# 2011

# Horn & East Africa

# Drought Response

# – Real Time Evaluation

**SUMMARY REPORT - 25 January 2012**

**Vicky Tindal**

# SECTION 1: Introduction

This summary report highlights the Key Recommendations arising from the findings of a Real Time Evaluation (RTE) conducted for CAFOD on its Drought Response programme in the Horn and E Africa[1]. The Key Findings contained in the full report represent a snap shot of opinions based on almost 30 interviews, guided by evaluation questions, carried out from mid November – mid December 2011 and it is important from the outset that the report is read in this context. It is recognised that some findings may be subjective and are not backed up by field-based evidence. It is hoped that the findings and subsequent recommendations are useful and practical and will provide a useful platform for reflection going into Phase II of the programme.

## 1.1 Purpose and Objectives of the Real Time Evaluation

CAFOD is committed to assessing and improving the quality of its humanitarian programmes. In order to meet this commitment, and create space for those engaged in the emergency response to "step back" from its work, CAFOD has begun to make use of RTEs.

The overall purpose of this RTE is to enable CAFOD Management and Emergency Response Team(s) to learn from implementing the programme to date and to make improvements so that the programme is effective in meeting the needs of disaster affected populations. [2]The RTE is primarily an internal learning exercise and took place at the end of the first phase of the response.

**The objectives for this RTE are:**
1. To review the response against established criteria and recommend immediate changes that can improve the emergency programme.
2. To promote a learning approach within CAFOD.
3. To identify good practices and successes to use more widely and lessons learned in this response.
4. To identify persistent weaknesses for organisational learning and recommend how they can be addressed.
5. To identify the successes and limitations of CAFOD Ways of Working in Humanitarian Context and PCM in this response.

## 1.2 External Environment in the Region

### Drought in the Horn and East Africa[3]

Throughout 2011 drought worsened across the Horn and E Africa following successive failed rains. The late 2010 rainy season failed completely in many parts of the region, and the April-May 2011 rains also were well below average. Parts of NE Kenya received just 10% of the usual level of rainfall.

---

[1] The full report is available upon request.
[2] The ToR for this RTE are attached in Annex I to the full report.
[3] Information taken from CAFOD 2011 Horn and E Africa Drought Response Framework.

The price of staple foods rose to unaffordable levels for many people, and weak animals and the collapse of livestock markets reduced people's income and ability to buy essential foodstuffs. In many areas up to 75% of livestock were lost. Malnutrition rates rose to above 20% in Kenya and 31% in Somalia.

Food security in lowland and pastoral areas of E and NE Kenya, S Ethiopia and large parts of Somalia was severely affected. The epicentre of the drought hit the poorest people in the region in an area straddling Kenya, N Tanzania, Ethiopia, Somalia Eritrea and Djibouti where families rely heavily on livestock for survival.

In July 2011, the UN officially declared two regions of Somalia as in a state of 'famine'. At its peak INGOs and UN estimates showed over 3.5 million people affected in Kenya, 4.5 million in Ethiopia and 3.5 million in Somalia.

International recognition as to the scale of the problem increased dramatically in July 2011. On the 5th July, CAFOD launched an appeal for the drought response. On 6th July 2011, the British based Disaster Emergencies Committee (DEC) launched its own appeal targeting Kenya, Ethiopia, South Sudan and Somalia.

## How the Sector in general was/is viewing and responding to the drought

CAFOD's response to the drought was in line with other INGOs across the Region. The Sector as a whole experienced the same challenges as CAFOD in terms of a lack of resources pre-July 2011 and whilst they "saw the crisis coming" from late 2010, with plenty of early warning information, agencies struggled to get into gear until the media picked up the story in late June. There was found to be a "…failure of early intervention at the time, and on the scale, that was required"[4]. Save the Children's initiative to bring a BBC crew into the Somali refugee camps in Dadaab, Kenya, at the end of June, attracted intense international media attention and triggered the launching of appeals for many of the major agencies at the beginning of July (including DEC and CAFOD) and an upscale of funding across the Sector. There was, in general, across the Sector a missed opportunity and a lack of any real attempt in fundraising materials at communicating in any depth to the public around underlying causes of drought and what agencies were doing to tackle these.

