



# **Mid-Term Evaluation of the Project: EC-SHARE Coordinated Recovery to Community Resilience in Borena (CR2B), Ethiopia**

## **Final Report**

**Submitted by:**

**MASKAD Consultancy & Business PLC**

**April 2016  
Addis Ababa**

## Table of content

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	6
1. INTRODUCTION.....	7
1.1 Background.....	7
1.1.1 Community Resilience Interventions in Ethiopia .....	7
1.1.2 EC Share Resilience Building Initiative.....	7
1.1.3 Resilience Initiatives/efforts by Consortium Partners.....	7
1.1.4 CR2B Project Overview .....	8
1.2 Objectives and Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation .....	9
1.2.1 Objectives.....	9
1.2.2 Scope .....	10
2. METHODOLOGY .....	11
2.1 Documents Review .....	11
2.2 Field Data Collection.....	11
2.3 Data Analysis and Report Writing.....	12
3. FINDINGS.....	13
3.1 Relevance/Appropriateness.....	13
3.1.1 Alignment with Community Needs and Government Policies and Strategies .....	13
3.1.2 Relevance to European Commission and Partners' Missions .....	14
3.1.3 Project Design .....	14
3.1.4 Beneficiary Targeting.....	16
3.2 Operational Effectiveness .....	16
3.2.1 Livestock Productivity .....	17
3.2.2 Crop Production and Productivity .....	21
3.2.3 Income Diversification and Household Asset Building.....	23
3.2.4 Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction .....	27
3.2.5 Community-based Peace-making .....	28
3.3 Efficiency .....	31
3.3.1 Project Budget Utilization.....	31
3.3.2 Coherence and Coordination among NGOs Operating in Borena Zone.....	31
3.3.3 Synergy and Complementarity with Government Sectors.....	32
3.3.4 Capacity, Management and Organization.....	33
3.4 Progress towards Achieving Impact and Sustainability .....	33
3.4.1 Progress towards Achieving Outcomes and Objectives.....	33
3.4.2 Sustainability of Outcomes.....	37
3.5 Cross-cutting Issues .....	37
3.6 Factors Affecting Outputs and Outcomes/Results.....	39
4. OBSERVED LESSONS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	40
4.1 Observed Lessons .....	40
4.2 Conclusion .....	40
4.3 Recommendation.....	42
<b>Annexes</b>	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Mid-Term Evaluation is conducted by MASKAD Consultancy & Business & PLC. The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress of the project in achieving the project outcomes and its contribution to the higher level goal as per the indicators stated in the logical framework. Qualitative data collection methods were employed and data were collected through FGDs, KIIs, and Large Community Discussions made with project beneficiaries, project staff, experts and heads of zone and woreda sector offices, kebele administrators, and community promoters. The key evaluation findings are summarized as follows.

**1. Relevance:** The findings of the review indicate that the project components and activities are relevant to the government development priorities/policies and address community needs. The project interventions fill zone/woreda government budget gap to address community development problems, which cannot be done due to budget and capacity limitations. Thus, the woreda stakeholders (concerned sector offices) incorporated the project activities into their action plans implying that the project interventions are aligned with the government development plan. The interventions identified and being implemented are highly relevant to the EC policy and strategy of transforming emergency related interventions into a more long term resilience and development ones. They are also relevant to consortium members' missions in enhancing resilience interventions by building the capacity of the beneficiaries and government stakeholders to sustainably improve the livelihoods of the pastoralist and agro-pastoralist community in the target woredas of Borena.

The design has been to some extent flexible to accommodate changes such as care practice initiated by ACF. However, the targets to attain in the end of the project which is 80% increase in income, seems over ambitious to attain given the context. The targeting made for crop seed beneficiaries is focusing on model farmers having better knowledge, capabilities and resources. Though these are appropriate target groups to promote new technologies like new varieties of seed which was provided by the project, there has been observed tendencies of excluding poor agro-pastoralists in this regard because they are not model farmers.

**2. Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the project has been evaluated in terms of production and productivity of livestock and crop, income diversification and household asset building, community managed disaster risk reduction and community based peace building and co-existence. Generally, the project achievement is said to be low in terms of accomplishing planned targets.

In the target woredas, only 36% of the target for ellas/ponds rehabilitation/construction was achieved thereby creating water access for livestock. Regarding improvement in animal health service, the capacity building of CAHWs has been undertaken. Though CAHWs have limited linkage with private drug suppliers, the plan to strengthen this linkage by the project has not been achieved yet and delayed as a result of which CAHWs are unable to effectively provide their services. Moreover, awareness raising workshop for government sector experts on drug control was conducted. The other activity undertaken was improving pasture and forage availability through bush thinning (3,750 ha accomplished) and 215 women trained on forage preservation.

To promote crop production and productivity among agro-pastoralists for attaining food security in Borena, the project supported 420 model agro pastoralists with 28,131kg drought resistant and short maturing haricot bean seed varieties have been provided. This was done after providing training on improved agricultural practices and postharvest techniques that enhanced their agricultural skills even though productivity was low mainly due to the erratic nature and below normal rainfall intensity during the cropping period in the target woredas.

However, the plan to establish community based seed supply system through primary cooperatives has not been successful in all project areas yet due inadequate budget allocation to provide start-up capital to the cooperatives for purchasing the required seed. In addition to this, there was no excess production and supply of seeds due to erratic rainfall during the planned period. The other reason, as mentioned by CISP, is that the existing primary cooperatives are not strong and do not have such experience.

The CR2B project has strengthened 14 (51.8%) cooperatives in the project woredas to enhance income diversification and asset building. However, this component is less achieved since most of the completed activities are training and awareness creation (not operation). Multi-purpose cooperatives and SACCOs supported with the project grant in turn support their members through revolving fund arrangement. As a result, beneficiaries were engaged in different IGAs such as cattle fattening, petty trade, and bee keeping. The IGAs are progressing well except the beekeeping which is not yet successful in most of the kebeles due to migration of bee colonies, in which the cause for migration is not yet determined. Moreover, some of the activities in the income diversification and household asset building component have not been started, which need due attention.

In order to enhance community resilience to disaster risks, awareness raising trainings were organized on contingency planning and participatory vulnerability and capacity assessment for the already established early warning kebele level DRM committee members. The training was also organized for woreda level task forces. Consequently, community vulnerability mapping assessment was done with kebele DRM and assessment reports were produced. Refreshment training was provided for kebele DRM committees on how to report early warning information to the respective woreda sector offices. As a result, each kebele level DRM/EW committee meet and discuss on any DRR issues twice a month regularly and most of them have started reporting the situation update of their respective kebele to the woreda on monthly basis. Moreover, experience sharing visits were organized to help DRM committee members share good practice.

The community based peace building and co-existence intervention is the least achieved component of the project. Out of the eight planned forums, only one Ethio-Kenya forum was conducted so far. Some of the factors for the delay were associated with the sensitivity of the issue and the last Ethiopian National Election overlap with the project activity in that the major focus of the government was on the election and partners have had limited movement during the pre and post few months of the election period.

**3. Efficiency:** budget utilization, coherence and coordination are used in evaluating efficiency of the project. The project budget has been less utilized compared to the remaining period in general. For instance, the programme budget utilization of GOAL was 23% as obtained from document review. There are also issues related to under budgeting of some activities (budget ends before activities get completed) and over budgeting of some other activities.

GOAL as a lead agency works closely with all consortium members through working groups. Technical working group comprising of the three consortium members was established with the aim of harmonizing and facilitating implementation. Technical working group meets monthly and has prepared a guideline for all project related activities for standardization of operations- from beneficiary selection criteria to payment rate and modality. There is regular meeting by the technical staff of the consortium twice a month to discuss on the progress update, targeting issues, payment and situation-update. There is also a quarterly grant review meetings to discuss progress and budget. However, the quarterly HO level meeting and joint monitoring is less regular than the field offices.

There is a strong synergy and complementarity of the project with government sectors as indicated by government sector office experts. The woreda Task Force coordinates all the projects and facilitates their operation by assigning focal persons who have a key role in beneficiary identification, selection of project sites, providing training to community members, facilitating smooth implementation of project activities, and monitoring. In addition, there is high and active community involvement in the project implementation and management.

**4. Progress towards impact and sustainability:** though comparative figures for changes in results couldn't be given at this stage, there are observed signs of change in the lives of the target beneficiaries which would lead to Result and objective achievement by the end of the project. The rehabilitation/upgrading of existing water schemes and ponds/traditional wells have brought observed changes and satisfaction of beneficiaries. Pasture improvement support has also improved forage availability. The service provided by CAHWs has improved animal health service accessibility. Among the best practices related to crop production and productivity which show progress towards impact are practices of row planting and saving seed and production successes of some agro-pastoralists irrespective of the challenges related to rain shortage and pest infestations. However, expected changes in-terms of increasing household income from crop production was not found significant and could be least achieved in the project period. Some of the beneficiaries were able to actually generate income and diversify their asset building through small business engagement with loans provided by the cooperatives. To enhance community managed disaster risk reduction, non-functional kebele level DRR committees are re-established and become functional. The peace building activities are partially achieved and the expected results /signs of achieving the results of minimizing conflicts have not been observed. The strong synergy with government partners and the community in the project planning and implementation has a positive indication towards ensuring project sustainability.

There were some challenges that affected the achievement of project results, which include over/under budgeting of some of the activities, less attention in targeting of pastoralist drop outs, less involvement of the community in crop seed variety selection, delay in overall activity implementation/budget utilization, etc.

The key observed lessons are: the need for critical analysis and immediate budget revision for over/under budgeting, considering indigenous knowledge in seed variety selection, realizing the non-effectiveness of forage reseeding, employing agreed and similar work and payment modalities among consortium members, and working closely with government sector offices and the community to ensure sustainability.

**Recommendations:** Budget and activity amendment for some activities to address the issue of under/over budgeting; strengthening of gains on early warning information sharing and local level DRR preparedness planning; acknowledging community knowledge and experience in some areas like crop seed variety selection; operationalization of the proposed drug supply system for CAHWs; designing appropriate exit strategy and concrete tri-partite (Consortium partners, Cooperatives and Government sector office) MoUs signed and followed-up; expediting implementation and completion of remaining activities; conducting regular and frequent review of project activities and grant review meetings; and extension of the project implementation by one quarter.

## ACRONYMS

ARCE	Accelerating Resilience Capacity in Ethiopia
CAHWs	Community based Animal Health Workers
CDW	Community Development Worker
CMDRR	Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction
CR2B	Coordinated Recovery to Community Resilience in Borena
CRGE	Climate Resilient Green Economy
DA	Development Agent
DPP	Disaster Prevention and Preparedness
DPPO	Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Office
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRMFSS	Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Sector
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EC SHARE	European Commission Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Office
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Office
EU	European Union
EW	Early Warning
FDRE	Federal Democratic republic of Ethiopia
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FTC/PTC	Farmers Training Center/Pastoralist Training Center
GTP	Growth and Transformation Plan
HEW	Health Extension Worker
HEW	Health Extension Worker
HH	Household
HO	Head Office
HoA	Horn of Africa
HRD	Human Resource Development
IGA	Income Generating Activity
IYCF	Infant, Youth and Children Feeding
KII	Key Informant Interview
LRRD	Linking Relief to Rehabilitation and Development
MDG I	Millennium Development GOAL I
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGOs	Non-Government Organization
NPM	Nutrition Promotion Messaging
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PDO	Pastoralist Development Office
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme
PVRCA	Participatory Vulnerability Risk Capacity Assessment
SACCOs	Saving and Credit Cooperatives
ToT	Training of Trainers
TWGs	Technical Working Groups
VSLAs	Village Saving and Loan Associations
WaSH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The mid-term evaluation team would like to appreciate GOAL Ethiopia, its consortium members and the donor for their initiative to promote productivity and resilience thereby securing livelihoods and food security in changing contexts in the Borena zone of Oromia region. Such a kind of attempt would trigger other development partners to follow the path towards actualizing food security instead of investing in a short-term disaster response initiatives that have not contributed to improve the life and the livelihoods of the affected population by different hazards.

