



Oxfam International
Tsunami Fund
Final Evaluation:
Gender Review
Summary

An evaluation
of gender
issues in Oxfam
International's
response to
the 2004 Indian
Ocean tsunami
by Annette Salkeld

Tsunami Evaluation series

As part of its ongoing aims to learn from experience and to hold itself accountable for its actions, Oxfam has commissioned a wide-ranging evaluation of its response to the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004. This comprises 14 thematic evaluations, 12 of the 14 studies have been conducted by independent consultants, while the remaining two conducted by members of Oxfam International Tsunami Fund secretariat (*)

Recurring issues and key themes from the 14 individual evaluations are brought together in this evaluation summary report 'In the Wake of the Tsunami'.

The reports available in this series are:

Evaluation summary report: 'In the Wake of the Tsunami'

Thematic evaluations:

1. Livelihoods Review (Rajan Alexander)
2. Public Health Review (Pradeep Bharwad & Wim Klassen)
3. Shelter Review (Sarbjit Singh Sahota & Dave Hodgkins)
4. Gender Review (Annette Salkeld)
5. Downward Accountability Review (Ravinder Kumar & N. Raghunathan, Catalyst Management Services)
6. Corporate Accountability Review (John Chilver*)
7. Advocacy Review (Alasdair Collins)
8. Disaster Risk Reduction Review (Man B. Thapa)
9. Partners and Partnerships Review (Stuart Kenward)
10. Monitoring and Evaluation Programme Review (Catherine Lowery)
11. Communications Review (Alex Wynter)
12. Funding and Finance Review (Clive Surman & John Chilver*)
13. Management Issues Review (Simon Harris)
14. OITF Architecture and Structure Review (Geoffrey Salkeld)

The evaluation summary report and the executive summaries for the individual reviews can be found on the Oxfam website at www.oxfam.org/emergencies/tsunami. Full versions of the individual reviews are available on request from the Oxfam International Secretariat via www.oxfam.org/contact

Philip Horgan,
Oxfam International Tsunami Fund Monitoring and Evaluation
Coordinator, December 2009

Cover image: Rajamma, 70, lives alone in a temporary shelter in Madavamedu village, Nagapattinam district. "I dry fish to give my neighbors. They give me food each day but I have nothing to give in return. This is all I can give. I don't know when I will go to a permanent home but until then, I will live here." Oxfam Partner Sevai is providing water and sanitation facilities and conducting health and hygiene activities for the more than 50 families who live in this temporary shelter location. Credit: Marie Banu Jawahar/Oxfam

Summary Report

Contents

Acronyms	2
Acknowledgements	2
Introduction and context	3
1. Introduction	3
2. Background and context	3
The Oxfam International tsunami response	3
Oxfam's gender policies and approach	4
3. The gender review process	5
Gender review objectives	5
Methodology	5
Review findings	6
4. Gender mainstreaming structures and support mechanisms	6
5. Working with partners	8
6. Gender in the programmes	9
Gender in Oxfam's shelter programmes	12
Gender in Oxfam's livelihoods programmes	16
Gender in Oxfam's public health programmes	20
7. Key achievements	22
8. Effectiveness	23
9. Sustainability	24
10. Priority lessons and recommendations	25
11. Key lessons and recommendations	27

Acronyms

CBO	Community-based organisation
ECDF	East Coast Development Forum
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
INGO	International non-government organisation
NFI	Non-food item
OITF	Oxfam International Tsunami Fund
OI	Oxfam International
OGB	Oxfam Great Britain
PHP	Public health promotion
PKK	Perhimpunan Kesejahteraan Keluarga (Family Welfare Association)
SEEDS	Sarvodaya Economic Enterprise Development Services
SHG	Self-help group
SLF	Sewalanka Foundation
TFMT	Tsunami Fund Management Team
TOR	Terms of reference
UN	United Nations
Watsan	Water and sanitation
WCDM	Women's Coalition for Disaster Management

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all of the people who participated in and supported this evaluation, whether through discussions, participation in workshops, phone contact, emails, or written feedback. Their insight into Oxfam's tsunami response programme was invaluable. Particular thanks to those who provided feedback on earlier drafts and support along the way.

The views expressed in this report, as well as any mistakes or errors, are that of the author alone.

Introduction and context

1. Introduction

The extraordinary devastation and impact of the December 2004 tsunami led to Oxfam International (OI) delivering its largest and one of its most complex programmes ever. Its tsunami response, in line with Oxfam's global objectives,¹ was to be underpinned by gender mainstreaming.

The scaling up of Oxfam's operation, as with most agencies, was at an unprecedented level. With a budget of nearly US\$300m, Oxfam established a large and complex programme. Although there were many challenges, Oxfam was able to reach nearly 2.5 million people in some way, a significant achievement.²

This gender review was commissioned by the Oxfam International Tsunami Fund (OITF) to review the work on gender done by Oxfam and its partners throughout the tsunami response, to reflect on what has been achieved, and to identify lessons that will improve Oxfam's assistance in future emergencies.³

For an organisation that places such an emphasis on gender justice, the quality of gender integration into the tsunami response of Oxfam and its partners was highly variable and inconsistent in the support provided, programme outcomes, and effectiveness. There was some excellent work where skilled staff implemented innovative and successful gendered programmes. However, equally there were programmes that failed to address gender at all.

2. Background and context

The Oxfam International tsunami response

Oxfam's response to the tsunami saw it undertake the largest and one of the most complex humanitarian responses in its history. The response was implemented by nine Oxfam affiliates: Oxfam America, Oxfam Australia, Oxfam Great Britain, Oxfam Novib, Oxfam Canada, Oxfam Hong Kong, Oxfam India, Oxfam Quebec, and Oxfam Solidarity (although most responses were

implemented by the first four), working in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India (including the Andaman and Nicobar Islands), the Maldives, Somalia, Thailand, and Burma. Programmes were delivered through direct implementation, partners, advocacy and policy initiatives, and research projects, in partnership with approximately 170 organisations.⁴

Oxfam's response was immediate and, changes in timelines notwithstanding, the large bulk of programmes were completed by December 2008. In the emergency phase, responses focused primarily on shelter, livelihoods, and public health; these later transitioned into longer-term development programmes focusing more deeply on sustainable livelihoods, social services, policy, and disaster management.

Oxfam's gender policies and approach

The pursuit of gender justice is deeply embedded in Oxfam's rights-based approach. As one of the four change goals in OI's current strategic plan, it sits alongside economic justice, essential services, and rights in crisis, and should underpin all of Oxfam's work.