Most INGOs have tended to build their responses on the back of existing programmes and partnerships. Initial findings from the DEC RTE show that this approach has "…played to existing strengths and competencies…and ensured that for the most part, there was a good 'fit' between relief responses and longer term programmes". DEC agency responses are found to be "generally effective and appropriate", quality found to be "generally high" and accountability and responsiveness to aid recipients was found to be in general "an area of comparative strength" among DEC members.

Within Caritas, there was good coordination in S Sudan and Eritrea as programmes and coordination mechanisms were already existing and in Eritrea CAFOD were the only Northern Caritas agency with a direct presence. However in Kenya, many Caritas agencies were engaging with the same partners causing coordination challenges.

---

[4] DEC RTE – Consultation Draft 11/12/11

## 1.3    Internal Context

CAFOD is responding to the needs of communities heavily affected by the recent drought and conflict in 6 countries across the Horn and E Africa: Somalia, Kenya, Ethiopia, S Sudan (through DEC funding, Caritas Australia/AusAid funding and CAFOD appeal funding) and Eritrea and Tanzania (through CAFOD appeal funding). CAFOD to date has raised over £8.9million[5] for the Horn and E Africa Drought Response (£4.75million CAFOD Appeal, £2million DEC allocation, £2.1 million other sources (AusAid, Caritas network for Eritrea, WFP). To date over 165,000 beneficiaries have been supported by this response.

CAFOD's drought response programme is built on the back of its existing long term programmes and partnerships across the region in all cases except Somalia. In Somalia (new area for CAFOD), CAFOD is responding through sister agencies Trócaire and CRS, as well as in the Somali refugee Camp Kambios, Dadaab in Kenya. CAFOD is the Facilitating Partner in the Eritrea joint Caritas response but have not incorporated this under DEC funding. Tanzania was also not included under DEC funding due to its small scale and pockets of need. South Sudan is included in the overall response as it was deemed important to keep focus on South Sudan at such a critical time (South Sudan Secession on 9th July 2011) as well as ongoing food insecurity and LRA displacement. Moreover, the Horn and E Africa Appeal took away any chance of launching an appeal for South Sudan.

*Programme Management*
As the response was across the majority of the Horn and E Africa Region, different management and implementation structures were used. An Emergency Management Team (EMT) was created to respond to the overall regional response. Country Management Teams were set up for Kenya, Eritrea, Ethiopia and S Sudan reporting to the REC[6].

The Regional Drought Response Programme is managed from the Nairobi Regional Office under the REC who reports to the EMT. The individual country responses are managed in different ways. Kenya, Somalia, Eritrea and Tanzania humanitarian programmes are managed primarily from the Nairobi office with inputs from the UK. S Sudan response is managed within its own existing country structure and Ethiopia response within the joint CAFOD SCIAF Trócaire (CST) office structure.

## 1.4    Real Time Evaluation Methodology

An external consultant, who had previous experience of CAFOD's Ways of Working in Humanitarian Contexts, collected qualitative data through interviews (27 interviews in total both individual and group) with CAFOD staff, some key partners (4 partners across 3 countries) and 1 external sister agency representative. The RTE was primarily focussed on how CAFOD has responded to the crisis in the Horn and E Africa, and although the impact on beneficiaries is beyond the scope of this RTE, other evaluations should examine this.

Data collection was based on standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance and appropriateness; efficiency; effectiveness; connectedness and sustainability; coverage; and coordination and coherence. It also included a light examination of impact. Under each criterion, specific evaluation questions were drafted for the humanitarian context (26

---

[5] See Annex VII for CAFOD Income and Allocations breakdown 2 Dec 2011 – attached to full report.
[6] CERT ToR Horn and E Africa attached in Annex VI to the full report.

questions in all). As the humanitarian response is on-going the questions were both retrospective and looking at what was actually happening at the time of research[7].