Thus, the evaluation team would like to thank GOAL Ethiopia for giving the opportunity to undertake the mid-term evaluation of the CR2B project, which is the first of its kind in this country. The team also would like to be grateful to GOAL head office experts Yeshambel Kinde, Fitsum Teshome, Mulugeta Hailu for their technical support and guidance to come up with concrete findings and recommendations.

The team also would like to acknowledge the valuable assistance provided by the colleagues at Head and Field Offices of GOAL-Ethiopia, Consortium members and government implementation partners. Particularly, the team would like to thank Gemechu Deed, Diriba Insene and Girma Getachew of GOAL for their support and facilitation during the data collection process. Moreover, the team would like to appreciate the field office staff of Consortium members including Sofia Abdela, Haimanot Lemma, Dida Sara and Tewodros Hailu of CISP; and Alemu Solomon, Dr. Kasim Guyo and Boneya Guyo of ACF for their facilitation in the data collection process and for providing us adequate and relevant information for the mid-term evaluation.

Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to the beneficiaries of the CR2B project for their patience to provide us true and valid information at their level best.

It is our sincere hope that GOAL, its implementation partners and the donor would benefit from the findings of this mid-term evaluation, experiences and positive gains for the successful completion of CR2B and future programming of similar projects.

Assefa Gessesse  
Daniel Alemu  
Workneh Nigatie (PhD)

## I. INTRODUCTION

### I.1 Background

#### I.1.1 Community Resilience Interventions in Ethiopia

Important strides in economic development have been made in Ethiopia in recent times. Despite double digit fast economic growth over the last ten years, Ethiopia remains one of the world's poorest countries with mostly rural population susceptible to many shocks and hazards related to climate change impacts such as drought, flood, disease, conflict, and pest. Moreover, large-scale land degradation resulting from population pressure, overgrazing, soil erosion, bush encroachment on rangelands, deforestation, and underdeveloped market systems and infrastructure significantly reduce the potential for sustainable improvements to agricultural productivity, and thereby to food security (MoFED, 2010).

As a result, the humanitarian needs are often well covered through the annual emergency relief food aid appeal mechanism (average 3.5 million people per year) since the last 10 years. Furthermore, around 7 million chronically food insecure people, for instance, 7.9 Million in 2016 (HRD,2016) are receiving a multi-annual support since 2005 under the on-going Productive Safety Nets Program (PSNP) implemented by the government of Ethiopia with full financial support from its development partners including the EU.

Currently, Ethiopia is facing the worst drought in fifty years and around 11 Million people require immediate support (HRD, 2016). Until recently, the agenda of resilience building was not given due emphasis. Currently, resilience building and resilience to disasters is getting focus and is becoming the government agenda being incorporated into the country's different programmes and strategies of development and disaster risk reduction.

#### I.1.2 EC Share Resilience Building Initiative

The EU is committed to strongly support an action plan to avoid the repetition of large-scale disasters in the Horn of Africa including Ethiopia. Agriculture, rural development and/or food security are focal sectors identified for development cooperation in Ethiopia, Kenya, Eritrea, Djibouti, Uganda and Somalia. EU has allocated large sum of money for agriculture and food security in the region. Food security also features prominently in the long-term cooperation programme financed by the EU. The Commission envisages an engagement, framed in a partnership approach, supported by EU development assistance, in order to accelerate progress towards food and nutrition security (MDG1) in the Horn of Africa (HoA), based on sustainable, inclusive resource management.

In response to the 2011 drought in the Horn of Africa, the EU has launched a new initiative "*Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience – SHARE*" to advance food security, sustainable agriculture and resilience in the Horn of Africa. The EC SHARE initiative is a joint product of the humanitarian and development services of the Commission. It aims to address drought resilience through a combined humanitarian and development approach. The strategic objective of the EC SHARE programme is to contribute its part towards averting the underlying causes of food and nutrition insecurity through integrated actions and strengthening "*Linking Relief to Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD)*" to bring sustainable livelihood for the vulnerable rural population in low land agro-/pastoral areas.

#### I.1.3 Resilience Initiatives/efforts by Consortium Partners

To contribute to the EU resilience approach, on component 4 entitled "*Integrated Recovery Support*" the three partner organizations, GOAL, ACF and CISP, with GOAL as a lead, are implementing EC SHARE Coordinated Recovery to Community Resilience in Borena (CR2B) project since July 2014. Prior to this, the partner organizations have considerable experience on resilience building and disaster

response projects with funding from EU as well as other donors. GOAL has implemented an EU funded project targeted in the current project location with the aim of reducing level of acute malnutrition amongst children through timely provision of targeted nutrition interventions, health promotion activities and capacity building initiatives and to contribute to the recovery from consecutive droughts for targeted vulnerable households. GOAL has also been engaged in partnership with all stakeholders to protect and promote resilient livelihoods to ensure adequate food availability and income access across rural and urban environments. Side by side to resilience building, GOAL has extensively implemented a lot of projects to deliver a coordinated, rapid, and effective humanitarian response to targeted populations affected by emergencies (natural disaster, conflict, or disease outbreak) and in response to malnutrition. GOAL is the lead for Borena cluster which ECHO and EU support multiple emergency response and resilience building projects.

ACF is the member of the Borena cluster and currently implementing emergency and resilience building projects funded by ECHO and ECSHARE/CR2B. On top of this, ACF has good experience on resilience building in the country. As a result of its experiences, ACF has received multiple donor funds including EC to enhance the social and economic stability in the drought affected areas through supporting the recovery of livelihoods of the affected population and building their resiliency. Some of the projects implemented by ACF are similar and target pastoralist and agro-pastoralist households have been supported to increase assets and income from livestock, livestock by-products, and from non-livestock sources. Moreover, the interventions aim at increasing livestock productivity through better access to water, animal health services and improved rangeland management and capacity building of local government and community/traditional institutions to provide better services and ensure peaceful co-existence.

CISP has long experience in the country and specifically in Borena zone on emergency and development projects including resilience building. CISP has implemented an EU funded project with the aim to contribute for enhancement of livelihood capacity of vulnerable households and local capacity in consolidating and managing food security interventions to tackle the root cause of poverty. CISP is a member of the Borena Cluster.

#### 1.1.4 CR2B Project Overview

As a result of the recurrent drought and the 2011 drought in the Horn of Africa, EU launched a new initiative to enhance drought resilience and food and nutrition security for vulnerable populations in southern and eastern Ethiopia to strategically link development interventions to short-term humanitarian action. In line with this, EU-SHARE consortium - GOAL ACF and CISP- has agreed to implement a project entitled 'Coordinated Recovery to Community Resilience in Borena (CR2B)' in six drought affected Woredas of Borena Zone of Oromia Region. The project runs from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2014 – 31<sup>st</sup> Dec 2016.

The **Overall Objective** of the project is to contribute to the strengthening of disaster resilience and food security of pastoral, agro pastoral and pastoral dropout communities in Borana Zone. The **Specific Objectives** of the project are to reduce vulnerability to external shocks and increase productive and income generating capacity of target communities, and to enhance capacity of local government and community /traditional institutions to improve their service delivery and disaster risk management for sustainable peace and development in the target areas.

The project has five main results:

**Result 1.** Increased Livestock Productivity through better access to water, animal health services and rangeland management

**Result 2.** Increased Crop Production and productivity

**Result 3.** Increased income diversification and household asset building

**Result 4.** Enhanced Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction

**Result 5.** Strengthened Community Based Peace Building and Co-existence

As indicated in the project document, various activities have been planned to achieve the stated results. The major activities include rangeland reclamation and forage development, improvement of water supply for livestock, improvement of animal health services, provision of crop seeds and postharvest handling, promoting dryland conservation agriculture, increasing income through strengthening cooperatives and IGA groups, strengthening community managed disaster risk reduction and decision making through capacity building action; and strengthening existing traditional peace building practices and institutions working on peace-making.

To properly implement the project activities and achieve the stated project results, the Consortium Partners (GOAL, CISP and ACF) have jointly designed modality of project implementation and identified target locations/woreda for implementation. Accordingly, GOAL works in Dire and Dilo, CISP works in Moyale and Arero, and ACF works in Miyo and Dhas woredas. GOAL plays a consortium lead role while each consortium member is responsible for a technical lead in some thematic areas like ACF in WASH and CISP in activities related to peaceful co-existence.

The consortium partners have also defined project target groups. The target groups are a total of 34,555 HH pastoralist, agro-pastoralist and pastoral dropout communities within the six target woredas of which 20,670 HHs are pastoralists, 9,880 HHs are agro-pastoralists and 4,005 HHs are pastoral dropouts. The primary beneficiaries are 172,775 pastoralist, pastoral dropout and agro-pastoralist people.

To implement the project activities in the defined target areas, a total budget of € 2, 500,000 is allocated with the contribution of € 2,000,000 by EU (80%) and €500,000 (20%) by Co-applicant financing (GOAL, CISP and ACF).

## 1.2 Objectives and Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation

### 1.2.1 Objectives

The major objectives of this mid-term evaluation are to:

- carry out a process evaluation, log-frame analysis based on all given information, and host a “project review exercise” with all partners;
- create an opportunity both to address where delivery is deviating from design and to incorporate new learning or changes to the external context and as such will substantially contribute to the aims of the project as being iterative, responsive and flexible;
- assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact-trend and sustainability of the project;
- assess the level of the intended synergy/integration/complementarities as well as the coordination of the project interventions with other on-going similar resilience building and food security initiatives implemented in the respective project intervention woreda by both government and other actors; and
- jointly review and reach to consensus with the consultant on the findings and recommendations of the evaluation; and
- draw lessons and give recommendations having strategic significance for improvement in the remaining implementation period.

### 1.2.2 Scope

The mid-term evaluation covered all relevant activities, accomplishments, processes and results achieved by the CR2B project thus far, and checked the progress towards achieving impact and sustainability. The key focus areas covered were:

- Assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact-trend and sustainability of the project;
- Critical analysis of progress towards achieving project results conducted and specific recommendations given for further strengthening, modification or change;
- Analysis of the appropriateness of the project design to achieving the expected results;
- Assessment of the synergy among project components and partners- GOAL, ACF and CISP;
- Assessment of how gender and environment issues have been addressed within the project;
- Identification of contributions made towards EU resilience agenda/complementing existing projects with the objective of enhancing resilience; and
- Assessment of the contribution of the project towards the regional and zonal plan for development and DRR.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

A participatory evaluation methodology, which addresses the views of all actors including beneficiaries and stakeholders, was employed to track the progress of the project towards the major project results. In order to achieve the objectives of midterm review, qualitative data were collected from different sources. The following sub-sections discuss the sources of data, data collection methods, type of data collected and methods of data analysis.

### 2.1 Documents Review

One of the main data sources for this evaluation was desk review especially with regard to the design, implementation and results of the project. Accordingly, the relevant documents of GOAL, its consortium members, and government organizations were thoroughly reviewed. The major reviewed documents include the project proposal with the log frame, annual reports, regular or ad hoc monitoring reports, EU monitoring visit reports/feedbacks, technical working group reports, and government policies and strategies related to the project focus. Furthermore, the project budget, financial reports and other relevant documents were reviewed (See list of reviewed documents in Appendix 5). Secondary data were also collected from various published and unpublished documents to support the review.

