfactory, satisfactory, very satisfactory, and excellent. Table 6 below presents the rating on performance for Oxfam staff and beneficiaries (including volunteers/supervisors).

Table 6: Overall rating of project performance by project staff and beneficiaries
--

Rating of Project Performance	Beneficiaries (%)	Project staff (%)
Not satisfactory	1 (1.7%)	-
Satisfactory	2 (3.4%)	2 (10.5%)
Very Satisfactory	3 (5.1%)	5 (26.3%)
Excellent	53 (89.8%)	12 (63.2%)
TOTAL number (%)	59 (100%)	19 (100%)

Ratings in Table 6 are presented for beneficiaries and for project staff separately. Most beneficiaries (89.8%) who participated in the evaluation scored the project excellent, and the remaining small proportion scored very satisfactory (5.1%), satisfactory (3.4%), and not satisfactory (1.7%). The majority of staff (63.2%) rated the DGD project excellent, followed by very satisfactory (26.3%), and satisfactory (10.5%). These results are indicative of the general perceptions of beneficiaries and project staff and it is not surprising to observe that beneficiaries rated the project performance more highly than the project staff. Oxfam staff who were the implementers of the project benchmarked their scores against expected outputs and outcomes and the daily project operations while beneficiaries probably based their rating on the services received and impact on their lives as a result.

Below are supporting statements made by beneficiaries and project staff to support the ratings in Table 6 above.

“.... they gave us money to buy food items, and buy clothes, they gave us soap, buckets, Ghana-must-go (bag), built latrines for us and many things, I am not happy that Oxfam is leaving, cannot even sleep because of this thought.” (beneficiary, Damboa, 7th September, 2018)

“The project trained all the protection committee very well on all aspects including advocacy (i.e. lobbying etc.). The committees were supported on weekly bases by the local authorities who provided continued support, and the protection committee members provided referral pathways.” (Oxfam staff, Damboa, 6th September, 2018)

“Looking at the entire humanitarian response it may be rated as satisfactory because finance was not enough, and the response was complex. But for the DGD project, it was excellent because it met the targets, supply plan, and program implementation plan was in place and fully executed.” (Oxfam staff, Maiduguri, 4th September, 2018)

“Toilets built and open defecation no more, water provided by Oxfam, they provided cash for trade, and created more work,I strongly appeal that Oxfam should continue.” (beneficiary Damboa, 7th September, 2018)

“The implementation has changed lives; the work is good. Last distribution exercise was 105% successful, and there was complete documentation. Oxfam Belgium have supported us by confirming complete documentation. I rate process and work done 90%, and documentation performance 100%.” (Oxfam staff, Maiduguri, 3rd September, 2018)

“.... enabling the communities to know their rights, and claim their rights. 2. teaching the communities on advocacy to claim their rights. 3. Empowering women to take part in decision making. 4. Sensitization of the community to prevent GBV.” (Oxfam staff, Damboa, 6th September, 2018)

“The project empowered the IDPs in the host communities with improved knowledge and capacity to do things for themselves, the project improved access to sanitary facilities, restored some life i.e. reduction of cholera outbreak unlike before, the response changed the perception and ways of thinking of the IDP communities on different ways of doing business.” (Oxfam staff, Maiduguri, 4th September, 2018)

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The DGD emergency response targeted eight communities in Damboa and Chibok LGAs in Borno state with lifesaving humanitarian assistance which included WASH, EFSVL, and protection contracted between 1st October, 2017 and 30th September, 2018. Evaluation findings showed that the project reached and surpassed planned targets in most areas of assistance. The enabling operational platforms provided by the project structure i.e. the three integrated services (WASH, EFSVL, and protection), MEAL, administration and human resource, logistics, and accounts teams worked in consonance to achieve about 100% performance on planned targets.

In spite of the achievements of the DGD project, evidence from beneficiaries suggest that the one-year life span of the project did not allow enough time to set-up frameworks that will ensure strong bases for long-term development activities in the future. It is important that this type of project runs for a longer period of time to accommodate full internalization of information and acquired skills that will translate into long-term behaviour change and sustainability. It is therefore recommended that future programming should strengthen the integrated services and increase project lifespan to at least two years or more to enable the building of stronger institutional frameworks in the host communities, and rehabilitation plans for the IDPs in the camps who overwhelmingly expressed desire to have a more settled life. In sum, future programming should have rehabilitation strategies imbued in project to make it more beneficial and fulfilling to IDPs.