# SECTION 2: Summary of Key Findings

CAFOD's Horn and E Africa Drought Response programme is in general both relevant and appropriate and builds on the strength of long term partnerships in the affected areas across the region. There is an opportunity to improve regional working, and explore possibilities to build on programmatic coherence adding depth and focus to the programme in the recovery phase.

The overall impression is that funds were and are being used efficiently and appropriately. There is room for improvement in particular in the areas of Financial Management and Communications linked to a fine tuning of PCM and Ways of Working.

Overall, although slow to get started in some areas, the programme is effective and will on the most part achieve its objectives on time. CAFOD experienced the same challenges as other INGOs across the Sector, the major barrier being a lack of funding pre-July 2011 and a subsequent slowness to get funding to partners and projects post-July. This was due to a number of contributory factors as outlined in the report combined with too much disruption caused by staff movements at that time inevitably leaving staff overstretched.

The response is well linked to longer term programmes and this has the potential to be one of the programme's key strengths in particular in terms of links to DRR work and building communities resilience to inevitable future shocks as well as addressing short and long-term causes of recurring food insecurity.

Lessons learnt from previous responses are being incorporated into the current response. There is good potential for building on regional learning and sharing of experiences across countries from this response.

The overall impression is that CAFOD has coordinated, and is in general coordinating, well across the region. Although there were the usual coordination challenges of too many agencies chasing the same partners in the initial phase, CAFOD is building on its relationships with sister agencies and partners to coordinate joint planning and programming.

The Drought Response Programme is found to have a good focus on vulnerability across the board and in general to have incorporated some level of beneficiary accountability in all partner responses. There is an awareness of Conflict Sensitivity more as an approach rather than systematic tool.

---

[7] Interview Questionnaire and List of Interviewees are attached to the full report as Annex II & III.

Although it is still early days to measure impact, there are already some good examples across the region of immediate impact in the First Phase such as:

- Water interventions – water harvesting structures and community tanks are full of water, in use and making a difference.
- Cash programmes – immediate impact on household food security, enhanced dignity to beneficiaries able to buy their own food in the markets, improved local economy.
- Livestock programmes – increases in terms of production.

# SECTION 3: Key Recommendations

## 3.1 Relevance / Appropriateness

Needs Assessment / Evaluations

1. Incorporate improving partner and staff capacity on doing needs assessments, proposal writing, proposal review and ensuring that partners are truly engaged in project design into Phase 2 as appropriate.
2. Ensure partners and beneficiaries are central to subsequent evaluations for this particular humanitarian response.

Regional Working

3. Ensure all 6 countries are represented consistently at EMT level.
4. Explore opportunity and potential benefits of working towards a more regional programme – make space for opportunities to share learning and experience and explore ways to build on potential programmatic coherence adding depth and focus to the programme in a few strategic locations with a few strategic partners.
5. Explore feasibility and potential benefits of setting up a RERT or regional structure beneath the EMT to promote regional programmatic focus, support and learning.
6. Incorporate the questions raised in this report around strategy and focus as part of phase 2 planning discussions and include in future programme evaluations to inform future humanitarian response and learning.

## 3.2 Efficiency

Financial Management

7. Develop practical field based guidelines and template for setting up the overall financial framework for a major response on the back of an Appeal and linked to PCM. Clarify roles and responsibilities of financial management in a major humanitarian response, who should be setting up the overall financial framework, and ensure awareness of where, and who, to go to for support. Add to Ways of Working. Ensure Finance staff are made available at the critical early stage of the response.
8. Ensure humanitarian staff are adequately trained and prepared and that finance work is included in job descriptions at appropriate levels.
9. Look at ways of strengthening linkages between UK Finance Department and the Humanitarian Team – both in the UK and field offices. Management to

encourage staff to be more proactive in terms of seeking information and support.

## Ways of Working

10. Review Ways of Working in light of findings in this report to include the following:

- Look at developing field level operational "Ways of Working" – guidelines for decision making, building and developing a humanitarian programme at field level, roles and responsibilities and timelines.