### 2.2 Field Data Collection

The field level data was collected through focus group discussion (FGD), Key Informant Interview (KII), large community discussion (LCD), and observation methods of data collection. The consultants conducted 10 days field visit to Borena Zone intervention woredas. The field work took place from 07 - 18 March 2016 during which the team collected, synthesized and analysed data. In the data collection, both males and females were involved in the discussions to obtain their views. The participants of the various discussions are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Field Data Collection Tools with Participants

No.	Tool	No. of Discussions
1	Focus Group Discussion	9
2	Large Community Discussion	4
3	Key Informants Interview	21
4	Case studies	2
5	Observation (observed interventions)	7

#### **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)**

The consultants conducted FGDs with beneficiaries to assess the targeting, relevance, project benefits, resource utilization, quality of deliverables, and progress towards achievements and sustainability thus far and possible implications for future programming. The evaluation team sub-divided themselves into groups and run different FGDs to complete the task in time. For facilitating the discussions and keep on track, guide questions were used. Discussions were facilitated after obtaining the consent of participants. The FGD facilitators ensured fair participation of the discussants to obtain verified information and recorded what was said during the discussions. The consultants spent an average of two hours with the FDG discussants to explore all the relevant issues in depth.

#### **Large Community Discussions (LCDs)**

These are discussions with larger groups of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries including men, women, youth and children. In each visited kebele, LGDs/community discussions have been conducted to obtain information on community level perception on the achievements of the project and contribution to their food security and resilience capacity as a complement to the findings of the FGDs. Project activities that

potentially target the whole community like CMDRR were thoroughly discussed at large group discussions with representatives of the community.

#### **Key Informant Interviews (KII)**

Key informant (in depth) interviews were conducted with a range of people who are directly involved with the community that have important objective information about the CR2B project. The in depth interviews/KIIs were conducted with CAHWs, DAs, kebele officials, selected beneficiaries (crop), IGA beneficiaries, Ella management committee members, etc. The interviews were semi-structured and designed to elicit information on a broad range of areas similar to those covered in the FGDs (impact effectiveness, operational effectiveness, efficiency, capacities, management and institutional arrangements, etc.) Although the interviews cover the same topics as the focus group discussions, the questions were different and covered in much more detail with regard to the relationships between project operations and impacts.

KIIs were also conducted with key experts of project staffs of the Consortium members in Borena and in Addis Ababa, woreda level project intervention partners in the four targeted woredas, which include Agriculture/Pastoralist Development, DPP, Cooperatives Promotion and Water Resource Offices, and the head of zonal level NGO coordination office. These discussions have been conducted as briefing on the evaluation framework and debriefing on the preliminary findings.

#### **Observation**

Key project deliverables like constructed schemes (Ella and ponds), beekeeping, group level supports (SACCOs, IGAs), and interaction of group functioning and how project deliverables are managed were observed at field level.

#### **Cases studies:**

The field work includes case studies to substantiate the findings. The information was gathered through direct discussions with beneficiaries. The data were collected through questions addressing prior project intervention situations, interventions made so far, results obtained thus far, evidences verifying results, and future prospects as well.

#### **Briefing, Debriefing and Consensus building**

During the evaluation exercise, a detailed briefing about the project has been provided by key project staff of the consortium partners. Furthermore, detailed discussions at partners' head office level were conducted to substantiate findings. The consultants have also shared their basic findings and elaborated issues regarding project progress with partners. These discussions have helped to fill data gaps, substantiate findings and triangulate the information collected on the field with key project staff and consensus has been reached on major findings.

### **2.3 Data Analysis and Report Writing**

The collected data were analysed, interpreted, and used for preparation of the mid-term evaluation report. Data analysis, verification and report writing have been done using different methods which include the following. The data collected from secondary sources were consolidated, synthesized and interpreted to provide meaningful descriptions of the results/findings; the findings obtained using various methods of data gathering tools were triangulated to verify findings; quantitative findings from document review have been incorporated into appropriate sections of the report to substantiate findings; and series of debriefing and consensus building meetings were undertaken with key GOAL programme experts at field and head office levels to verify preliminary findings and complement gaps in findings. Finally, the reports of the findings are organized and presented.

### 3. FINDINGS

The findings of this mid-term evaluation comprises relevance, operational effectiveness, efficiency, progress towards achieving impact and sustainability, cross-cutting issue, factors affecting results (output and outcome), observed lessons, conclusion and recommendations as presented hereunder.

#### 3.1 Relevance/Appropriateness

This section describes evaluation findings related to appropriateness and relevance of the project objectives, design and the extent to which interventions are reflective to government, the donor and consortium members' policy and beneficiary needs. Relevance in this context is defined as appropriateness of the CR2B project design focusing on 'to what extent the stated objectives have managed to address the problems and real needs of the target groups as described in the project document and Logframe'.

##### 3.1.1 Alignment with Community Needs and Government Policies and Strategies

###### Target community needs

As it was verified by the discussions with the community and beneficiaries during the field assessment, the project is highly relevant and appropriate for their need of enhancing resilience to climate change induced shocks. They also appreciated that most of the interventions are contributing to enhancement of their livelihoods. The major source of income and consumption in the Borena context is livestock. Since livestock productivity is affected by prevalence of disease and loss of pasture due to drought, the project has identified and implemented key activities enhancing livestock productivity. Expansion of the livestock veterinary service through the CAHWs approach, rehabilitation of ellas and ponds, and the support provided to avail veterinary drugs at local level were found relevant to the beneficiary needs.

Moreover, incorporating crop production and productivity as a key component for agro-pastoralist community is considered as a good start to enhance food security in the target woredas. Similarly, income diversification and asset building interventions were found important for addressing unemployment through strengthening the existing cooperatives as source of finance for VSLAs; and IGAs as a mean for enhancing individual income. Some beneficiaries also indicated that the current project is relevant because it has increased their household income by providing start-up capital for running small businesses.

The CMDRR intervention also helped the community to identify hazards for timely interventions through strengthening the existing community early warning system and better early warning information sharing.

###### Alignment with government policies and strategies

Assessment of the extent to which the project aligns with the government policies and development strategies was made through key informants interview and review of documents. The government has been implementing food security programmes and different phases of PSNP in Borena zone. The government is committed to follow an economic growth path in agriculture and livestock development that is resilient to current weather variability and future climate change (CRGE, 2011). Employment access among the youth through various IGAs is also the basic focus in GTP II (2015/16-2019/20). Moreover, Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Sector (DRMFSS) is currently implementing a multi-hazard and multi-sectoral disaster risk management approach. To this end, the government has put in place various actions to enhance livestock productivity, crop production and productivity, employment creation, DRM and peaceful co-existence among others to achieve the GTP goals.

The KIs conducted with the woreda stakeholders also confirmed that the project components and activities are relevant to the government development agenda and policy. The project contributed in filling the gaps in addressing community development problems which cannot be done due to budget and capacity limitations in the woredas. As verified during the discussions, the woreda stakeholders (concerned sector offices) incorporated the project activities into their action plans implying that the project interventions are aligned with the government development plan. The development approach followed especially on improving water supply and forage for livestock, improving animal health, improving crop production and productivity, enhancing income diversification and asset building, strengthening kebele and woreda level early warning system, and enhancing peaceful co-existence among pastoralists are in line with the local government annual development plans, policies and strategies of the Growth and Transformation Plans (GTP-I and II).

### **3.1.2 Relevance to European Commission and Partners' Missions**

EC has been addressing emergency, resilience and development interventions through ECHO and DEVCO supporting various projects designed by implementing partners. CR2B is one of the projects intended to link emergencies to resilience and development in the target woredas. EC wants to link the emergency recovery to resilience that could pay the way for development. It has been observed that the interventions identified and being implemented are highly relevant to the EC policy and strategy of transforming emergency related interventions into a more long term resilience and development ones. Most of the CR2B project activities are implemented based on the EU guidelines and resilience framework.

With regard to the relevance of the CR2B project to consortium members' mission, the consortium members (GOAL, CISP and ACF) have been addressing emergency and resilience needs of the population of the target woredas through various projects. Borena is among the vulnerable areas and majority of the people are food insecure. The CR2B project synchronized emergency recovery through livelihood focused activities, which is a window of opportunity to pave the road to resiliency and livelihoods. This is in line with EC SHARE programme objective, which aims to enhance drought resilience and food and nutrition security of vulnerable populations in Ethiopia.

The project allowed consortium members to enhance resilience interventions by building the capacity of the beneficiaries and government stakeholders to sustainably improve the livelihoods of the pastoralist and agro-pastoralist community in Borena. Since the CR2B project synchronizes the recovery and livelihood components at grassroots level, it will enable beneficiaries to bounce back any type of shocks that would recur in the foreseeable future.

The CR2B project has also contributed to generate additional income through strengthening cooperatives and IGA groups, providing improved seeds, improving livestock feed, and creating access to water and their management. These interlinked activities are relevant for enhancing resilience and serve as a platform/foundation for future resilience building initiatives by the partner organizations. Accordingly, the strengthened early warning system has enabled partner organization to get better information for their emergency response projects while at the same time the DRR committees established and strengthened are serving as an entry point for other DRR/emergency related project interventions, specifically by ACF and GOAL.

### **3.1.3 Project Design**

As clearly stipulated in the project document, the activities are mainly designed to link different components that complement each other. The EU guideline which stresses the need for detail assessment and need identification before proposal development is one of the driving factors which has helped the partner organizations identify appropriate and relevant interventions. Accordingly, the

consortium partners held discussions with local community groups and local woreda and government staff culminating in a Validation Workshop for the proposal before submission. The interventions focused on capacity building and livelihood interventions that leads to stimulating resilience, which made the objectives and most of the interventions relevant to beneficiary needs. The planning and implementation modality of the project includes targeting beneficiaries, scheduling project activities, harmonizing implementation modalities and involving all stakeholders, mainly government and community in the project cycle. The development of standard guidelines for project implementation including a guide on Water for 'Livestock Project activities Implementation Guideline', is among the best design achievements for successful project implementation. The approaches designed and followed in the project implementation to expand veterinary services through CAHWS was successful. Accordingly, CAHWS are essential for providing animal health services at least in the years to come.

The design has been to some extent flexible to accommodate changes. In this regard, the care practice introduced by ACF has been accepted by the consortium partners and mainly implemented by ACF. Moreover, the key stakeholders identified, particularly the PDO was assessed to be within its capability and prevailing conditions to support the project. Participation of female community members in the programme activities has continued. All these ensured the appropriateness of the design of the programme and its implementation strategy.

There was community consultation and need identification at the initial phases of the project design. However, during the implementation phase, particularly in the course of detail activity preparation, discussions and consultations held with the government and community representatives were minimal as a result of which some of the activities like forage seed introduction were not successful.

The targeting design made for crop seed beneficiaries is focused on model farmers, which have better knowledge, capabilities and resources. These are appropriate target groups as observed by the consultants and as justified by GOAL (it includes also poor farmers) to introduce and promote new technologies like new varieties of seed which was provided by the project. However, there has been observed tendencies of excluding poor agro-pastoralists in this regard, because they are not mostly model farmers. This has to coincide with the ultimate aim of the project, supporting the vulnerable groups and poor agro-pastoralists and pastoral drop-outs. This could have been better implemented if additional targeting criteria were set to identify the poor while at the same time focusing on promoting the seed adaptation.

Sustainability issues and exit strategy have been well considered during the programme design. Incorporating the project components in the annual development plan of the government, joint planning and monitoring as well as reporting with the concerned government focal persons was found to be an important foundation to harmonize synergy and enhance appropriate handing over of the projects at the end of the project period. However, sustainability issues like handing over, technology selection (seed) was not properly designed and appropriate mechanisms to address such issues were not included in the detail implementation planning. Better engagement and involvement of the government was observed in implementation, monitoring and technical support.

The project design had some constraints that could affect the sustainability of programme outcomes. In this regard, the major factor for the achievement of a programme is its design initiated from a reliable socio-economic/market survey that could be a basis to record achievement and see the results at the end of the project period. This has been observed under budgeting of some activities. The design could have been better improved by considering reliable market/price data before embarking on activity planning.