As stated in its strategic plan, a key platform of OI's work is to ensure that 'Many more women will gain power over their lives and live free from violence through changes in attitudes, ideas and beliefs about gender relations, and through increased levels of women's active engagement and critical leadership [...]'.⁵ Addressing gender inequity must be addressed through all activities, and not be seen as an additional activity.⁶

These are ambitious and challenging goals. In the words of Amartya Sen:

"Gender struggles are even more difficult than class struggles because, unlike women and men, the capitalist and the worker did not normally live under the same roof!"

3. The gender review process

Gender review objectives

This gender review aims to evaluate how gender was integrated across Oxfam's response, including all affiliates, partners, and countries of operation, and forms part of Oxfam's evaluation of its tsunami response programme as a whole.⁷ Its purpose is for Oxfam to reflect on what has been achieved, identify lessons, and hold itself accountable to key stakeholders – donors, beneficiaries, and communities.⁸ The focus of this review is on overarching macro issues; it is not an evaluation of specific projects or programmes.

Methodology

As requested by the OITF, several methodologies were used for this evaluation:

- A desk review of Oxfam documentation from across the tsunami response, provided by the OITF evaluation team.
- Involvement in three sectoral evaluation workshops covering livelihoods, public health, and shelter, attended by Oxfam and partner staff.
- A survey emailed to staff and partners involved in Oxfam's tsunami response.
- Interviews with key informants who worked on Oxfam's response and who had a particular involvement in, or responsibility for, gender mainstreaming.

All staff and partners selected for the questionnaires and interviews were drawn from a list provided by OITF, containing names put forward by Oxfam affiliates.

Review findings

4. Gender mainstreaming structures and support mechanisms

This review looked closely at the institutional structures and mechanisms present to support gender mainstreaming, and found both strengths and weaknesses in this area.

An essential component in gender mainstreaming is clarity on the aims of such an approach in the context of the programme. Although there was an overarching strategy, gender aims or objectives varied across the response, and it is unclear how they were tracked or assessed at senior levels.

“We lack a clear and shared definition for gender equality or gender mainstreaming. Everybody assumes that management knows what gender means; management assumes that the staff will know.”⁹

There were noticeable differences between countries where Oxfam had already established programmes and countries where new programmes were developed, reflecting OI’s history of relationships with the community. Managers who had gender experience or knowledge and who provided consistent support to integrate gender into programmes also proved more successful.

Throughout the response, feedback was mixed on the level of support that staff felt senior managers placed on gender. For example, at times staff in Aceh did not feel that gender was a priority for senior management, whereas staff in Sri Lanka consistently highlighted the importance that was given to gender throughout the programmes there.

The large scale-up required by the tsunami response was a significant challenge as there was a global shortage of experienced staff. Experience in gender mainstreaming, and indeed in a range of so-called ‘soft’ skills,¹⁰ was highly variable throughout Oxfam’s response; there were examples of innovative work by skilled practitioners, but there was an overall shortage of

capacity to deliver gendered programming across the response. It was felt that the skill sets of many newly recruited staff were overly dominated by ‘hard’ technical skills.

“Technical staff do not have the skills or experience to know where to integrate gender.”¹¹

In directly implemented programmes, much of the field work was delivered by newly recruited national staff, some of whom had limited work experience prior to the tsunami. In addition, the programmes were delivered in countries that are socially conservative, particularly in relation to gender, which can create difficulties when engaging with women in the community.

“Staff in the livelihoods team commented that they do not think it is appropriate for them to work directly with the women’s farmer producer group.”¹²

One approach taken was to recruit specialist gender staff, who were considered a valuable asset in the programmes. Positive outcomes occurred where gender staff worked alongside other technical staff in the field, particularly when they conducted assessments or monitoring at programme sites.¹³ However, because of the small number of gender specialists, most did not have the opportunity to spend enough time in the field or be involved in project planning.¹⁴ These circumstances led to less collaborative working relationships and less successful gender outcomes.

Overall, Oxfam did not plan adequately for surge capacity in gender expertise. Its systems for deployable staff included technical specialists but did not appear broad enough to recruit deployable gender advisors.

OI did provide gender training for staff across the tsunami response, something that is certainly not standard practice across the humanitarian sector in general, and which should be commended. Most felt that this training was good for building awareness of gender issues, but that it did not provide enough guidance or tools for staff on how to integrate gender into the response in a practical sense, beyond simply targeting women.

“Many staff ... said that gender training had not changed how they worked; they found it difficult to link the training content with their daily work.”¹⁵

With more emphasis on practical ‘how to’ aspects of integrating gender into programmes, with a strong local context and with additional support in the field, the training would have been more productive.

Overall it was not clear how the OI management structures pushed the integration of gender throughout the tsunami response, given that gender is such a high global priority for the organisation.

7. Working with partners

Oxfam’s tsunami response supported partners in all countries of operation. The environment for working with partners was challenging: many were themselves affected by the tsunami; most were overwhelmed by the scale and needs of the disaster, but had little experience in humanitarian response. This led to a mixed performance on gender among partner programmes.

Some existing partners, particularly in India and Sri Lanka, already had a focus on working with women, had internal gender policies, and had been provided with capacity building to develop gender mainstreaming expertise. However, in the tsunami context it was not always possible to find adequately experienced partners. In some cases, partners were not provided with clear guidelines on Oxfam’s expectations at the outset and became confused.

“Partners felt that if gender is such an important principle to Oxfam, then it must be explicitly addressed ... before implementation begins.”¹⁶

The most effective gender mainstreaming by partners occurred when there was a close relationship, support was available when needed, and there was a shared understanding of gender objectives. This support was provided in a range of ways: gender training, gender forums, monitoring, and reviews were used to assess partners’ programmes and to develop strategies. Many

partners found such support very valuable and it generally increased their ability to integrate gender into their programmes.¹⁷

“The gender relations in recovery are dynamic and complex. Those OI partners, such as TOFARM, who recognise that gender relations are institutionally embedded, are better able to address them.”¹⁸

A number of programmes specifically sought to work with or strengthen support for women’s organisations and to build the capacity of their female leaders. This was a positive achievement for Oxfam in some parts of the response.

In Sri Lanka, Oxfam has been supporting an organisation that operates a women’s refuge for victims of domestic violence, raises awareness of women’s legal rights in such cases, and provides links to legal support. Many programmes in Sri Lanka focused specifically on the development of self-help groups (SHGs) and community-based organisations (CBOs) with women members, built capacity for women to organise, and provided forums for women to meet and engage in public discussion.