Relevance and Appropriateness

In terms of relevance and appropriateness, evaluation evidence showed that the project responded to the needs of IDPs in camps and at host communities, and was inclusive in meeting the specific needs of vulnerable sub-groups like the disabled, elderly, women and children. During qualitative data collection, the evaluator observed that participants who reported that the services received improved their lives cut across the vulnerable sub-groups. Also, evidence showed that the community members were involved in planning and implementation of project activities. Evidence showed that the traditional rulers (Lawan and Bulamas) contributed to how activities were implemented, and committee members, and women leaders were involved in the implementation of activities. Project volunteers/supervisors who were mostly members of the communities interfaced between Oxfam staff and the communities. Thus, the project added value to the lives of beneficiaries by averting hunger and malnutrition, infectious diseases, and more access to clean water, and latrines. Other added value reported by community members included better hygienic environment, and economic empowerment.

Evidence suggest that the project performed better in providing community based services like information dissemination and knowledge transfer, potable water, and latrines than in household based services like distribution of household sanitary or protection kits which were constrained by project budget. Findings showed that many households especially at the IDP camps shared items received with eligible neighbours who did not get any. Future programming need to increase access to household based facilities by increasing numbers targeted and perhaps, convert household based services to community based ones to increase access to these services.

Effectiveness

The DGD project was effective in delivering stated objectives and planned targets were surpassed. It averted outbreak of diseases, reduced hunger and malnutrition and other immediate treats to life in the intervention

communities. From the beneficiaries' perspective there was no delay reported in the delivery of services provided by the project. However, from the providers' perspective, findings showed that project activities were not evenly spread across the project lifespan. Uneven distribution of project activities during the lifespan of the project may have affected project quality and impact. Future program intervention need to ensure that activities are executed as planned and not clustered towards the end of the project. Evidence showed that project effectiveness was enhanced by the distribution of decision making power along project structure (i.e. Abuja, Maiduguri, Damboa). The base manager was responsible for most daily operational decisions based on financial threshold. Future humanitarian response should strengthen this chain of decision making and increase the financial threshold for the base manager to enhance more decisions at the grassroots.

Efficiency

Results of this study showed that resources were directed to the needs of the beneficiaries based on findings from initial assessments at the beginning of the project, and analysis juxtaposing budget versus actual to ensure that those who need the services most were served. Project efficiency benefitted from the complementary of services provided, focus on the repair of existing facilities, and community based facilities which were accessed by more people than expected. Efficiency may be improved in the future if programming can include continuous feedback from beneficiaries on how services and items supplied at the household were used, and suggestions for modification transmitted back to program implementers.

Complaints and Feedback Mechanism

Evaluation findings suggested that the complaints response mechanism put in place worked well for the project. There was no major challenge with receiving and responding to beneficiaries' complaints on services provided to them. Future programming on humanitarian response should improve on this mechanism by adopting the electronic based system that the MEAL team designed which was not tested before the project closed. This may improve response time, and reduce duplication of efforts in responding to complaints.

Coordination

Reports from Maiduguri and Damboa offices showed that Oxfam staff participated fully in coordination meetings with other partners which fostered closer working relationship in terms of referrals, sharing of information, reduction and duplication of efforts among others. Future programming should build upon this strategy by ensuring that all units of the project including the MEAL team collaborate with their contemporaries in other agencies as well.

Sustainability

The findings from the beneficiaries' perspective corroborated by program implementers views showed that the DGD project lifespan was short and did not allow sustainability to be well imbued in the communities. Evidence suggest that aspects that dealt with information, knowledge, behaviour change with respect to hygiene, environmental sanitation, rights and protection, and maintenance of some community facilities were more likely to be sustained in the near future compared with other activities such as unconditional cash transfer, cash for work, and cash incentives for volunteers and for mobilization in general. Future programming should examine strategies that will ensure that all project activities are sustainable in the long-run. As stated earlier, future programming should plan for at least two to three years to ensure that the bases for sustainability is all aspects of the project are well entrenched in the intervention communities.