It is also necessary to avoid over ambitious programme components that can't be achievable during the programme life time. The bigger the number of the project components, the high the risk for stretching efforts and wasting of resources and time. In this regard, though the project design is good in linking the interventions to the government system where they can get support to ensure sustainability, the targets set look over ambitious when it targets 80% increase in income, which may not be attainable given the context. The higher the number of programme components with varied and different objectives, the higher the requirement of manpower to address all activities which in turn affects achievement of targets.

#### 3.1.4 Beneficiary Targeting

Beneficiary targeting and selection has been agreed to be using the guideline developed by the consortium members to systematically identify the most vulnerable individuals from amongst the target community. The beneficiary selection was component based. This method of identifying beneficiaries ensures identification of activities based on the actual problems prioritized by the target communities.

The targeting committee at woreda level is a technical committee comprising of sectors which their mandate is in line with consortium's thematic areas of project implementation (Health, Water resource, Pastoral development, Cooperative promotion, DPPO, Women & children affairs, and Admin Offices). The other committee established at kebele level is a project partnership committee (composed of DA, Manager, NGO Staff, HEW, Animal health worker, Kebele project committee chair person, Kebele chairman and women affairs head) mandated to verify appropriateness of targeting together with other project implementation and management tasks (for summary of the targeting criteria, refer Annex4).

However, the criteria presented by the guideline have not been fully adhered to by consortium members. The targeting made for crop seed beneficiaries is focused on model farmers, which have initiative, motivation, better knowledge, capabilities and resources. Though GOAL justifies the inclusion of poor agro-pastoralists and as per the consultants' observations, the model farmers are appropriate target groups to promote new technologies like new varieties of seed which was provided by the project, there has been observed tendencies of excluding poor agro-pastoralists through focusing on model farmers. For instance, the selected model farmers in Tuqa kebele of Moyale Woreda and Hodod Samero kebele of Dire woredas seem to focus on farming experience disregarding level of poverty as a key criterion. This has to coincide with the ultimate aim of the project, supporting the vulnerable groups and poor agro-pastoralists and pastoral drop-outs. This could have been better implemented if additional targeting criteria were set to identify the poor while at the same time focusing on promoting new agricultural technologies.

The KIs held with the woreda government stakeholders and project staff indicated that cooperatives, VSLA groups and IGA beneficiaries were selected by the Woreda Task Forces and Community Leaders. Although 4,005 pastoral drop outs were to be targeted according to the CR2B project plan, their involvement in the actual project intervention is not visible in the reporting and field visits conducted.

### 3.2 Operational Effectiveness

Effectiveness examines how well the project activities delivered the expected outcomes (results) and how well the project activities coped with the challenges faced in the period of implementation. It measures the outcomes of the activities in terms of current and perceived results with respect to the achievement of the agreed/planned objectives. This section provides evaluation findings related to project achievements against the planned targets in relation to operational effectiveness. It explains the major CR2B project outputs achieved so far by result area as discussed below and summarized in Table 2.

**Commento [u1]:** I recommend to put some pictures in round out the narratives.

### 3.2.1 Livestock Productivity

In this section, improving water supply for livestock through ella/ pond rehabilitation and pond/cattle trough construction, improving animal health services through supporting CAHWs, local level veterinary drugs supply system and private drugs vendors, and improving pasture and forage availability through reclamation of community rangelands and forage preparation are presented.

#### Improving water supply for livestock

The major interventions towards improving livestock water supply are ella rehabilitation, pond rehabilitation and construction, and cattle trough construction around existing water schemes as the details is provided here under.

#### ***Ella rehabilitation and pond rehabilitation/construction***

There are two predominant sources of water supply infrastructure for livestock in the target areas. These are traditional Ellas (open wells) and ponds. These facilities become essential particularly in the dry season as alternative temporary surface water for livestock. Traditional ponds are common and are made to harvest and store rain water in small valleys. The FGD participants of the community in Arero and Miyo woredas indicated that the rehabilitation of the ellas is very relevant to their need and indicated that it is the common source of water during drought and dry season so that livestock can survive during water shortage season.

Regarding rehabilitation/upgrading of ponds, the activities planned with CR2B were to enhance the capacity of ponds by removing entrained silt and enlarging the reservoir. As the project staff indicated, embankments of the pond will be further strengthened using surplus excavated materials. Silt traps will be constructed at appropriate inlets which are further strengthened with gabion works to reduce the scouring effect of disproportionate rains.

As FGD participants explained, some of the planned traditional ellas of CISP and ACF which were non-functional for years due to of lack of resource for rehabilitation become rehabilitated. Rehabilitation works were completed with labour work contributed by the community and material and technical skill cost covered by the project. The partners have uniformly paid Birr 45/ labour work/day while at the same time community contributed 15 days labour work without payment as part of their contribution. Where necessary, contracting local artisans were also involved in upgrading structures. Tools for excavation and carting away of surplus earth were also provided for the cash for work participants who have facilitated the rehabilitation works as per the partners plan.

For instance, the Hidale ella in Tesso kebele of Miyo woreda rehabilitated by ACF is providing service to the community and livestock. Similarly, among the planned upgrading of 8 (eight) traditional wells (*ellas*) and ponds (including increasing the size, silt trap, diversion canal and buffer zone protection) by CISP, the designs and studies of 5 (five) pond were prepared by the zone pastoralist department and completed (3 in Arero and 2 in Moyale woredas). The construction of 2 ponds in Arero is on progress and the pond rehabilitation works in Moyale are completed and become ready to be transferred to the community. MoU is prepared for completed ponds and is ready for handover agreement signing by partners (CISP, kebele administration and PDO) and transfer of the pond to community management. At the time of the evaluation, the ponds were not filled by water and rain is expected shortly to fill the ponds. The capacity of one of the ponds is 2083 m<sup>3</sup> which is expected to serve the surrounding community during the dry season. Once the water is filled, the ponds will be the main source of water for livestock as well as human. Beside water provision, the pond construction was also serving as a means of income generation to the community.

The utilization of rehabilitated/constructed ellas/ponds are managed by a committee member of 5-7 out of which 4 are females in the case of 7 committee members. The water from the ellas is used at all times for cattle while for human it is used for drinking only. Water treatment chemicals are provided by the partners and the community treats the water before drinking. Before the establishment of these committees, it was managed by local leader "Aba Herrega". However, the planned rehabilitation/upgrading of 2 ellas of GOAL have not been started in Dire woreda due to under budgeting as indicated by key informant project staffs, the Project Manager.

The other issues regarding the ellas is sustainability. A point worth mentioning on the sustainability of these schemes is a significant contribution of the community during rehabilitation. Though the committee has firm belief and commitment to take care of the ellas and pass on it to the next generation, for instance, one of the ellas rehabilitated by ACF in Miyo lacks proper fencing and door to protect animals falling into it and for proper utilization of the water. In the case of CISP, the ella in Web kebele requires additional work at the entrance so that cattle go inside and come out of it without difficulty after drinking water, like without falling down because of the slope of the entrance. The community requested additional support in this regard. The water volume, though it decreases during dry season, doesn't totally dry-up so that the community use it for livestock during water scarcity period.

#### **Construction of cattle trough around existing water schemes**

Before the project, the cattle troughs were made of earth and prone to seepage. The activity focused on upgrading the existing mud troughs to concrete structures to facilitate the smooth operation of livestock watering. Stairs, collection chambers, well mouth protection and separate troughs for cattle and small ruminants were in the plan to be constructed around the existing water schemes. The ella rehabilitations by ACF and CISP include constructing cattle trough annexed to the ellas. Accordingly, 3 completed cattle troughs were providing service and all of them were found in good condition. However, protection mechanisms like fencing to sustain them and protect them from damage is not yet started in Miyo except the community commitment to do so in the near future. Moreover, as observed during the evaluation, separate cattle trough for small ruminants are not constructed (which was in the project design) as a result of which small ruminants might not get sufficient water access. Furthermore, GOAL was not able to construct the planned 2 cattle troughs because of under budgeting of the activity at the planning phase. Accordingly, GOAL is proposing a budget revision to complete the activity in the remaining period of the project.

#### **Improving animal health services**

The major planned interventions regarding animal health improvement are strengthening community based animal health services through supporting CAHWs, strengthening local level veterinary drugs supply system through providing initial vet drug capital via existing cooperatives, supporting private drugs vendors for better and quality services through training and other actions, and building government capacity towards controlling and managing the quality of private veterinary drug supply.

#### **Strengthen community based animal health services through supporting CAHWs**

Assessments carried out by the project partners<sup>1</sup> before the start of the project and regular experiences working in the area indicated that animal health, particularly the quality of services and treatment for animals, plays a prominent role in negatively impacting on the quality of production of livestock and of the resilience of animals to drought and disease. CR2B has identified the need for expanding the service and strengthening services across all six woredas working with existing Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs).

---

<sup>1</sup> Borana ARCE Assessment August 2013

The CAHWs approach in Borena was started long ago before the project implementation. The project has identified CAHWs as one of the most accessible veterinary service provision mechanism. In Arero, it has been 5 years since the CAHWs started functioning in the kebeles. The kebele where the CAHWs are working have got large livestock population and usually only one Veterinary Health Post with one Animal Health Assistant from the government side are providing the service. This will not allow the government to reach all places and provide the service effectively. Accordingly, the CAHWs provide mobile and easily accessible basic treatment services within their villages.

The support provided to CAHWs by the implementing partners is refresher training and providing start-up equipment and drugs. Accordingly, all of the partners were in achieving their plan of providing training, kits and drugs. After the refresher training, each CAHW is provided with kits and drugs worth Birr 6000-7000/CAHWs. The service they provide to livestock owners is by charging the drug fees with small margin of service charge. The CAHWs are expected to provide the service on affordable price to the service clients. Livestock disease cases which are above their capacity are usually referred to the government clinic. They also share their activity report to the woreda Vet HP/AHA on a monthly basis.

The CAHWs support has enabled to expand the animal health service provision coverage including vaccination. There are annual vaccination campaigns by the government which are supported by the implementing partners. As indicated by KII participants, ACF supports the vaccination campaign by providing per diem for animal health workers and providing vehicle. FAO is the one who supply the vaccine. Moreover, they participate in the government vaccination campaigns during disease outbreak.

The livestock population and kebeles as compared to the number of CAHWs currently available is very big. On the other side, the government has capacity limitations to reach all kebeles. Accordingly, CAHWs are essential for providing animal health services at least in the years to come. However, their service provision is challenged by lack of accessing drugs in the nearby as mentioned by CAHWs in KIIs. Some of them are obliged to go to Yabello to purchase drug. Moreover, the project didn't reach all the CAHWs available in the target woredas as a result of which the non-supported ones lack enough capacity to provide the service at their full potential.

#### ***Strengthening local level quality veterinary drugs supply system***

The Pastoral Development Office (PDO) and private sector actors are working in the drug supply chain of the target location. The government allocates budget for each woreda for the purchase of drug on a revolving scheme. However, discussions conducted with government experts indicate that the budget usually allocated is very small and doesn't cover the demand on the ground. As a result, poor quality and fake drugs are massive problems in Borana due to its very porous border with Kenya and increasing availability of cheap and generic drugs throughout the district. The project planned to work with zone and Woreda PDO and the private sector to promote and support the supply and use of good quality drugs, creating a specific information and dialogue platform for this purpose.

The plan for enhancing drug supply system for CAHWs was in two ways: linking them with existing private drug vendors and strengthening cooperatives to supply drug through providing initial vet drug capital. To help CAHWs purchase quality drug from private drug vendors in a fair price, the project has planned to support private drugs vendors for better and quality services through training and other actions. The partners will sign MoU with identified vendors which will be provided with drug and equipment as a start-up capital to their business. Few of these vendors are trained by CISP in Arero, while ACF has made selection of local drug vendors and processing purchase of drugs. GOAL has identified local veterinary drug vendors which are unemployed diploma veterinary graduate person for both woredas (Dillo and Dire). As learned during the evaluation, CISP and GOAL were processing

purchase of drugs to supply to private vendors to be used by CAHWs. Besides promoting CAHWs and local drug vendors, GOAL and CISP have also organized awareness creation forums on illegal and counterfeit drugs for all CAHWs and sector office experts. However, the level of control and enforcing through government partners was unclear and there is still the potential use of fake drugs.