In Aceh, Oxfam’s partner programme developed its support for a number of women’s organisations, including the network organisation Solidaritas Perempuan, which supports the development of grassroots women’s organisations.

There was comment that Oxfam could have provided more support in linking women’s organisations to government agencies or to private credit organisations; this could have strengthened sustainability over the longer term. However, overall its support for women’s organisations has been a strength of Oxfam’s response.

8. Gender in the programmes

Gender relations are complex and highly variable.¹⁹ While some of Oxfam’s programmes were based on an understanding of gender and community relations, this was not consistent.

“Engagement with local actors was itself a challenge and was not always viewed as a priority by emergency-orientated managers.”²⁰

This was identified as an issue, and some detailed analyses were undertaken as the response progressed. Oxfam supported some excellent gender research in Aceh, India, and Sri Lanka, which was shared with other humanitarian actors. However, this approach was not consistent and there was less community-level analysis to inform programmes.

Oxfam's tsunami response did engage with both women and men, although the way in which this occurred was variable. While there are some innovative examples of engagement, in some areas women were excluded from providing input into Oxfam's programmes.

One of the most positive examples was seen in Sri Lanka, where Oxfam supported the establishment of the Women's Coalition for Disaster Management (WCDM). This was a regular forum held with the participation of women from camp committees and of humanitarian agencies, establishing a direct line of communication between women and those in a position to act. This simple model was very well received by both the community and by participating agencies, and could easily be replicated.

*"The WCDM was a way to get a watchdog to oversee our roles, to push the agenda, to help ensure gender mainstreaming is achieved."*²¹

Many Oxfam and partner programmes specifically targeted women, with many seeking to elicit input from women on issues such as the composition of NFI kits and the design of housing; these were key in establishing many livelihood initiatives. As a result, some women reported having a greater sense of self-empowerment and self-confidence.

*"The women used to exclude themselves from the discussion. Recently, the women started to actively take part in discussions about livelihood projects."*²²

However, equally there were examples where this did not occur. In one partner programme in India, women were not consulted on the design or siting of public health facilities. As a result, the facilities were not used and were eventually demolished, wasting resources and providing sub-standard support for communities.²³

It was also often the case that community consultations were held via mixed-gender meetings, where it was common for women to be excluded from discussion. While in some cases women could effectively contribute to such meetings, this needed skilled facilitation, which was not always available across the response.²⁴

Some evidence shows that where Oxfam and its partners did engage with women, men's attitudes towards women began to change as they saw the benefits for the community.²⁵ However, this was inconsistent across the response.

Oxfam and its partners should be commended for the efforts made across their response to target vulnerable and excluded communities, many of whom had been overlooked by governments or other organisations. This included women, dalits, farm labourers, landless transgendered people, and other minorities.

However, there were variations in the impact of the targeting. In the early phases of the response, women were targeted as beneficiaries, but the quality of the support was not always given as much attention – some saw it more as a 'numbers game' to meet beneficiary quotas.

*"Field programming shows variable evidence of gender-aware programming; there is a tendency to equate gender with a numerical emphasis on women."*²⁶

Many of Oxfam's programmes aimed to raise awareness of gender rights. In Sri Lanka and India, much of the work with SHGs and CBOs included gender rights training. This led to many women feeling more confident and more active in the community, and in some cases their increased leadership was accepted and supported by men.

*"[In] all the villages there were attitude[s] changed in positive way[s] [that] encouraged women to be involved in community activities."*²⁷

A particularly positive outcome was increased reporting of, and a reduction in, gender-based violence in some areas.²⁸

“This woman reported her case to the police ... No woman had done this before. The courage came from working with other women.”²⁹

In Aceh a series of trainings on gender awareness-raising was undertaken with men. However, this did not use the term ‘gender’ but instead looked at issues such as the ‘household economy’ and the roles of women and men, in a way that resonated with the men. This training was shown to have positive results in raising gender awareness.³⁰ The women’s empowerment training held in Aceh included a component on reproductive biology, which was considered very empowering as few women had knowledge of their own reproductive biology, reproductive health, or family planning.³¹

This experience showed that any gender awareness activities need to be developed to suit the local context, as inappropriate training may lead to resistance in communities.³²

Gender in Oxfam’s shelter programmes

Shelter programming was a significant component of Oxfam’s tsunami response, with variation in how these programmes were delivered. In India (including the Andaman and Nicobar Islands), Sri Lanka, and Aceh, and to a lesser extent in Somalia, Oxfam was involved in all phases of shelter programming. Delivery was through direct implementation, partners, community-driven building, and private contractors. Advocacy and policy were important to shelter programming.

Shelter programmes were a challenge for Oxfam as no affiliate, nor many of its partners, had any significant prior experience in undertaking large-scale permanent shelter programmes. At the outset, Oxfam had little specialist expertise and few guidelines, policies, or procedures available to guide staff, including how to effectively mainstream gender into shelter programmes.³³ With few existing shelter experts, Oxfam had to recruit new staff, some of whom lacked technical skills in gender or community engagement.³⁴

“Because we don’t have clear shelter processes, it is difficult to include [gender].”

“Engineers should have some sort of social training as much as technical.”³⁵

The involvement of women, and communities more broadly, in the design of their housing varied across OI’s tsunami response. In many programmes shelter committees were established, with equal representation of women and men. These provided an avenue for the community to have some input into shelter design and allowed Oxfam to design housing to meet the needs of women, whether for practical or safety reasons. This included aspects such as the positioning of windows and doors, lighting needs, safety of children in building areas, cooking facilities in the homes, and ensuring that cooking fuels/materials were safe.

“In the case of shelter programmes, OI wanted to follow its principle of involving beneficiaries, especially women, in designing the house ... In Nagapattinam District, SEVAI [a partner] had discussions with women and altered the entrance to toilets and provided storage space in kitchens.”³⁶

There were also some instances of links between shelter and livelihoods, such as the layout of housing being designed to incorporate space to run a small enterprise. In Aceh shopkeeping is a common livelihood activity for women, and at some sites Oxfam provided space for this resource at the front of the houses.³⁷

It was not uncommon for OI to use external contractors to design and build housing. High levels of competition and a lack of competent contractors meant that it was difficult to find contractors with even minimum technical skills, and almost impossible to find contractors with community/social skills. This meant that some women had no input into the design or construction of their housing.

However, Oxfam developed some innovative community approaches. A shelter programme in Sri Lanka provided one example.

