




Oxfam GB Project Effectiveness Review Management Response

Regional Director: Fran Equiza

Country Director: Sylvie Louchez

Name of Project reviewed: Food Security and Livelihoods Support among Fishers and Fish Processors in Kasenyi and Tchomia

Date: 28/01/2013

Outcome/Impact	Rating	Short Commentary
Outcome 1 – Sustained improvement in the quality and/or quantity of production		No evidence of a sustained effect on the quantity or unit price of fish being sold by supported households.
Outcome 2 – Sustained increase in household income		Some indications that household income is significantly higher among supported fishers, but not among the fish processors.
Outcome 3 – Accumulation of asset wealth		Some evidence of an increase in asset wealth among the households of supported fishers, but not among supported processors.

<p>1. What follow-up to the review have you undertaken or planned (if any) e.g. discussion, analysis, workshop?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion at Programme Level (Ituri Programme) – The EFSL team (Team Leader and Animateurs), the Programme Manager and Provincial Coordinator discussed the Review draft report, agreed on the content and indicators of outcome. As the Provincial Programme is to be closed in March 2013, it was noted that no follow up on the Review could be done.
<p>2. Overall, do the findings concur with your own expectations or assessment of the project/programme's effectiveness?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not really. The expectations were to have results indicating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence supporting more modest impact at the best; or - Evidence of large impact, but constrained to specific sub-groups as a worst case scenario. However, the indicators show a worse scenario than our expectations.
<p>3. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were particularly strong in the project (ie large impact)?</p> <p><i>If so, please comment briefly on why you think this was so.</i></p> <p>The project had three aspects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetable and cereals farming • Livestock keeping and technical support • Fishing – support to fishing households and processors. <p>From the field reports during and immediately after the project implementation, the reports indicated farming and livestock keeping had a higher outcome. An evaluation done in 2010 and 2011 indicated the vegetable and cereal cultivators and livestock groups as being with high positive impacts.</p>
<p>4. Did the final results of the Effectiveness Review identify areas that were weak or very weak (ie no or very little impact)?</p> <p>From the review, it is apparent that fishing would have been the weakest link in the project.</p>
<p>5. a) Is the reviewed project continuing? If yes, what actions are being taken in response to the weak areas identified in question 4?</p> <p>The Reviewed project is part of many small one year cycle projects in the OPAL Project DRCB12. This aspect of the project didn't continue beyond 2009, the year of implementation.</p> <p>As the Review was done in 2012, and the report of the Review released after a decision to close the provincial programme already taken, no actions have been undertaken to respond to the weak points.</p>
<p>b) What actions are you planning in response to the Programme Learning Considerations?</p>

Programme Learning Considerations:

- **Ensure that project activities are implemented with sufficient intensity and on a long enough time-frame to achieve lasting impact.**
- **Further investigate the dynamics of change observed among the fishers, to understand how the lack of impact on the level of fishing activities is consistent with the observed increase in household expenditure and asset wealth.**

These actions may be undertaken, but can only be done so in other Oxfam DRC programme areas such as in South Kivu, North Kivu or Equateur provinces where Oxfam will continue being present.

6. If the project/humanitarian response is ending or has already ended, what learning from the review will you apply to relevant new projects in the future? How can the Regional Centre and Oxford support these plans?

- Such a project should be implemented in areas with less population movements. A high number of beneficiaries are suspected to have moved elsewhere thus affecting the impact.
- Fishing regulations and epidemics or other calamities should also be considered in the planning process. Fishing regulations may have had a negative impact on fishing and processing. Besides, the recurring cholera epidemics in the area could also be a contributing factor to low impact.

Support

- Need for experienced EFSL technical teams to support planning and implementation of such project activities.

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

No objections