In Miyo and Dhas, ACF operational woredas, there is an experience that many drug vendors were supported by other agencies with start-up capital to supply drugs and yet most of them failed to satisfy the purpose of the support. Based on this lesson, ACF tightened the criteria for selection of private drug vendors. Only few found which fulfil the criteria and so far ACF has identified only one drug vendor in Dhas to sign Mou but not yet functional.

In sum, linking CAHWs with existing private drug vendors as planned has not been yet realized by all partners except limited initiatives and progresses. Furthermore, the second approach, drug supply system establishment through cooperatives, has not been undertaken by any of the partners until data for this study was collected. As a result, the ultimate purpose of the support, which is to make veterinary drugs and equipment easily accessible to CAHWs and strengthen the service provision, has not been realized by all of the implementing partners.

#### **Improving pasture and forage availability**

As identified during the design of CR2B, local traditional methods of pasture management were used to cope with the growing demand for rangeland across the zone due to the encroachment of non-native invasive species such as the prosopis juliflora, Acacia drepanolobium, Acacia melifera and Acacia bussei. To help the community reclaim rangelands for improving pasture and forage access, detail plan was prepared by the project partners to work with local institutions to improve the availability of rangelands by reclaiming at least 2000 hectares through bush clearing, area closure and enrichment plantation. Moreover, it was planned to improve pasture availability through innovative forage preservation techniques.

The main activity with this regard is bush thinning so as to allow grass to grow freely instead of bush so that target beneficiaries feed their animals. Hay making is the other activity where some of the partners like CISP has used moulding boxes and rob cutter to prepare the fodder in bales. In the bush thinning, poor households have participated through cash for work arrangements and 500 birr is paid for 1 ha of land cleared, except in Dillo where 700 Birr/ha is paid because the bush is dense in the woreda. The payment is uniform across the three partners. The community has a contribution of 30% except in Dillo (20%) so that total cost of bush thinning per ha was 650 birr in all areas and 910 birr in Dillo. The community provides free labour for 2 days per week as part of their community contribution/participation. Usually bush clearing is supposed to be conducted in the months from beginning of December to mid of March which are dry periods though this time was not maintained in some of the Kebeles in this project intervention.

So as to lead the community based bush clearing, the NRM experts in all the implementation woredas were provided with training. Awareness raising on rangeland management has been provided to the community so that the protected lands are well managed. Participants of the KII at woreda PDO indicated that the DAs follow up the progress of bush clearing and provide technical assistance to the community. The kebele administration and different committees were highly involved in community mobilization. Consultation of the government research center in Yabello was also made to provide practical guide on bush clearing. The bush thinning is done selectively by just clearing the unwanted bushes while protecting the needed ones. One of the sustainability mechanism in place is the agreement signed with the local government so as to close the area and use it only for fodder production by the community.

During the time of this data collection, 900 ha of land is cleared and protected in Arero with the support of CISP. ACF has a plan of 2000 ha with rangeland management and so far 1150 ha completed. Out of 1000 hectare (400 in Dire and 600 in Dilo) of GOAL, 850 bush thinning activity is conducted in the two woredas. The plan for Dire woreda is completed and the remaining clearing activity in Dillo is expected to start soon.

Regarding the enrichment plantation through introducing drought tolerant forage species and supporting existing government nurseries to produce selected forage species, GOAL and CISP distributes 150 kg and 800 kg various varieties respectively to the beneficiaries for over sowing in backyard forage production. ACF also distributed such forage seed varieties for 425 households. As learnt from the KII discussion with project staff, the local forage species was found more productive and locally adapted so that the introduction of new improved forage seed varieties was not successful. As a result, the multiplication of these seed varieties in government nurseries was not found important and worth spending money. Hence, it was learnt that it is better to close the area than re-seeding new grass seeds.

To improve pasture availability through innovative forage preservation, training on forage preservation technique was provided by all of the partners as per their plans. CISP has provided the training for women although they didn't further cascaded the training into practice except in Arero. Trained women by ACF have also prepared staked grass and fed cows and weak animals. However, the forage preservation and hay making practice requires improvement. In this regard, good experience is observed in CISP operational area where trained women used hay packing materials into bale to preserve forage for dry season. However, further improvement is required on the appropriate storing of hay by all partners

### **3.2.2 Crop Production and Productivity**

The primary agricultural production systems in the target woredas of Borena zone is livestock. However, crop production is also a vital component in the food security of the area providing a local and affordable source of grains, pulses and tubers. Although land availability is generally less of a problem than other parts of the country, crop production is poor since production skills and techniques are generally weak. This necessitates the need to support agro pastoralists engage in crop production to improve their farming techniques and in the use of suitable species and varieties of crops. Since moisture stress is also the other major limiting factor for crop production in Borena zone, supporting farmers on the use of early maturing varieties of crops, moisture conservation techniques and other improved farming techniques were considered. With this intention, crop production and productivity interventions have been practiced in 6 woredas of Borena Zone through CR2B project.

The major planned activities for this component were providing drought resistant and short maturing crop varieties, improving agricultural practices and post-harvest handling, and promoting dry land conservation agriculture and supporting primary cooperatives to establish a community based seed supply system. The major project planned activities and their accomplishment are presented as follows.

#### **Provision of seed varieties**

To improve the crop production system of the area, the project planned to support model agro-pastorals, those who have prior crop production experiences in the crop production system, in the five of the six target woredas, i.e., except Dillo. In the targeted woredas, volunteer, hardworking, and exemplary agro pastoralists were selected by the kebele Development Committee. Although it is good to make the crop production known through model farmers, the prime objective of ensuring resilience of the poor ones need also be considered in targeting. For instance, targeting of model farmer in Tuqa

kebele of Moyale Woreda and Hodod Samero kebele of Dire woredas seem to focus on farming experience disregarding level of poverty as a key criterion.

To promote crop productivity among model agro-pastoralists, suitable seed varieties were selected by the zone pastoralist development department in consultation with kebele level development agents. The main selected seeds varieties were haricot bean Awash I and Maize. Therefore, 28,131 kg seed varieties out of the planned 30,799kg seeds were purchased and distributed to 420 model agro pastoralists of which 127, 100, 120 and 73 agro pastoralists were in Moyale, Miyo, Dire, and Arero woredas respectively. Although the plan was to provide different varieties of crop seeds such as haricot bean, maize and millet, a large amount of haricot bean was provided due to lack/scarcity of others seed varieties on the market. ACF also purchased vegetable seeds such as tomato (4kg), cabbage (4kg), carrots (6kg), onion, cassava, sweat potato, and different types of fruit seedling (e.g., mango and avocado) and distributed to targeted model farmers. A total of 800 agricultural tools of four different types such as hoe, spade, pick axe and watering can were purchased and distributed to model agro-pastoralists targeted by ACF.

However, there was haricot bean crop failure on some plots although the seed was bought from certified supplier by the Yabelo zone PDO. The causes for the failure, as reported by GOAL, were inadequate rain and pests.

It was observed during the evaluation that the partners provided haricot bean seed with the recommendation of PDO without assessing community needs. Although there has been good harvest by some of the model agro-pastoralists, the market price was found to be too low in the local market since the selected variety of the haricot bean is not well known in the community. They used the product for food only although it was also intended for market and improve their resilience. During the FGDs conducted with model agro-pastoralists who got good harvest, they said the demand for the product is low and unable to sell at good prices compared to the local variety as a result of which they were forced to consume the produce beyond their immediate need. The production is not also viable for export since there is limited production that can't attract exporters to come and collect the production.

The kulo seed, which is a Kenyan variety, was demonstrated by agro-pastoralists and found good but it is difficult to buy and distribute to them since it is not known and approved by the Ethiopian Seed Enterprise. As a result, there was no certified seed supplier that the project can purchase the seed and distribute to target beneficiaries. However, during the writing of this report, it was communicated to the Consultants that the Zone PDO has recommended *Kulo* local variety to be distributed to beneficiaries.

In terms of timing for provision seed, it was observed during the evaluation that only ACF was able to distribute seed for the coming planting season, which is approaching while CISP and GOAL didn't succeed in providing the seeds. This indicates that the planting window might pass before seeds are provided by the two partners to the target beneficiaries. However, during the time of report writing, GOAL has reported the commencement of seed distribution to target beneficiaries.

#### **Capacity building on agricultural practices and post-harvest handling**

To raise the awareness of model farmers on improving crop productivity and production, orientation training on agricultural practices (e.g., farm land preparation, row planting) and postharvest handling techniques were provided for the targeted model agro-pastoralists. Moreover, training on farmer to farmer extension approach was provided to DAs and Woreda government experts to help them easily facilitate farmer to farmer extension approach. As a result, agro-pastoralists have been involved in the crop production activity employing modern agricultural and post-harvest handling techniques as well.

DAs, woreda experts and CDAs have been providing technical support. However, trainings so far in Miyo areas as reported by the government sectors were more of theoretical; providing appropriate training inputs for every training and engaging agro-pastoralists practically helps them easily understand what they are expected to do.

The other issue of concern was productivity and post-harvest handling. The yield was not as such promising in some areas due to the effect of pest and erratic rain fall. For instance, the erratic nature of rainfall affected crop productivity in that most of the farmers in Dire woreda produced less and even some others do not produce at all. The effect of pest, especially in Miyo woreda, was so severe and it was reported to the zone for action to resolve the problem. Moreover, the produced yield in some areas is infested by insects. For instance, the surplus produced yield of a model agro-pastoralist in Tuqa kebele of Moyale woreda was destroyed by weevil. This indicates that there was a gap in some of the target areas on raising the awareness of agro-pastoralists on how to mitigate the effect of pest and how to store produced yield and associated practices of on post-harvest handling of crops.

#### **Dry land conservation agriculture**

As described in the project document, GOAL planned to contribute to improve crop production through enhancing the awareness of target communities and creating access to improved agricultural inputs. Hence, GOAL provided capacity building training for the DAs and woreda government experts on conservation agriculture techniques in the form of ToT. As a result, DAs cascaded the training to the target model agro-pastoralists in their respective kebeles. Moreover, material and technical support were provided for most of (9/10) FTCs/PTCs.

#### **Community-based seed supply system**

The major planned activities were mapping the existing primary cooperatives, provision of start-up capital, and provision of selected drought tolerant and early maturing crop seeds to seed producing cooperatives. The project mapped those cooperatives and selected 28 cooperatives to support for strengthening quality seed supply system. The plan was to train selected cooperatives on seed multiplication and to link them with local and zonal credit services to help them supply quality seed for agro-pastoralists in their localities.

Accordingly, the trainings were provided and MoU was signed among the project, Cooperatives, and Pastoral Development Offices to provide start-up capital and make the cooperatives supply seeds to the local agro-pastoralists in some of the target areas. However, the provision of start-up capital to cooperatives has not been materialized. Moreover, the activity planned by GOAL to strengthen local seed supply system in the target areas was not achieved during the data collection due to inadequate budget to provide the start-up capital for the targeted cooperatives. Accordingly, the start-up capital which was planned to be given to 10 primary cooperatives by GOAL to purchase and distribute seed for their members based on members' needs has not been implemented due to budget limitation (under budgeted during planning), i.e., the start-up capital to be given was found to be inadequate to purchase the required seeds. At the time of report writing, the consultants learnt that GOAL shifted this approach of cash support to direct seed provision to cooperatives. Thus, timely seed supply for agro-pastoralists is not yet achieved. Similarly, the other two partners (ACF and CISP) were not able to achieve this objective besides providing support to the cooperatives.