“This [programme] required the use of engineers and ... contractors, most of whom had little experience in or time for discussing technical matters with ... “ordinary” community

*members... Oxfam Australia addressed this by assigning community mobilisers to work alongside the engineer, to ensure that community preferences were taken into consideration.*³⁸

Adequate consultation requires time and flexibility and may need to be ongoing, and not just considered at the outset. In the above example, it was felt by the programme managers that the project had better outcomes in regards to appropriate housing design and community empowerment.³⁹

Not all of Oxfam's shelter projects demonstrated such commitment to community engagement. For some there was a lack of resources or expertise, pressure to complete construction, or a lack of commitment to involving the community, specifically women.

*"It was extremely difficult to ensure that ... community consultation remained central; this was often seen as unnecessary by government authorities."*⁴⁰

In India, the Government's mandatory housing design included an internal toilet, which many women were very uncomfortable using. It was suggested that Oxfam could have put more effort into advocacy initiatives to change this critical design fault; this was a missed opportunity.⁴¹

Similarly, OI's 2006 Sri Lanka evaluation found that kitchens were sometimes not incorporated into transitional shelters, latrines were not always provided, fire extinguishers were often absent, and lighting, windows, and storage shelves were not always included,⁴² demonstrating that women were not routinely consulted to ensure that their needs were incorporated.

A number of Oxfam programmes actively supported women to become more involved in shelter construction, and saw women trained in construction roles such as small timber formwork, painting, and bricklaying. In most cases, they were paid the same wages as men. This provided an alternative livelihood option for women, but also served to break down gender stereotypes, showing that women could be involved in this male-dominated sector.

'One woman stated, "Before I had never held a saw and now I know how to build a house".⁴³

While these initiatives did not always lead to long-term livelihood options for women, they did provide shorter-term income opportunities and a sense of empowerment, as women gained new skills and a greater role in the community. However, Oxfam did not influence other actors to increase the involvement of women in the shelter construction sector, which was seen as a missed opportunity across the response.⁴⁴

OI played a key role in advocating for women's rights to land and housing entitlements. This is an area where Oxfam had a significant impact for women.

In Sri Lanka, Oxfam has been advocating for some time for joint titling of housing for women and men; following the tsunami, it included advocacy to maintain traditional matrilineal land ownership practices in the northeast of the country. This is considered likely to happen, in part due to Oxfam's long-term advocacy initiatives.⁴⁵ In some programmes Oxfam insisted that beneficiaries registered their housing title in the names of both husband and wife as a prerequisite for obtaining occupancy.⁴⁶

In India, Oxfam supported women to play a major role in community-level initiatives to lobby the government on land entitlement and housing location issues. However, advocacy initiatives did not achieve joint ownership in family households, as men were still given ownership rights.

In Aceh, Oxfam had a strong advocacy programme that commissioned research and engaged in a range of initiatives related to women's land rights, settlement conditions, and other shelter issues. Most notable was research into women's rights to land and housing, which has had an impact on government policy on joint land titling in Aceh.⁴⁷ Oxfam also supported gender-aware legal training with local political and religious leaders in mediating land rights disputes.

Overall, Oxfam has played a significant role in promoting strategic gender issues of women's entitlement to land and housing. However, it missed opportunities to advocate for some of the

practical shelter issues that have affected women, missing the opportunity to influence the shelter sector more broadly.

Gender in Oxfam's livelihoods programmes

Oxfam's livelihood programmes were a significant component of its tsunami response, were undertaken in all phases of the response, and have been amalgamated into some long-term country programmes. In most programmes, women made up the majority of beneficiaries, with a particular focus on vulnerable communities such as dalits and landless farm labourers.

Cash-for-work programmes dominated the early phases of OI's livelihood response, supporting work such as clearing rubble, irrigation channels, and fields. In most cases, Oxfam and its partners supported women and men equitably. However, this was not consistent, often due to a distinction between higher-paying 'heavy' work dominated by men and lower-paying 'light' work considered appropriate for women.

In the Maldives, a partner programme paid women significantly less than men, because the men's work was considered more difficult. After the women complained, the situation was rectified, but it should have been avoided in the first place.

"The project was managed on a contract basis where only performance [number of bricks in a given timeframe] was considered. The delivery approach, i.e. equal inclusiveness of all beneficiaries including women, was considered to be secondary."⁴⁸

In one programme in India, the short-term, low-status task of clearing privately-owned land was given to women, whereas the job of cleaning irrigation channels was given to men. The latter was a larger, longer-term job, and as the channels were highly visible and a valuable community asset, it was also considered a higher-status occupation.⁴⁹

The ability of Oxfam and its partners to recognise the differing needs of women in the cash-for-work programmes often came down to individual staff members, rather than being an organisational commitment. However, even though Oxfam did not provide equitable access to cash in all cases, it was seen in a

majority of programmes overall. There was also some success in co-ordinating with other organisations to support the payment of equitable wages.

The establishment or support of women's SHGs and CBOs was a major component of Oxfam's livelihoods programmes; in some areas up to 90 per cent of beneficiaries were women. In India and Sri Lanka, this approach built on a strong tradition in which Oxfam and its partners have had significant experience.

Across the response it was found that the process of forming into groups, and of being given resources and training, gave many women a feeling of empowerment. They gained new skills, social infrastructure, and support within the community. This was a significant outcome.

However, SHGs and CBOs can take time to develop their capacities to provide adequate support for their members. In some cases Oxfam and its partners worked with groups for one or two years. While providing short-term assistance, many of these groups are unlikely to operate in the longer term. It was also felt that, in many cases, Oxfam did not provide links between these groups and local institutions or market networks that could provide longer-term support.

In general, the support that Oxfam and its partners provided to women did not allow them to reach income parity with men or to escape poverty. Across the response, women were largely supported in low-income-earning, low-status, and often domestically focused, home-based industries such as handicrafts, cake-making, and rearing small animals. With some exceptions, few other options were provided.

In some cases women earned less than the minimum living wage from their Oxfam-supported enterprises, which meant that they had to continue other income-generating activities, adding to an already high work burden.

"Oxfam did not provide options other than support in these traditionally low-income sectors, nor ... explore alternative livelihood strategies ... As such, most women undertake their new livelihood activity in addition to their existing workload, as they do

*not earn enough income to drop other activities.*⁵⁰

Similarly, funding for women's enterprises was usually not enough to establish a business of significant scale. For example, of a group of women in Aceh trained in embroidery skills, none sustained their own small business; some ended up working in what were considered exploitative conditions at a male-owned embroidery factory.⁵¹ A review undertaken on the coir sector in India (which predominantly involved women's enterprises and which was largely supported by Oxfam) found that the women involved were working long hours but earning less than the minimum wage they could earn for labouring.