- Ensure Ways of Working adequately caters for regional humanitarian responses as well as country based responses. Incorporate clarity around country based ERT and regional ERT remits and structures, roles and responsibilities and timelines. Ensure EMT remits, structures, roles and responsibilities are sufficient for major regional humanitarian responses and that EMT and IEG roles are not duplicated.

- Update Finance section to include template and clarity around who does what when in a humanitarian response, how to set up a financial framework once an appeal is launched, who should be doing this, and where to look for support (as per Recommendation 7).

- Develop simple Comms / Media strategy and procedure for major humanitarian response to incorporate into Ways of Working and clarify roles and responsibilities of Humanitarian and Comms /Media staff.

- Explore feasibility of including Comms/Media and HR representative on IEG (even as observers) or find suitable alternative acceptable solution in major humanitarian responses.

- Ensure Ways of Working is sufficiently tuned to slow onset crises and incorporates effective and sufficiently robust early warning procedures and trigger points.

- Develop simple Advocacy strategy and procedure and incorporate into Ways of Working to ensure Advocacy is part of any major humanitarian response from the outset.

- Ensure EMT minutes and key decisions (strategy, comms and funding) are properly recorded, key document drafts are finalised and all key documentation is stored centrally.

## PCM

11. Review PCM in light of the findings in this report to include the following:

- Ensure all humanitarian staff in UK and field offices are appropriately trained in how to use PCM and receive regular refresher training as appropriate.

- Ensure Humanitarian staff are aware of where they can receive appropriate support. As well as strengthening linkages with the appropriate departments / teams, this could include calling on development staff to work alongside them to help resolve PCM issues when needed in a major humanitarian response.

- Explore feasibility of fast track documentation for initial phase of emergency programmes.
- Look at sign off mechanism and authorisation procedures to ensure this process is timely and efficient – such as sign off when managers are out of office and reduction in number of signatures required.
- Investigate and resolve issues of updating – eg info being updated in the field and not showing up on the system, delays in updating changes of managers etc. This should include clarification on roles and responsibilities such as who should do the updating.

## 3.3 Effectiveness

Staffing Structure and Capacity

12. CEG, IEG and EMT need to ensure that there is sufficient follow up and support once decisions are made and factor in adequate management and programme resourcing (both short term and long term) into planning to ensure that decisions are followed through efficiently and effectively at emergency management and programme / operational levels and quality is not compromised by too much disruption and staff being too overstretched.

13. Ensure adequate IEG time and space is devoted to overall programme strategy and direction from the very beginning and documented. CAFOD's Director, International Director and Head of Humanitarian Department need to reiterate corporate responsibility to prioritise humanitarian work in a major crisis and put all non-urgent work on hold. This includes humanitarian staff who need to drop their existing non-urgent pieces of work and prioritise setting up humanitarian response in a major crisis and the option of recalling critical staff on leave.

14. EMT need to be clear on how long development staff are expected to prioritise humanitarian work eg ToR for 6-12 weeks with clear handover.

*Ethiopia*

15. Review staffing needs in Ethiopia to ensure fully staffed and working at full capacity and salary scales are appropriate etc Look at ways of retaining staff in terms of career progression, regional work experience, etc.

16. Follow up with CST Ethiopia to see if support is needed to resolve administration weakness.

## 3.4 Connectedness and Sustainability

Communications

17. Develop a Comms / Media strategy / template for major humanitarian crisis and incorporate into Ways of Working (as per Recommendation 9 under Ways of Working)

18. Explore feasibility of including Comms / Media representative to sit in on IEG (even as observer) or find alternative appropriate solution (as per Recommendation 9 under Ways of Working)

19. Speed up sign off of Comms materials (are 2 or 3 managers really needed?) – appoint 1 key manager who will engage with Comms for first few weeks of appeal to ensure it is being appropriately prioritised.

20. Streamline and coordinate comms requests to the field to ease burden on programme staff especially in the initial phase of a major humanitarian response and clarify roles and responsibilities. Second dedicated Media and Comms staff to a major humanitarian response from the beginning.