Challenges: Internal and External

Challenges experienced during the project implementation may be categorized as internal and external. Key internal challenges include among others; (1) inadequate protection actors due to increased demand for this services that were hitherto unknown, (2) the risk of distributing cash for food especially in IDP camps, and (3) anxiety of staff on the news of project closure which may have doused their moral and enthusiasm. The main external challenge was security which a recurring factor in the daily project operations. The internal challenges should be addressed in future programming on humanitarian response in the region, while the external challenge posed by security will need concerted efforts from all stakeholders including the governments (both federal and state) who are the main players and their military apparatus.

Lessons Learned & Best Practices

Lessons learned in the project implementation process were that (1) transparency enabled the establishment of commitment by the communities, (2) community trust produced real security intelligence crucial in a security laden environment, (3) to be perceived as neutral on both sides of the conflict reduced chances of been a possible target, and (4) transparency on the beneficiary selection process elicited better cooperation. These lessons learned should be deployed in future intervention efforts to improve on desired outcomes.

Best practices reported in the project include media based campaign on protection, campaign targeting mothers on household hygiene, community engagement and sensitization efforts, and pro-active, rather than reactive coordination which yielded much results. These best practices should be used in future programming to possible scale-up the humanitarian response in the sub-region.

Impact of the Response

Despite the 12 months' lifespan of the project, the impact was evident in the communities their situation before the DGD project response. Evidence suggest that the sanitary and hygienic situations of the communities have improved, outbreak of diseases have been averted, beneficiaries now have access to potable water, the economic lives of the communities were enhanced, and gender based violence and related issues have attenuated substantially. Overall, the majority of evaluation participants rated the project impact as excellent. A breakdown of the rating showed that far more beneficiaries (89.8%) compared to project staff (63.2%) adjudged the project impact excellent. Future programming should aim at attaining better impact rating from both the beneficiaries and program implementers perspectives.

APPENDIX I

OTHER RELEVANT FINDINGS

On Prospects for Future Response

In addition, the need for emergency response is increasing in the north-east so the project has the opportunity to expand and make more impact. As long as the IDPs are there, the response will be needed now and perhaps, in the future. Currently, there are estimated 8 million IDPs in the region. Even when peace is attained, a lot of rebuilding will need to be done. On the issue of whether Boko Haram will be eliminated, it is neither here nor there because the group have succeeded in maintaining sizeable numbers by forcefully recruiting child-military by abducting and training community members in the forest. Evidence from the communities showed that the need for humanitarian response are there and getting bigger. Also, there is the need to cover more communities, the DGD project activities covered only 8 communities whereas there are estimated over 50 communities (both host and IDP camps) in Damboa and Chibok areas affected by the Boko Haram attacks most of which were not covered by Oxfam or any other organization. It is therefore recommended that the DGD project funders revisits the possibility of continuing the response in the area.

On The Management

Evidence suggest differences in perspectives between humanitarian response approach and developmental approach and this may have affected project implementation. The differences in perspectives may have affected relationships between country office in Abuja (with more development-oriented perspective) and the Maiduguri office (with more humanitarian crises response perspective). The country management system was not, designed to accommodate emergency humanitarian response. Future programming needs to examine these discrepancies and fashion out a common platform for easing out the differences. It may be necessary to consider a three-pronged approach which starts with rapid response, and then move to stable humanitarian response, and to more long-term development perspectives.

The decision to close was purely executive decision which did not give enough time to close the humanitarian response gradually. This may be unconnected with the financial deficit experienced based on management gaps which became ubiquitous sometimes during the entire humanitarian response. Future humanitarian response should elicit contributions from operational team in-country on best approach to close a project based on the circumstances prevalent.

On Security

Security issues were embedded in the entire project implementation process. Evidence suggest that staff training about security can be better, that is go beyond debriefing on security issues which achieves awareness and information sharing. It is recommended that future programming should incorporate security training to include how to respond when involved in cross fire attacks, and at military check points. Future programming should include adequate security knowledge and readiness to take appropriate actions.

On Program Implementation

Project successes premised on best practices which included; intense community engagement from the beginning, maintaining neutrality, media-based campaign using soap opera and play lets propagated in local dialects; sensitization using grassroots community frameworks i.e. committee members, traditional leaders, and volunteers among others. These best practices contributed to the impact observed within the window of project implementation. Future programming should scale-up and synergize these best practices for maximum impact in both IDP and host communities.