Oxfam did not consistently investigate alternative income-generating opportunities, value adding, improved technologies, or market chains to support women's livelihood opportunities. However, where this did happen, it was successful. In Sri Lanka, after several years of support for women in the coir sector, many women's enterprises improved their production techniques and engaged along the market chain, not only producing the raw material but being involved in the manufacture, marketing, and sale of finished goods. This resulted in a reported doubling or tripling of their income. These women have achieved greater financial independence, gained confidence in their abilities, and improved their standing in the community.⁵²

By contrast, men were often supported in agriculture or in the development of larger enterprises. In Aceh, livelihood programmes were often delineated by support for micro-enterprises for women through SHGs and agricultural support for men, even though many women were farmers.⁵³ However, agricultural support provided to women in India and Sri Lanka, particularly in innovative organic methods, has proved to be successful.

In some cases Oxfam did look at supporting women in non-traditional livelihood options such as construction, fisheries, or business enterprise. This requires more intensive resourcing and longer-term support, ongoing skills development and, at times, 'community socialising', particularly of male family members and community leaders, to gain acceptance of women working in

non-traditional enterprises, earning (and keeping) their own wages, and having skilled roles outside the traditional family setting.

The distribution of fishing boats was a prime example. Boats, one of the most significant assets, were distributed primarily to men across the tsunami response, but Oxfam and its partners did strive for gender equity by promoting some distribution to women. This received a mixed response and required significant work to engender community acceptance of women's access to these traditional male assets. It was suggested that Oxfam may not have appreciated the significance of the social change it was promoting through its support of women's fisheries and the support required to ensure that women would benefit.⁵⁴

*"It is not part of their culture and custom to engage women in fishing; sensitisation of men and women is required to change their attitudes. This may take a long time and concerted efforts."*⁵⁵

Oxfam should be commended for considering alternative livelihoods through its response, and this is an area that could have been expanded to provide a broader range of livelihood options, both short- and long-term, for women. However, clarity is needed from the outset on the purpose and the support required both in skills development and community socialisation, to ensure that women are able to realise their potential.

This review has found that in general, many women did increase their income from pre-tsunami levels. Often this benefited their families; the extra money was spent on purchasing food for the family, sending children, particularly girls, to school, and on improving household amenities. Many women stated that they now also have an increased role in decision-making in the home, and are supported by their husbands or fathers in their work. This is a real achievement by Oxfam and its partners.

However, even though OI programmes have supported women to earn their own income, this does not always increase their control over their income and assets – money can go straight into the control of their male relatives.⁵⁶ This impact was not always clear in the evaluations or documentation of livelihood programme impacts.

This is an opportunity for Oxfam to learn and improve on its livelihood support for women. While some notable examples exist, women's livelihood sectors supported by Oxfam and its partners in the tsunami response have predominantly locked women into low-paying, low-status occupations – a highly significant gap.

Gender in Oxfam's public health programmes

Oxfam's public health programmes focused on the construction of water and sanitation infrastructure, coupled with public health promotion (PHP) activities. In some areas this was combined with livelihood programmes to provide cash-for-work opportunities. Public health activity was concentrated in the emergency and transition phases of the response. Programmes were delivered through a mix of direct and partner-led implementation.

Involving women in the siting and design of public health facilities is crucial; such decisions can increase (or reduce) their security, safety, and health. However, particularly in the early phase of the response, Oxfam and its partners did not systematically consult women in this area.

A problem in Oxfam's initial response was the domination of 'hard-skilled' engineers and technical staff. There was no consistent deployment of PHP or community engagement skills; these tended to come later.⁵⁷

In India this led to significant issues in the siting of latrines and bathing facilities. In one programme in Tamil Nadu, women's and men's latrines and bathing units were built facing each other and the doors did not close properly or lock, affording little privacy. Women did not use them, instead defecating in open spaces, thus increasing health and safety risks. This infrastructure was eventually demolished and rebuilt, increasing costs and inconvenience for beneficiaries.⁵⁸

However, in other programmes Oxfam developed mechanisms to ensure engagement with women. The Women's Coalition for Disaster Management (WCDM) was a key avenue for input, with many of the issues it raised concerning public health facilities in the camps and other temporary settlements.

It is recognised that at community level engagement can be challenging in the early phases of an emergency, when much public health construction work actually takes place.

"At the time of construction, beneficiaries were in a traumatised state, and it would have been difficult to ask them about construction design."⁵⁹

In the Maldives, water tanks and desalination plants were installed, but there is no indication that women were involved in the decisions leading to the building of these facilities or their siting, even given their key role in collecting water.

While this was in part outside Oxfam's control, it is also unclear how OI engaged with women on the ongoing management of these highly technical water supply systems, as there were no women on the water committees.

As the response progressed, more resources and processes were put in place to engage with women on public health issues. However, even though there are challenges in the early phase of a response, an organisation with Oxfam's experience in public health should ensure that the needs of the community, particularly women, are considered right from the outset. Community structures such as the WCDM demonstrate that this is possible even in the earliest stages of a response.

Most programmes had a significant focus on PHP, especially on the safe use of public health facilities, establishing committees to maintain facilities, and health messaging such as hand-washing and vector control.

Oxfam was strong in establishing public health committees to maintain shared public health facilities, to help spread PHP messages through the community, and to provide feedback on public health issues. However, many of these committees had an over-representation of women, often because the traditional division of labour defined public health as a woman's role. Often these women were tasked to clean toilets and facilities for the entire community, which for many of them became an unacceptable burden. This led to a reduction in maintenance of the facilities, leading in turn to unhygienic conditions and lower rates of use.

*“It was felt that there was a lack of appropriate strategies to involve men and other community members”.*⁶⁰

However, programmes in Sri Lanka made a concerted effort to include men in public health committees and to distribute the responsibility for the maintenance of facilities more equally. This was positively accepted by the communities and led to better maintenance of the facilities.

Oxfam had mixed results on its advocacy around public health-related gender policies and practices amongst key stakeholders. There were some excellent examples, including the WCDM, described above. This forum provided a means of raising capacity in gender and public health in Sri Lanka, particularly as the conflict there continued to displace communities.⁶¹

In Aceh, Oxfam developed relationships with the PKK and Ibu Aceh, two significant women’s organisations. These organisations took the concerns of women to the Government and were able to exert some influence to improve water supply and public health outcomes.⁶²

However, not all opportunities were taken. Oxfam was present on a range of co-ordination forums, where gender issues were not necessarily broached if the representative did not have the knowledge or skill to do so.