21. Ensure sitreps are being received every 2 weeks and circulated fully as well as being posted up on central system. Ensure sitreps are being signed off in a timely manner and represt all 6 countries in regional programme.

22. Ensure that all Humanitarian Job descriptions have some reference to Comms.

*Communications between country offices and regional office*
*Ethiopia*

23. Work together with Ethiopia CST office to find appropriate ways to improve communications and linkages.

24. Explore feasibility of designating lead agency for CST Ethiopia humanitarian programme.

## Lesson learning

25. Look at ways to build in space for regional learning and sharing across countries in Phase 2 planning.

26. Share learning documents regionally and incorporate learning from country programmes into regional learning doc.

27. Work with Learning Team to draw up summary document of lessons learnt in recent major humanitarian responses and post on central system / circulate.

28. Incorporate lessons learnt from recent major humanitarian responses into agenda of one of the first EMTs – present summary of lessons learnt from last few major emergencies (Add to Ways of Working).

**29.** Ensure that CAFOD is more proactive and better prepared across the organisation for slow onset crises – contingency plans, pre-prepared proposals, pre-prepared Q+As and advocacy analysis around underlying causes.

## 3.5   *Coverage*

## Conflict Sensitivity

30. Review need to do conflict sensitivity training with staff and partners across the region as appropriate given each different country context.

## Beneficiary Accountability

30. Beneficiary Accountability focal point in UK to follow up on identified training and support needed in S Sudan and CST Ethiopia.

### *3.6    Coordination and Coherence*

Coordination

31. Look at ways of encouraging partners to engage more in coordination and encourage staff to feed back to partners on coordination meetings attended. Work more closely with Northern Caritas agencies to ensure coordinated Caritas representation at UN / INGO coordination meetings.
32. Work more closely with Northern Caritas agencies and the National Caritas to ensure a more coordinated response at Diocese level to reduce burden on partners and avoid causing delays and frustration in planning and implementation.

### *3.7    Impact*

Measuring Impact

33. As part of Phase 2 planning ensure that sufficient baseline data is being gathered across all programmes so as to be able to demonstrate impact.

## Concluding Remarks

As stated in the Introduction, this report is based on a number of key interviews with staff from across the organisation as well as some partners (partners were limited and beneficiaries were not included at this point but should be central to subsequent evaluations for this humanitarian response). Findings and conclusions are therefore based on an overall impression derived from qualitative data and not backed up by field based evidence or substantive documentary evidence. It is hoped that the Key Recommendations are helpful and practical going into the Recovery Phase.

It will be important to pick up on a number of the Key Findings and Recommendations in this report in subsequent evaluations (to include beneficiary and partner perspective) to ensure that CAFOD and its partners continue to improve and learn and address the causes of recurring food insecurity and strive to work to improve communities resilience to future hardship that will inevitably come.

**Glossary of Acronyms**

| | |
|---|---|
| AusAid | Australia Aid |
| CEG | Corporate Emergency Group |
| CERT | CAFOD Emergency Response Terms of Reference |
| CI | Caritas Internationalis |
| CST | CAFOD SCIAF Trocaire (joint office) |
| DEC | Disasters Emergency Committee |
| DFID | Department for International Development |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction |
| ECHO | European Community Humanitarian Office |
| E-Comms | Emergency Communications Group |
| EMT | Emergency Management Team |
| ERT | Emergency Response Team |
| IEG | International Emergency Group |
| INGO | International Non-Governmental Organisation |
| LEGS | Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards |
| LRRD | Link Relief, Rehabilitation and Development |
| OCHA | Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| OECD/DAC | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee |
| PCM | Programme Cycle Management |
| PDFO | Programme Development and Funding Officer |
| PO | Programme Officer |
| REC | Regional Emergency Coordinator |
| RERT | Regional Emergency Response Team |
| RM | Regional Manager |
| RTE | Real Time Evaluation |
| SCIAF | Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund |
| SERO | Senior Emergency Response Officer |
| WFP | World Food Programme |