#### **3.2.3 Income Diversification and Household Asset Building**

The income diversification and asset building component of the CR2B project is part of the overall livelihood diversification focused resilience programming. The key activities focused by the project are: building the capacity of beneficiaries, increasing access to financial services and improving market linkages. These activities are designed to help the target groups increase the benefits they gain (sales,

income and jobs) through participating in the market more effectively. Women are the core beneficiaries of this activity. This section highlights the achievements with regard to the off-farm income diversification activities of VSLAs and IGAs as alternative means of increasing income and diversifying household assets through strengthening cooperatives as source of loanable fund. The project planned to achieve an increase of off-farm income by 50% at the end of the project through enabling 80% of the target HHs to have at least two or more income sources by implementing the planned activities for a total 1,210 direct and 6,050 indirect beneficiaries.

As stipulated in the project design and interim report of GOAL, the project has conducted a rapid assessment, and mapped and identified available economic opportunities in the intervention woredas to engage communities. The target community members (livestock and crop producers, small business owners and micro-entrepreneurs) require access to financial services to increase their income and diversify their livelihood. The activities planned by this component are designed to link at least 300 pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and/or pastoral dropouts to formal financial services through strengthening and supporting existing cooperatives.

Accordingly, the project has implemented various activities towards achieving its objectives. The progress in achieving planned targets/outputs of the project is presented hereunder.

#### **Strengthening of cooperatives**

As indicated in the baseline survey conducted by the project, one of the constraints identified by the CR2B project was lack of financial capital by cooperatives and small business groups, which impede them from successful engagement in more profitable activities. Lack of financial capital limits their capacity to compete with other established market business actors and enter into the potential market opportunities. As a result, the project planned to support cooperatives with small grant in order to create a linkage between these cooperatives as financial intuitions and groups and individuals engaged in income generating activities to address the identified gaps sustainability.

Accordingly, strengthening of cooperatives was undertaken through providing training, revolving loan capital, stationary materials, and technical support including management and auditing. The CR2B project has planned to strengthen 27 cooperatives in the project woredas and was able to achieve only 14 (51.8%) of its planned targets. In terms of individual partner achievements, GOAL has not implemented the planned activity, while ACF completed the planned activities ahead of the project schedule. CISP also accomplished 66.7% of the planned target. The cooperatives strengthened and supported include multi-purpose cooperatives and SACCOs with grant and revolving fund arrangement to be provided for their members. Disbursement of a starting capital to the groups through the cooperatives and shared among the members is a maximum allowed capital of Birr 5,000.00 per individual loan receivers.

Capacity building supports for the selected primary cooperatives were planned by the project, which include provision of budget for improving the structure of the cooperatives such as furniture, stationary, etc. However, this has not been materialized due to budget limitation. As stated by members during the FGD conducted at Medo Kebele SACCO, they requested the project to provide budget for furniture and office equipment for their office. Prior to the groups and individual capacity building interventions, trainings were given to the cooperative members on effective management of loans disbursement, revolving fund system, business planning and management, portfolio selection, monitoring and evaluation of the IGAs, etc. by Woreda Cooperative Promotion Office experts. Most of the trainings have been conducted as planned while some of them are delayed.

#### **Strengthening SACCOs**

Currently there are 65 SACCOs supported by the project. Training was given to the members of these SACCOs by the Woreda Cooperatives Promotion Offices experts. In order to qualify and get loan from the cooperatives, individual business plan is required for individually run businesses, which is part of the training given. Once the training is given and individual business plan is presented, the first round loan receivers will get the loan based on the business plan. The repayment will revolve for giving loan to the other members. In this process, one third of the cooperatives and VSLA members are entitled to receive loans in the first round upon presentation of a business plan. The other members become the mirror groups to receive from the first recipient at the due date. Each of the mirror groups' member (the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> round beneficiaries) will be linked/paired with the first round beneficiaries (i.e. the 2<sup>nd</sup> round beneficiary to the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the second) in order to create peer pressure for timely repayment of the credit.

The project is thus actively engaged in providing seed money, which members can access through a revolving loan system in the respective implementing kebeles. As verified during the FGDs with the Bika Teso Negaa SACCO of Medo kebele, the first beneficiaries revolve the amount of money received through reimbursement of the initial capital with limited interest within due date of repayment.

The field findings indicated that the supported SACCOs are functional and performing well. The major activities individual loan receivers engaged in include cattle fattening, solar energy for mobile charging, petty trade, etc. which have shown good progress. The individual businesses were said to be running well as described by the FGD participants. The Office also follows up the cooperatives in the implementation of their business plan and supports individual business running. As stated by the Woreda Cooperative Promotion Offices, supports have been provided in auditing service and management. They are also provided management support.

#### **Strengthening village savings and loans associations**

Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs) approach is designed to be more accessible than formal savings services and has also been developed in a way that even illiterate people groups can benefit and understand the process. VSLAs are autonomous, self-selecting organisations typically containing 20 to 30 members each. Self-selection is the key criterion for membership that ensures a high level of trust among group members. These groups provide poor households with the capacity to save, gain control of their cash incomes and get access to small, manageable micro capital investment.

Hence, VSLAs are the other intervention points for the project support. The project planned to strengthen VSLAs through training and technical support. The activity planned by GOAL to strengthen VSLAs has been implemented as planned by GOAL. However, the full support for VSLAs up to their graduation is not yet achieved and in the course of implementation. One of the supports so far provided is training. The training provided focuses on management, group formation, leadership and elections; business development, savings and credit policies; constitution; record keeping and meeting management; savings meeting procedures; loan disbursement and collection; loan management and loan repayment; financial management, roles and responsibilities of management and potential income generation opportunities; and end of cycle share out. At the time the evaluation, CISP was making preparations to establish and strengthen VSLA groups. One of the contributing factors for low achievement in this regard, as stated by CISP, was livelihood staff turnover. Furthermore, regular follow up and technical support were planned to be given by the implementation partners to further strengthen the associations including inputs such as finance and minute recording note books.

#### **Strengthening IGA groups**

The main intension of supporting cooperatives is to increase the income sources and generating capacity of targeted individuals through providing access to credit, and training and technical support of IGA

groups. To be an IGA group, there is a need to fulfil the criteria of: joblessness, being 3 and above persons; contributing weekly/monthly payments; and having business plan. The membership of each IGA group supported by the CR2B project is 20 persons and each member is supported with an average of Birr 4,000 revolving loan. These groups get the loan fund from cooperatives. This loan also serves the groups to buy a share which will be used as collateral for loan from these cooperatives. A minimum saving is required to qualify for loan from cooperatives. In addition to providing initial working capital for the IGA groups through cooperatives, the project provided them with training that enabled individuals to prepare their business plan and qualify for the loan.

ACF has conducted an assessment for identifying potential IGAs and associated gaps. Accordingly, ten IGA groups with 20 members each have been organised in 10 kebeles. The groups have identified types of businesses they want to run. Side by side, they started saving to start their business and collected Birr 22,500 as reported by ACF at the time of the evaluation. Linking the IGAs to financial sources is on progress and MoU was signed among ACF, IGA groups, SACCOs and woreda cooperative promotion offices.

IGAs were selected in consultation with cooperatives promotion offices from the existing cooperatives and provided refresher training. The training included rules and regulations of groups, business development, entrepreneurship development and financial management, loan management, disbursement and collection, term or bylaw of the organization, roles and responsibilities of management and potential income generation opportunities identification, establishing and selecting stable livelihoods and experience sharing through presenting of their successful history.

Accordingly, CISP planned to support 9 IGAs and so far achieved supporting 6 of them. The selected IGA group members have developed their business plan and feasibility of the selected income generating activities. The IGA groups engaged in sale of livestock and livestock by-products and petty trade like sugar, soap, cell phone charging using solar energy, and small restaurant as prioritized by the beneficiaries.

The IGAs groups were trained and materials like passbooks, register books, and other stationery items were provided. The trainings provided include basic business skills (business management, portfolio selection, microcredit and saving, etc.). Further technical support was provided by the project and government partners together with close follow up to ensure their success.

### **Beekeeping**

As stipulated in the project document, over 60% of average income of the Borena community comes from livestock (cattle and small ruminants) and livestock by-products. Recurrent drought and related animal diseases make this livelihood highly vulnerable. Hence, diversification of their sources of income is a vital aspect of resiliency building in Borena. Beekeeping is considered as one of the appropriate means to diversify the income sources and contributes towards resiliency building. There were experiences that ensure viability of beekeeping in the area as verified by the CR2B project consortium partners. The project identified two type of income generating possibilities through this intervention: sale of naturally reborn (swarming) bee colonies and the sale of honey produced.

The project supports beekeeping in selected kebeles. The intervention was implemented where there is the experience of beekeeping using traditional beehives. The total HHs planned to benefit from the beekeeping support are 60 and the first round 30 beneficiaries have received the support while the remaining 30 will be supported in the second phase, which will be implemented after this mid-term evaluation. Each of the beneficiary HHs was provided with one modern beehive with full accessory, which includes beehive, bee colony, eye cover, glove, cloth, smoker, water spray, brush, and hard cover.

Beekeeping training was provided to the beneficiaries before providing the materials. Transferring of bee colony from traditional to the modern beehives was conducted by government experts who have experience on beekeeping.

The plan was to harvest up to 12 kg of honey from one modern beehive which is much higher than the product from the traditional beehives which is usually 2-3 kg/beehive. There was also a plan for marketing and honey value chain strengthening; the project envisaged to link the beneficiary groups with zone honey marketing groups, which are established and supported by SOS-Sahel.

The achievement of the beekeeping intervention is, however, mixed. There are a few modern beehives that attracted bee colonies and became successful in retaining the colony. The beneficiaries of these kebeles appreciated the support provided by the project and indicated that they have prior experience on traditional beekeeping before the project. However, the intervention has not been successful in most kebeles. Beneficiaries couldn't get the expected output from the intervention. The bee colonies couldn't settle in the modern beehives and left the beehives after staying a couple of months without making honey.

The beneficiaries indicated that the reason for the emigration of the bee colonies is because of climate change, the hot weather, and pest attack. They claimed that they managed to control the pests using traditional pest management although there was no support from the project in this regard. The beneficiaries requested a study to be conducted to understand the root causes and support for beehive pest prevention from the project. Initially at the start of the intervention, detail study has not been conducted whether beekeeping is feasible in the area and it was recommended just based on the traditional practice of beekeeping in the kebele. Modern beekeeping was not tried in the target locations since then. From the context they know, beneficiaries claim that there will be good production during the rainy season and low production during the dry season. They hope that the bee colonies may come back during the rainy season. They are still taking care of their beehives and cleaning the area hoping that the bee colonies will return back.

As described by CISP field office Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, the project is now trying to find out the real cause of the bee colony migration in consultation with research institutes. Currently, the project has allocated budget to replace the wax with new ones based on the research outcome with a view that inappropriate wax might be the cause for migration of the bee colonies.

### **3.2.4 Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction**

Since the disaster risk is a common event in Borena zone, community managed disaster risk reduction (CMDRR) is incorporated in the project. The main focus of this component is on strengthening CMDRR and decision making through capacity building, strengthening community based early warning system, supporting preparation of woreda disaster profiling and contingency planning, and organizing experience sharing visits on CMDRR and rangeland management practices. The accomplishments of planned activities are presented as follows.

#### **Strengthening CMDRR**

The major capacity development intervention plans for strengthening the CMDRR and community decision making were organizing awareness raising events, conducting vulnerability assessment and supporting kebele DRM committee and woreda DRM task forces. ACF established/strengthened 10 kebele DRMCs and organized training for 100 KDMC members while GOAL trained 30 KDMC members. Likewise CISP planned to support 10 Kebele DRMCs and achieved the planned target.