*“There was a lot of engagement [with the community], but [Oxfam] playing an advocacy role between government and community didn’t really happen. Oxfam could have taken this further, and there was potential for us in this area.”*⁶³

7. Key achievements

The most consistently noted gender outcomes of Oxfam’s tsunami response related to women’s increased sense of empowerment, voice in the community, and involvement in community decision-making processes. These were not related to any specific project intervention, but came about primarily through the processes of consulting with and involving women.

Similarly, Oxfam’s support of women’s organisations and women’s leadership will continue to have an impact on women’s

ability to assert their views and play an increased role in public life. Capacity building of partners in gender mainstreaming may also have an ongoing impact on their ability to promote gender equity in their work.

Advocacy and lobbying to give women equal rights to land and property titles will have a long-term impact. While this did not occur everywhere, many women now have the legal right to land and inheritance entitlements. This is in part due to Oxfam’s efforts in this area.

Increased income opportunities, skills, and ability to engage in the commercial sector have made a significant difference for many women and their families. Increased incomes have meant better nutrition levels for families, more girls attending school and, for many women, more decision-making power within the family.

Finally, efforts to reduce gender-based violence, while not consistent or evident across the whole of the response, have had a significant impact for some women, particularly in Sri Lanka.

However, none of these achievements are absolute or consistent across programmes. Gender-based violence is still widely evident, women’s incomes are still lower than men’s, and women are a long way from having equitable space in public life.

8. Effectiveness

*“Oxfam has no problem with commitment to gender mainstreaming, but we still struggle with implementing it.”*⁶⁴

Oxfam is committed in its strategies to mainstreaming gender and provided resources to integrate gender into its tsunami response. This has produced some compelling results, seeing many women gain confidence, assert their rights, earn higher incomes, and play a more active role in their communities.

However, OI fell far short of truly mainstreaming or institutionalising gender across its response. There were insufficiently consistent skills, experience, and management emphasis to integrate gender in a consistent way. In many cases OI relied on individual staff rather than being systematically resourced, with oversight from the management hierarchy across the response.

For directly implemented Oxfam programmes, those that had the greatest impact on promoting gender equity shared several key factors: country programmes with an existing focus on working with women, programmes with key staff with skills and experience in gender, and programmes where senior managers placed a high priority on gender and pushed this through the line.

With partners, the most effective programmes occurred where partners were experienced in community engagement and gender mainstreaming – more so if they had a prior relationship with Oxfam, had received capacity building support, and had a strong and trusted working relationship. Even new partners benefited from close working relationships with Oxfam.

It was found across the programmes that, where staff were not experienced, did not place a priority on gender, or were not supported by senior managers, gender was easily seen as additional to the programmes, not as a part of the core work.

Dedicated gender staff have been a significant support throughout the programme, but they were most effective when in senior positions and when working closely in the field with technical programme staff. When gender specialists were removed from the field, they found it more difficult to develop working relationships and an understanding of, or influence in, the programmes.

As an organisation that places such a high priority on gender, Oxfam's effectiveness in the tsunami response fell below its stated commitment: there is a clear gap between the rhetoric and the reality. Oxfam failed to address this in a systematic way throughout the response hierarchy.

9. Sustainability

There have been mixed reactions as to whether long-term change in gender relations within the affected communities will occur as a result of OI's tsunami response interventions.

In areas where Oxfam had pre-existing long-term programmes, history, and partners, such changes have already been evident, with its own and partners' tsunami programmes serving to

develop and support community structures that support women's economic development and rights.

Many partners are in a good position to continue to promote gender equity in their work. For some, gender experience may be a 'market advantage' for them for other partnerships or funding, adding another impetus for them to maintain work in this area.

Improvements in women's rights to land and housing assets have been significant. Although Oxfam cannot take all the credit for changes in national policy, it has been active in this area and is seen as a significant player in ensuring that these long-term rights are upheld.

As described above, a consistent outcome reported across programmes in all countries is that many women have a greater sense of empowerment than they had prior to the tsunami. For many communities, the tsunami response was the first time that women had been engaged or included in community programmes, or that men had been included in discussions relating to gender roles.

This sentiment was echoed in many programmes. However, in the programmes where gender was weak, or where the programmes were only short-term, it was thought that improved gender relations at the community level were unlikely to be sustained in the longer term.⁶⁵ This certainly highlights the benefits and importance of integrating gender, and of having the support and resources to do this.

10. Priority lessons and recommendations

*"It is clear that the tsunami response is not unique and many, if not all, of the lessons that are emerging from the tsunami response experience have been recorded in previous emergencies."*⁶⁶

1. Learning the lessons: The recommendations provided below highlight a range of ways in which future humanitarian responses can achieve better gender outcomes. However, if Oxfam International and Oxfam affiliates truly want to meet

their goal of gender justice, they need to take serious steps to review and understand why they failed to institutionalise gender in the tsunami response. This is beyond the scope of this review alone; the issue needs serious consideration from the top levels of Oxfam down.

2. Senior staff and management capacity: In parts of the tsunami response, there were clear gaps in gender programming that were not addressed by senior managers. Oxfam needs to put more resources into building the gender capacity of permanent senior staff and managers responsible for humanitarian programmes. Effective oversight of gender mainstreaming by senior staff has produced significantly better results.
3. Gender-sensitive assessment and consultation with women and men is vital to obtain an understanding of gender dynamics, the needs and capacities of women and men, and other local issues; however, this did not occur systematically across the response. Assessment teams for all stages of a response should include staff with gender, or at a minimum, community engagement skills. Failure to ensure this caused serious gaps in Oxfam's livelihoods, public health, and shelter tsunami response programmes.
4. Gender aims of each programme need to be clear to all from the outset to ensure that all staff have an understanding of them. Many staff throughout OI's tsunami response were not aware or did not adequately understand what either the global or specific project gender aims were. Specific project outcomes and objectives, rather than vague or general terms such as 'empowering women', need to be defined; objectives need to go beyond merely numbers of women targeted.
5. Engaging with women in emergencies: Structures such as the Women's Coalition for Disaster Management were highly effective in providing a way for women's concerns to be heard directly by humanitarian agencies, and for those agencies to be held accountable to women. Such structures are not complex and can be established at even the earliest stages of a humanitarian response. They should be utilised more widely.