Evidence especially among the local project staff suggested some unanswered questions on why a project strategy should be implemented in a certain way and not the other especially given community dynamics that occurs during implementation. These are questions that are better addressed by experts who worked on the original proposal. In order to increase the impact of a project, it is advised that implementers have access to the experts who drafted the project proposal for quick questions and clarifications. This may be achieved through virtual platforms or by physical presence.

The project over performed in on most EFSVL planned monitoring indicators but was weak on tracking beneficiaries' compliance with use of items received especially when in monetary value. The implication of this action is that some activities may have been over reported (i.e. planned vs. actual activities). Future programming may need to consider supplying food directly to beneficiaries instead of cash given to them. Another approach is to conduct analysis of the opportunity cost of the most desirable need in the household so the resources can be channelled appropriately. Such analysis will help reduce non-compliance in using funds for what it was originally meant for. Also, cash distribution system is laden with substantial unnecessary logistical and other human risks that may be reviewed and re-strategized in future programming.

Evidence suggest that logistics unit was not adequately staffed with experienced staff during the course of the project implementation. Since this is a critical unit of emergency response, future programming should ensure that enough qualified staff are recruited from the beginning with training and re-training to ensure proper documentation and accountability.

APPENDIX II

Names of Evaluation Participants

Oxfam Maiduguri Office

Kenneth Otieno—Humanitarian Programme coordinator/WASH Coordinator
Samuel Komakach—Protection Coordinator
Neil Panzipanzi—EFSVL Coordinator
Gloria Affiku—MEAL Coordinator
Shaid Sadiq—Security Coordinator
Adbi Gedi—Logistics Coordinator
David Mwenda—Finance Manager

Oxfam Damboa Office

Grace Mbabazi—Program Manager
Phillip Jatu—PHE/WASH Coordinator
Victor Audu—Human Resource Officer
Lawan Abana Konede—Finance Officer
Barka Iliyasu—PHP Officer
Sawa Michael—EFSVL Team Leader
Zubairu Magaji—PHE Officer
Abayomi Abdulazeez—MEAL Officer
Louis Mapendo—Logistics Officer
Abdulmajid Mohammed—Security Officer
Isa Mohammed Korede—Protection Assistant

Oxfam Volunteers/Supervisors

Zakariya Ashem—Supervisor
Lawan Alh Buhari—Supervisor
Hussaini Mustapha—Supervisor
Audu Darman—Volunteer
Hauwa Fali—Volunteer
Halima Mala—Volunteer
Hajja Abogu—Volunteer
Rita Samson—Volunteer

WASH Committee

Bukar sheriff
Mulima Grema
Bashik Ashaka
Lawan Gana Usman
Falmata Shettima—Women Leader
Fati Lawan
Malami Lawan

Protection Committee

Kolo Modu
Yagana Bulama
Yambra Gambo
Amina Bulama
Gambo Alhaji
Ibrahim Aji

Bakura Musa
Gambo Alhaji Tapchi
Burkar Gambo
Modu Kelluye
Mallam Modu Bukar
Alkali Mulima
Falmata Ibrahim
Gambo Batoji

Wuyaram Village (Community Leaders)

Lawan Shettima—Village Head
Sule Maina—Village Secretary
Bulama Modu
Bulama Abdulahi
Bulama Mustapha
Bulama Kolo
Bulama Golima

Wuyaram Village (Men Beneficiaries)

Aisami Alh Modu
Aisami Hassan
Lawan Yoro
Buba Bukar
Chiroma Mustapha
Modu Gana

Aburi IDP Camp (Women Beneficiaries)

Aisha Kori
Gambo Bukar
Zara Fantami
Fana Komala
Kadija Modu
Fatima Sulaiman
Hauwa Mohammed
Falmata Ali
Hauwa Grema
Mairam Bukar Maidu
Fatima Hassana

Aburi IDP Camp (Men Beneficiaries)

Bulama Gumdo
Letami Ali
Bulama Ali Hassan
Modu Kolomi Goni
Shettima Buk. A
Mustapha Kyari
Modu Fantami Dusula

Evaluation Instruments

Oxfam DGD 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 DGD 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!