The awareness raising trainings were organized on contingency planning and participatory vulnerability risk capacity assessment (PVRCA) for the already established early warning kebele level DRM committee members composed of CAHWs, HEWs, DA, PA manager, traditional forecasters, elders and active village members. The training was also organized for woreda level task forces who were drawn from sector offices by the partners. During the training, the participants discussed on strengths and weaknesses of task force to take early warning information from kebele level DRM committee and disseminate information to zone task force. They also agreed to organize a meeting twice a month. Consequently, community vulnerability mapping assessment (PVRCA) was done with kebele DRM and assessment reports were produced.

#### **Strengthen community based early warning system**

For strengthening community based early warning system, the project has been working on strengthening the DRM committee at all targeted kebeles. Primarily, refreshment training was provided for kebele DRM committee on how to report early warning information to the respective woreda sector offices. The project has also strengthened the committees through materials provision for record keeping and capacitating them to have contingency plans and reports at kebele level. As a result, each kebele level DRM/EW committee, which has up to 20 members, meet and discuss on any DRR issues twice a month regularly. ACF has organized workshop to support woreda and zonal level DRM task forces with the intention of strengthening DRM capacity in order to carry out, monitor and early respond to drought related shocks. In addition to this, ACF has supported preparation of woreda risk profiling and contingency planning in Dhas woreda. CISP also strengthened information flow system in two kebeles.

Most of the DRM committees have started reporting the situation update of their respective kebele to the woreda line departments on monthly basis. This has also strengthened the traditional “wuchus” or weather forecasters. However, some of the kebeles do not prepare DRR plan to undertake the information transfer in a systematized manner. One of the important aspects of DRR identified by the project was preparing woreda contingency plans. However, most of the supported kebeles didn't prepare this plan to respond to anticipated emergencies. For instance, only three of the five kebeles in Arero woreda prepared DRR plan and become active in terms of CMDRR. Moreover, the activity designed to support the transfer of EW information at kebele and woreda levels through providing mobile phone apparatus by GOAL and CISP was not undertaken due to lack of clarity on the provision of the apparatus although the planned budget for the intervention is high.

#### **Experience sharing visit**

To help DRM committee members share good practices, experience sharing visits were organized. A group of DRM committee members including Dire Woreda went to Denbi kebele in Moyale where there is a good practice. From their visits, the team has learned that the committee has its own office to facilitate its various DRM tasks and to document their works. The team also has learned that the DRM committee of Dembi kebele have best practices in undertaking regular meetings, early warning information data collection, documentation and information transfer to their woreda line offices.

#### **3.2.5 Community-based Peace-making**

As clearly described in the project design document, drought and conflict are mutually reinforcing as scarcity of water and pasture occurred during drought periods. The resource-based conflict in pastoral and agro-pastoralist areas exacerbates food insecurity through loss of life, loss of livelihood productive capacities, lack of access to grazing resources and markets, and interruptions in the delivery of interventions. Hence, the project adopts a “do no harm” approach to ensure that all activities do not create further risk of tension between communities. Accordingly, the project planned to assess and support existing community structures for peace-building through awareness raising, facilitation and

training, and enhancing early warning systems to avert potential conflict flash points by anticipating tensions before they become critical. The plan and achievement of the project were presented as follows.

To strengthen community based peace building and peaceful co-existence, key activities anticipated to leading into successful achievement of the result have been identified during the design phase of CR2B. The activities planned by this component were mapping the causes of conflict and documentation of traditional peace-building practices in the target woredas, organizing workshops on conflict resolution in schools for children, youth and parents in all target woredas, organizing sport events, and building the capacity of beneficiaries on conflict prevention and mitigation. The activities were planned to be implemented in all the six intervention woredas (Dhas, Arero, Dilo, Dire, Miyo and Moyale) with the technical lead by CISP. The main activities planned by CISP were organizing forums, providing training for government staff and clan leaders, and harmonizing DRR activities with peace building.

Compared to the other project results, the peace building result is the least achieved; there is slow progress; and the activities lag behind the plan. Out of the eight planned forums, only one forum which include representatives from Ethiopia and Kenya was conducted. The forum was conducted by the government while CISP played the facilitation role. However, the government couldn't organize all the planned forums and couldn't provide the trainings as planned.

As learned from the KII discussion with project and government staffs, the project design is to work on resource based conflicts. But what is actually found on the ground by the project is that the conflict is mainly clan based and border related. Accordingly, an assessment was initiated by the project (CISP) and conducted by the government to identify the causes of resource based conflict in three woredas (Arero, Negele and Dhas), two of which are CR2B intervention woredas. However, the findings of the study have not been realized and implemented as planned by the project.

Some of the factors for the delay in the implementation of project activities were associated with the sensitivity of the issue and the overlap of the Ethiopian National Election with the project activity. Since the major focus of the government during the time of the national election was on facilitating the election, the project activities were not effectively implemented.

**Table 2: Project Activity Performance (Plan Vs Accomplishment)**

Results/Activities	Unit	Total			Intervention Woreda								
					GOAL			CISP			ACF		
		P	A	%	P	A	%	P	A	%	P	A	%
<b>Result I – Livestock Productivity</b>													
<b>Improving water supply for livestock</b>													
Rehabilitation and construction of ponds/Ellas	No	22	8	36.4	2	0	0	10	3	30	10	5	50
Construction of cattle trough around existing water schemes	No	9	3	33.3	2	0	0	4	1	25	3	2	66.7
<b>Improving animal health services</b>													
Strengthen community based animal health services through CAHWs (training, provision of kits & drugs)	No	127	109	85.8	53	45	84.9	30	20	66.7	44	44	100
Strengthen local level vet drug supply system by linking to coops and training	No	11	1	9.1				3	1	33.3	3	0	0
<b>Improving pasture and forage availability for livestock</b>													
Bush thinning, area closure and enrichment plantation	Ha	4800	3750	78.1	1000	850	85	1800	900	50	2000	1150	57.5
Improving pastor availability by innovative forage preservation techniques and material support	No	280	215	76.8	120	100	83.3	60	15	25	100	100	100
Promote dry land conservation agric. through model agro pastoralists	No	120	120	100	120	120	100	-	-		-	-	
Support primary coops to establish community based seed supply system	No	28	13	46.4				8	3	38	10	10	100
<b>Result II: Increased Crop Production and Productivity</b>													
Provide drought resistant & short maturing crop varieties and fruit species	kg	30799	28131	91.3	6836	4800	70.2	4830	4000	82.8	19133	19331	101
Promote dry land conservation agric. through model agro pastoralists	No	120	120	100.0	120	120	100.0	-	-		-	-	
Support primary coops to establish community based seed supply system	No	28	13	46.4	10	4	40.0	8	3		10	10	100
<b>Result III: Increased Income Diversification and Household Asset Building</b>													
Strengthen cooperatives as financial sources for income generation	No	27	14	51.9				9	6	66.7	8	8	100
Promote Village Saving and Loans through support of VSLAs	No	80		0.0	80	80	100.0	-	-		-	-	
Augment modern beekeeping practices (Training and materials provision)	HH	60	30	50.0				60	30	50			
<b>Result IV: Enhanced Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction</b>													
Strengthen CMDRR through capacity building action (awareness raising)	No	8	3	37.5				8	3	38			
Support Kebele DRM committees/TFs		10	10	100	25	25	100.0	10	10	100			
Support Woreda DRM Task Forces		2	0	0.0				2	0	0			
Strengthen community based EVW system	kebele	10	10	100				10	10	100			
Organize experience sharing cross visit		3	2	66.7	1	1	100	1	0	0	1	1	100
<b>Result V: Strengthened Community-based Peace-making</b>													
Assess existing traditional peace building practices and institutions								2	2	100			
Facilitate community discussion forums on peaceful coexistence		7	1	14.3				7	1	14.3			
Training for traditional institutions in anticipating and managing resource based (grazing and water) disputes in the pastoralist areas and its borders	No	140	45	32.1				140	45	32.1			

Source: GOAL, CISP and ACF

### 3.3 Efficiency

Evaluating efficiency of the project requires assessing how the project performs in terms of planned schedules and allocated budget by looking at how the project has been using resources effectively to deliver its target results and objectives. The efficiency parameter evaluates whether the targeted project outputs were achieved within budget and schedule.

#### 3.3.1 Project Budget Utilization

The consultants observed that the budget utilization (burn rate) is low compared to plan and the time elapsed (see Table 3). From table 3 it could be observed that the overall budget utilization until the end of March 2016 was 54%. Moreover, the financial plan for some of the project activities was low compared to the budget requirement to accomplish the activities. As a result, such activities have not been yet implemented requiring budget revision. One of the contributing factors as mentioned by the partners is that lack of detailed assessment on market prices during project design resulted in under budgeting of some of the project activities. On top of this, the exchange rate of Euro against local currency has gone down, which in turn affected the budget allocated for some of the activities.

**Commento [u2]:** What about the late release of the second budget instalment from the donor due to various reasons. It was late about six months, which also contributes for the less utilization/under accomplishment of activities

**Table 3: Summary of Budget Utilization, March 2016**

S/N	Description	Budget		
		Budget (in Euro)	Expenditure	% utilized
	Human Resources	251,625	94,031	37
	Travel	652	179	27
	Equipment And Supplies	108,482	25,260	23
	Local Office	83,882	1,673	
	Other Costs, Services	55,052	51,321	93
	Programme Costs	1,951,301	1,046,672	54
	VAT	0	4,716	-
	<b>Total Direct Program Costs</b>	1,951,301	1,046,672	54
	<b>Total Indirect Costs</b>	48,699	25,188	52
	<b>Total eligible costs</b>	2,000,000	1,071,860	54

Source: GOAL's Finance Documents

#### 3.3.2 Coherence and Coordination among NGOs Operating in Borena Zone

The internal coordination among the project consortium, NGOs working in the same woreda, and the zonal cluster members is briefly described as follows. As to the consortium members, there is zonal level coordination meeting by partners. GOAL as a lead agency works closely with all consortium members through working groups. Technical team comprising of the three consortium members was established with the aim of harmonizing and facilitating implementation. Technical working group meets monthly. It has prepared a guideline for all project related activities for standardization of operations- from selection criteria to payment rate and modality.

There is regular meeting by consortium members twice a month. Technical staffs of the consortium partner take part in these meetings. The common agendas for discussion are progress update, targeting issues, payment, and situation-update. There is also a quarterly grant review meetings to discuss progress and budget. Similarly, there is quarterly head office (HO) level grant review meeting which the field and HO consortium technical and support staff jointly conduct. The consortium members work in coordination by developing cluster mapping (who is doing what, where), standardization of payment, and forming TWGs, and information sharing. In the regular meeting discussions, challenges raised and

common solutions proposed for tackling challenges. The MEL team of the consortium jointly developed assessment tools and conduct project assessments. The coordination of the partners is used beyond the CR2B project interventions. For instance, the assessment for the design of the RESET-II has been jointly conducted.

Regarding synergy among NGOs working in the same woreda, there is limited linkage because most of them work in separate kebeles, except ACF where ECHO project components like nutrition, primary health, and goat provision for SAM HHs cover all woreda kebeles including EU (CR2B) operational sites. What is available is cluster meeting at woreda level. In Moyale for instance, ACF is implementing ECHO project and hence it shares information on the ECHO project to consortium partners (like beneficiary data, SAM HHs and the same information to CARE for goat provision activity) during meetings. There is no strong linkage with other ECHO fund recipients like CARE except limited information sharing.

There is also a zonal level ECHO and EU cluster coordination quarterly meeting which coordinates the ECHO and EU projects. GOAL is the cluster lead. ECHO fund recipients are CARE, ACF, SCI and Cordaid. The ECHO project is led by Cordaid. However, the cluster meeting dates are not maintained because of other priority issues to the partners and there is high staff turn-over. As a result, discussion agendas sometimes become new/start afresh to new participants. The cluster has developed a cluster map to avoid overlaps and share information on who is doing what and where. The map is being updated and the template is shared to partners. However, the cluster is not as strong as the consortium in-terms of meeting frequency, information sharing, and coordination of activities.