6. Partner support: Many of Oxfam's partners failed to adequately integrate gender into their programmes. Oxfam must ensure that it has the capacity and skills to build relationships with and support partners so that they are able to build and develop gender-sensitive programming. This requires open, trusting, and transparent relationships.
7. Gender staff need to spend a significant time in the field with programme staff, particularly when undertaking assessments, designing projects, or monitoring. Their input is required right from the outset of a programme. Where this occurred, there were successful outcomes, which was less often the case when gender staff were based primarily in the head office or did not make regular field visits.
8. Surge management: Oxfam did not have enough gender capacity in its tsunami responses. While few organisations did, OI did not appear to have contingencies in place to ensure that gender capacity was available for a humanitarian response. The Oxfam International Humanitarian Register and other staff surge management systems (e.g. HSPs) should have more gender specialists available for rapid deployment.
9. Gender training had some effect, particularly for staff new to Oxfam, but was not always practical enough for staff implementing programmes in the field. Future gender training should provide more practical advice on how gender mainstreaming is done in practice, using case studies to demonstrate the potential positive outcomes.

11. Key lessons and recommendations

Internal staffing and resources

- Particularly in the early phases of a response, there needs to be a mix of 'hard' (technical/engineering) and 'soft' (social/community) skills within a programme response team to ensure that all aspects of programming can be delivered, not just the hardware.

- Programme management posts can be filled by technical gender specialist staff rather than technical or programme generalists.
- Gender staff need to be embedded in the programme, under the programme line management, not external to it, and in a senior position to ensure real space for input into programmes.
- Gender staff should be involved in ongoing coaching of staff in the field, not just in delivering training.
- Gender focal points, where used, need to be represented across the programme hierarchy.
- Technical staff on OI's Humanitarian Register should have demonstrated experience in gender mainstreaming, or be provided with adequate capacity building.

Strategy

- Promoting gender equity is a long-term social change mechanism. Long-term goals may not be possible in short-term projects. However, all projects can be gender-equitable.
- There need to be adequate mechanisms to verify that what is included in project plans can, and is, carried out at the field level. Programme managers should be held accountable for this.

Staff training

- In-field support is needed to supplement gender training to develop a practical understanding of the concepts involved.
- Gender training should be appropriate to the local context when working with a large local staff body for whom concepts of gender may be very new. It should build in local concepts and knowledge.

Assessment and consultation

- All community consultation needs to allow for adequate input from women; women's attendance at community activities does not necessarily mean that they can contribute. Ideally,

women should be consulted separately from men, in a space where it is comfortable for them to meet.

- Logistical issues, such as location and timing, need to be planned to ensure that both women and men are available.

Engaging with women and men

- Engaging with men on gender issues is important as they are key players in gender equity.
- Formal gender training/awareness-raising with men may be more effective if it avoids the term 'gender', instead emphasising household roles or economies, or using other appropriate messaging.

Partners

- Oxfam could be more creative with its selection of partners; partners specifically focused on gender could be brought in to support other partners.
- A number of programmes utilised private construction contractors. In such cases Oxfam needs to ensure that women are included in community engagement processes.
- Capacity building and experience in gender mainstreaming may provide a 'market advantage' for partners after the emergency or partnership is over.

Livelihoods

- More attention should be paid to market chain analysis and to women's roles beyond domestic or small-scale production. Even traditional, lower-paying enterprises can develop with better linkages and business development.
- The development of SHGs, CBOs, and other social capital can be a powerful way to empower women and develop women's leadership. This should be an aim of livelihood programmes to ensure that appropriate support is provided.

- Engaging women in non-traditional livelihoods can create social and economic change that may meet resistance. This needs to be considered at the outset, and provisions made in programmes and advocacy plans to ensure that it is addressed.

Shelter

- If Oxfam continues working in the shelter sector, it needs clear guidelines and minimum standards for integrating gender into shelter programmes.
- Permanent shelter programmes provide an opportunity to improve equity in land and housing ownership. Advocacy in shelter programmes can take the opportunity to address long-term social and gender inequities.
- Shelter-related advocacy should include the practical needs of women and communities, influencing government and other humanitarian actors. Oxfam missed some opportunities in this area in the tsunami response.
- Women need to be consulted in the siting and design of their shelter as these factors can have a real impact on their security, safety, and livelihoods. Many women may not have experience in interpreting housing design layouts, so feedback may not occur until building commences and the layout can be seen.

Public health

- Women must be consulted on the siting and design of public health facilities. Failure to do this can result in failure to supply infrastructure that women will use, compromising their safety, security, and health.
- Camp PH committees need to have representation from both women and men. If such committees are dominated by women, this can lead to the over-burdening of women with maintenance and cleaning work.

Monitoring and evaluation

- Review periods are important to ensure that gender is being addressed. Time should be allocated, backed by management follow-up and translated into work plans.
- Gender-balanced evaluation teams are important at the community level; power and gender relations can influence the information obtained

References

- ¹ 'Demanding Justice, Oxfam International Strategic Plan 2007–2012'.
- ² OI, 'Oxfam International Tsunami Fund End of Programme Report'.
- ³ Terms of Reference, 'Oxfam International Tsunami Final Evaluation: Gender Review'.
- ⁴ OI, 'Oxfam International Tsunami Fund End of Programme Report'.
- ⁵ 'Oxfam International Strategic Plan'.
- ⁶ These approaches have been drawn from a number of Oxfam affiliate websites. See Oxfam International's website (www.oxfam.org) for more detail and links to each affiliate site.
- ⁷ This includes other cross-cutting themes including advocacy, accountability, partnerships, and disaster risk reduction.
- ⁸ Terms of Reference, 'Oxfam International Tsunami Final Evaluation: Gender Review'.
- ⁹ Oxfam GB (2008) 'Gender Review, Aceh-Nias Programme', 13 February 2008.
- ¹⁰ Often skills in community engagement, participatory methods, gender, and other social aspects are referred to as 'soft' skills, while engineering, construction, logistics, and agricultural extension are considered 'hard' skills.
- ¹¹ Comment from Shelter Evaluation Workshop participant, Chennai, 2008.
- ¹² Oxfam GB (2007) 'Gender Analysis of the Livelihood Sector and Oxfam's Livelihoods Programme in Calang, Aceh'.
- ¹³ Feedback from staff at the three workshops, from key informants, and a number of Oxfam documents.
- ¹⁴ Feedback from questionnaire respondent and key informants.
- ¹⁵ OI (March 2006) 'Aceh and Nias Evaluation'.
- ¹⁶ Oxfam GB (2005) 'Evaluation of The Tsunami Response in The Maldives'.
- ¹⁷ Feedback from partner staff at Livelihoods Evaluation Workshop, Colombo, 2008.

- ¹⁸ OI (2006) Oxfam South India Tsunami Evaluation.
- ¹⁹ Women Studies Centre (2005) 'Gender and Changes in Tsunami-Affected Villages in Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province', and comments from several key informants.
- ²⁰ OGB (2008) 'Learning about Transition Programming in Aceh and Nias'.
- ²¹ Comment from participant, Public Health Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ²² Burma report to the TFMT, 17 September 2007.
- ²³ Case study provided at the Public Health Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, October 2008.
- ²⁴ Oxfam GB (2007) 'Gender Analysis of the Livelihood Sector and Oxfam's Livelihoods Programme in Calang, Aceh' and 'Gender Analysis of the Livelihood Sector and Oxfam's Livelihoods Programme in Nias'.
- ²⁵ Based on feedback from a number of key informants and participants in the evaluation workshops, October 2008.
- ²⁶ Oxfam GB (March 2006) 'Aceh and Nias Evaluation'.
- ²⁷ Oxfam GB (2007) 'Oxfam Trincomolee Final Evaluation'.
- ²⁸ Feedback from Livelihoods Evaluation Workshop, Colombo, 2008.
- ²⁹ OI (2006) 'South India Evaluation – Final Report'.
- ³⁰ Feedback from Aceh staff member at Livelihoods Evaluation Workshop, Colombo, 2008.
- ³¹ Comments from participant in Livelihoods Evaluation Workshop, Colombo, 2008 and from key informant.
- ³² Comment from Livelihood Evaluation Workshop participant, Colombo, 2008.
- ³³ Feedback from participants in the Shelter Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ³⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁵ Participant in Shelter Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ³⁶ OI (2006) 'Oxfam International South India Tsunami Response Evaluation'.
- ³⁷ Comment from Shelter Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ³⁸ Oxfam Australia (2007) 'Reflections On A Low-Cost Housing Initiative In Hambantota, Sri Lanka'.
- ³⁹ Comment from key informant, Sri Lanka programme.
- ⁴⁰ Oxfam Australia (2007) 'Reflections On A Low-Cost Housing Initiative In Hambantota, Sri Lanka'.
- ⁴¹ Comment from participants at Shelter Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, October 2008.

- ⁴² OI (2006) 'An Evaluation of the Sri Lanka Tsunami Response Programme'.
- ⁴³ Comment from participant at Shelter Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ⁴⁴ Comment from key informant, Aceh programme.
- ⁴⁵ Comments from participants at Shelter Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008, and from key informant.
- ⁴⁶ Comment from key informant.
- ⁴⁷ Comment from key informant from Aceh.
- ⁴⁸ OGB (2005) 'Evaluation of the Tsunami Response in the Maldives'.
- ⁴⁹ Comment from key informant, India programme.
- ⁵⁰ OGB (2007) 'Gender Analysis of the Livelihood Sector and Oxfam's Livelihoods Programme on Nias Island'.
- ⁵¹ Case study relayed by Livelihoods Evaluation Workshop participant.
- ⁵² OI (2008) 'Humanitarian Field Studies, Improving Livelihoods After Disasters'.
- ⁵³ OGB (2007) 'Gender Analysis of the Livelihood Sector and Oxfam's Livelihoods Programme in Calang, Aceh'.
- ⁵⁴ Comment from key informant.
- ⁵⁵ OI (2006) 'Oxfam South India Tsunami Evaluation'.
- ⁵⁶ OGB (2007) 'Gender Analysis of the Livelihood Sector and Oxfam's Livelihoods Programme on Nias Island'.
- ⁵⁷ Comment from participants at Public Health Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ⁵⁸ Case study provided by Public Health Evaluation Workshop participant, Chennai, 2008.
- ⁵⁹ OGB (2005) 'Aceh (Indonesia) Tsunami Response First-Month Review of Achievements and Lessons Learned'.
- ⁶⁰ Comment from participant at Public Health Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ⁶¹ Comment from Sri Lanka staff member at Public Health Evaluation Workshop, Chennai, 2008.
- ⁶² Feedback from Public Health Evaluation Workshop participant, Chennai, 2008.
- ⁶³ Comment from Public Health Workshop participant, Chennai, 2008.
- ⁶⁴ Comment from key informant.
- ⁶⁵ Feedback from key informants and participants at Livelihoods, Public Health and Shelter workshops, 2008.
- ⁶⁶ OI (2006) 'Responses to the Recommendations of the Evaluations of the Oxfam International Tsunami Response'.

Oxfam International is a confederation of fourteen organizations working together in more than 100 countries to find lasting solutions to poverty and injustice: Oxfam America, Oxfam Australia, Oxfam-in-Belgium, Oxfam Canada, Oxfam France - Agir ici, Oxfam Germany, Oxfam GB, Oxfam Hong Kong, Intermón Oxfam (Spain), Oxfam Ireland, Oxfam Mexico, Oxfam New Zealand, Oxfam Novib (Netherlands), and Oxfam Québec. Please call or write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org

Oxfam America: www.oxfamamerica.org

Oxfam Australia: www.oxfam.org.au

Oxfam-in-Belgium: www.oxfamsol.be

Oxfam Canada: www.oxfam.ca

Oxfam France - Agir ici: www.oxfamfrance.org

Oxfam Germany: www.oxfam.de

Oxfam GB: www.oxfam.org.uk

Oxfam Hong Kong: www.oxfam.org.hk

Intermón Oxfam (Spain): www.intermonoxfam.org

Oxfam Ireland: www.oxfamireland.org

Oxfam Mexico: web: www.oxfammexico.org

Oxfam New Zealand: www.oxfam.org.nz

Oxfam Novib (Netherlands): www.oxfamnovib.nl

Oxfam Québec: www.oxfam.qc.ca

Oxfam International Secretariat: Suite 20, 266 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 7DL, UK

Tel: +44 1865 339100 **Email:** information@oxfaminternational.org

Web site: www.oxfam.org

For contact details of Oxfam International advocacy offices, please see the website of Oxfam International Secretariat, or: **E-mail:** advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

Linked Oxfam organization.

Oxfam International and Ucodep Campaign Office (Italy)

Email: ucodep-oi@oxfaminternational.org

Oxfam observer members

The following organizations are currently observer members of Oxfam International, working towards possible full affiliation:

Oxfam Japan: www.oxfam.jp

Oxfam India: www.oxfamindia.org

Oxfam International Tsunami Fund is a limited company number 5401107 registered in England and Wales and a registered charity number 1108700. The registered office is Suite 20, 266 Banbury Road, Oxford OX2 7DL, United Kingdom.