### **3.3.3 Synergy and Complementarity with Government Sectors**

As the zonal NGO coordination office head described, there are 104 projects including CR2B implemented by NGOs in Borena Zone. CR2B project progress evaluation was conducted by the Office and report will be released in the near future. There is a GO-NGO forum organized by the office which is conducted quarterly. This forum is an information sharing platform and helps to avoid overlaps. The office has NGO mapping that shows which NGO is doing what and where. There are also four major assessments conducted by GO-NGOs which include Pre-harvest assessment, post-harvest assessment, Gena and Hageya assessments.

The zonal NGO coordination office also participates in consortium meetings and review meetings. There is also a zonal taskforce coordination meeting conducted every 15 days mainly focusing on situation up-date and emergency response. However, long-term resilience building issues lack due attention; mainly emergency response needs are identified and roles were shared between the government and NGOs. The zonal taskforce is chaired by the Zonal administration. There is also sub-cluster (WASH, Health and Nutrition, Livestock, and Cooperative) taskforce monthly meeting.

There is also strong synergy and complementarity of the CR2B consortium with government sectors as indicated by government sector office experts. The woreda PDO coordinates all the NGO projects and facilitates their operations. The PDO signed MoU with consortium members and assigned focal persons after the launch of the project. The PDO has integrated the project activities into its plan and taken as its own responsibility. The PDOs in each target woreda assigned focal persons for each component to closely assist and monitor the project progress, which is exemplary. Government sector focal persons played key roles in beneficiary identification, project site selection, providing training to community members, and facilitating smooth implementation of project activities. Moreover, the focal persons report the project progress to pastoralist development office on weekly basis. As a result, the project uses PDO staff as technical persons.

At kebele level, the community participate in pond construction, ellas rehabilitation, NRM. There is also close collaboration between the implementing partners and the community. DAs are actively engaged in making close follow up of the project activities in their day to day work. The woreda office provides technical assistance and support during implementation to ensure sustainability. The CR2B project also builds the capacity of the woreda sector offices by providing motor bikes; and consortium members like CISP are members of the Woreda Task Force. There was a good experience of the government and the project staff in conducting joint monitoring although there was no regular review meeting.

### **3.3.4 Capacity, Management and Organization**

Capacity building is one of the activities of the project that contributes to the sustainability of the interventions. Accordingly, CR2B project has provided capacity building supports to the government and communities. Training was provided to DAs, woreda experts, and CAHWs. Consortium members also provided vehicle support, on job training, and technical backstopping.

The major actors in CR2B project implementation along the administrative hierarchy are the government focal persons, project staff, kebele beneficiaries, CAHWs, DAs, model agro-pastoralists, poor community members, and Task Forces. The main duty of woreda experts is cascading training they received during the ToT sessions down to the DAs and model agro-pastoralists. The CAHWs and DAs participated in the trainings, coaching, and mentoring the pastoralists and model agro-pastoralists.

The capacity building component is a cross cutting activity that plays a pivotal role and enhances the beneficiaries' ability and skill in the area of agronomic practices, livestock feed preservation and income generating activities. The model agro-pastoralists were also trained on conservation agronomic practices, harvesting, post-harvest handling, and market value chain.

Woreda experts also received training on various topics on which the project focuses. The kebeles also provided trainings to the pastoralists at the FTCs/PTCs supported by demonstration practices. In general, the training provided by the project has been found to be supportive to the ongoing government initiated capacity enhancement programme at grassroots level.

The project management is organized in such a way that the overall coordination is done by the Task Forces at woreda level and Partnership Committees at kebele level. There are also intervention committees responsible for the implementation and management of each intervention by mobilizing the beneficiary community.

### **3.4 Progress towards Achieving Impact and Sustainability**

This covers the broader effects of the action beyond the completion of specific activities, particularly the relationship between the specific actions and overall objectives. In assessing the project impact, this evaluation inquired what has happened to the community as a result of the project intervention, and assessed whether the project has addressed community needs towards enhancing community capacity for sustaining their livelihoods and resilience building.

Though comparative figures for changes in results couldn't be given at this stage, there are observed signs of change in the lives of the target beneficiaries which would lead to result and objective achievement by the end of the project as briefly presented below.

#### **3.4.1 Progress towards Achieving Outcomes and Objectives**

The rehabilitation and upgrading of existing water schemes such as ponds and traditional wells/ellas has brought observed changes and satisfaction from beneficiaries as observed during the field discussions. Some of the ellas which have been out of function for many years are rehabilitated and is improving

water access to livestock and human beings. Most importantly, as witnessed by the beneficiaries, livestock death resulting from lack of water is minimizing which could have happened earlier during drought. The pasture improvement support has also improved forage availability; and most importantly small ruminants and core breed animals are protected from death during drought because of lack of forage in dry season. However, such gains are limited as compared to the large number of cattle population.

The services provided by CAHWs have improved animal health service accessibility as indicated by beneficiaries. In this regard those CAHWs, which have been providing service under capacity because of lack of support, have regained momentum and fully functional as a result of the refresher training, material and technical support provided by the project.

Among the best practices related to crop production and productivity which show progress towards impact are practices of row planting and saving seed, and production successes of some agro-pastoralists irrespective of the challenges related to rain shortage and pest infestations. Row planting technology is accepted and practices by agro pastoralist and this has improved their production and productivity as indicated by FGD participants. On top of this, the residue from crop production has been used by successful agro-pastoralists to feed their small animals. Moreover, the training provided, the extension support, and the experience sharing visits organized have enhanced farming practices of agro pastoralists among themselves for better production. However, the overall expected changes in-terms of increasing household income from crop production was not found significant and could be least achieved in the project period although there are some individual successes. A worth sharing experience of a model agro-pastoralist is provided as a testimonial.

#### A Success Story of an Inspirational Model Agro-Pastoralist

Guyo Tadi is a 35 years old daughters, his wife, his mother woreda. His wife, and the are attending their education. second daughters attend respectively.



model farmer with 9 households (2 boys, 4 and himself) in Teso kebele of Miyo three of his children who reach school age His wife is in grade 10, while his first and schooling at grades 10, 8, and 4

Before the intervention of the ACF project, his household lost all their cattle due to drought. The only option left for the household livelihood was taking care of vegetables and other crops including plants (chat, banana and coffee planted in the households land). In the meantime, Guyo was selected as a model agro-pastoralist by the ACF project since he had prior experience of farming. As a result, ACF provided him training on improved agricultural practices and technology including farm land preparation, threshing and post-harvest management. He was also provided with inputs of seedling (avocado, mango, cassava, and sweet potato), seeds of vegetables and crops (tomato, onion, carrot, maize-10 kg, haricot bean-27kg), and agricultural tools (hoe, pick axe, and watering can).

With the support from ACF and his strong effort, Guyo initially produced 2 quintals of haricot bean and 5 quintals of maize which was sufficient for his household consumption. He also produced tomato and onion in 2015 and had the chance to buy an ox with 5,000 birr. The support from ACF continued and with his strong determination, in the beginning of 2016, he also produced more than 30 quintals of tomato and 4 quintals of onion and he sold the produce for 17, 000 birr. He also harvested 10 quintal of sweet potato and 5 quintals of onion which could be sold at current market price for about 15, 000 birr. With the money from crop and vegetables sales, he bought two oxen and two heifers for 16,000 birr. Thanks to the project support, Guyo now believes that he is better capacitated and resilient to withstand shocks associated with drought.

Being satisfied with his success, Guyo believes that he will become more productive and resilient in the coming years and plan to support his family up to higher levels of education. He has also a plan to move to irrigation

farming and is looking for purchasing water pump at reasonable price. He has also a plan to replace his thatched roofed house with corrugated iron sheet. He is too ambitious and has also a plan to construct new house in Hidi Lola, the woreda town. With his farming experience, determination, interest for change and commitment to work, it is the consultants hope that Guyo will be a model of model farmers in the near future.

The project is able to strengthen the cooperatives as means to increase their income of the targeted beneficiaries (poor households). Some of the beneficiaries were able to actually generate income and diversify their asset building through small business engagement with loans provided by the cooperatives. During the field visit, it was learnt that some beneficiaries got a good income from crop and income generating interventions like sale of small ruminants fattened. Most of the cooperatives were able to provide loans to their members and created better access to financial assets to their members as a result of support by the project. The progress observed on VSLA, IGA and cooperatives (SACCO, multipurpose and specialized) is said to be good and on track to achieve the intended objective of the project. The success of a pastoralist women participating in individual IGA through taking loan from the cooperatives described below is a case in point.

#### Income Diversification by a Pastoralist Women

Dloket and married woman in Dembi Kebele. She has 5 children (4 M & 1 F). Three of her school children attend their education. The first born, a 15 years old boy, attended his grade 4 Education in Kenya to help him learn English well. Her 10 years old girl and 5 years old boy attend their education in Grades 4 and 1 respectively in Dembi kebele.



active and cooperative members themselves and return the loan with interest timely. From the 25 members, the cooperative members including her to get the first round loan 6 months ago.

As a result, she got business skill training from the cooperative management on skills like potential business identification and business plan preparation. After the training, she planned to work mobile charging with solar lantern energy source along with her previous smaller petty trade. She took 5,000 birr loan from the cooperative with 250 birr yearly interest and bought solar lantern. Then she has started charging mobile phones with service charge. At present she charges 10 to 20 mobiles per day with 3 birr each.

With the income she is earning, she supports her shop with about 5,000 birr in purchasing necessary commodities required by the community and has saved about 2,000 birr in her saving box. She has also changed the solar lantern battery with 1,500 birr.

Her future plan is to repay the loan with its interest in time and strengthen her shop working with mobile charging income. Her passion to change the family's livelihood and her current success in a short period of time indicates that she could be more productive and successful in the near future.

One of the achievements is that the cooperatives have increased their capital through mobilization of saving from their members. However, the business of some of the cooperative members who have taken loan is not at maturing stage and might require further support, like creating linkage with government support before the project closes out.

Impact assessments have shown that participating in a VSLA enables some women to build up leadership skills in their homes and enterprises. This is an important step toward gender empowerment and improved relationships with communities and family. The promotion of Village Saving and Loans through establishment and support of VSLAs has created a room for improvement and there are observed signs of empowerment by women in VSLAs as a result of the project support. Accordingly, the VSLAs supported by the project have started group saving and some of them started providing individual loans to their members. In some of them, the group dynamics and the leadership role in guiding the business activities have been good which have contributed to the achievement of more income. As observed from the field discussion, those who haven't been successful was as a result of lacking capacity to save, while at the same time their business is not yet fully matured. However, this has not been significantly transformed into action according to the project plan and so far what is achieved in this regard by all the partners is very much limited.

The support provided by the project to enhance community managed disaster risk reduction has brought some changes. Accordingly, non-functional DRR committees are re-established and become functional. The woreda DRM task forces meet monthly and the kebele DRM committee meet bi-monthly to discuss on the situation of disaster risks encountered. This has been found as a good experience by the consultants. Early warning information sharing has improved as indicated by the community and sector office experts. However, only a few of the kebeles participated in the preparation of Woreda disaster risk profiling and Contingency planning and most of the plans developed have not been yet realized into action.

The peace building activities are partially achieved and the expected results /signs of achieving the results of minimizing conflicts have not been observed.

Table 4: Summary of Results Achievements

Results	Measures of Success	Consultant Remarks
<b>R1:</b> Increased livestock productivity through better access to water, animal health services and rangeland management	Improving access to water	There is observed changes in improvement of access to water as a result of rehabilitated schemes
	Improving veterinary service	The number of functional CAHWs has increased and their service provision improved. However, lack of uninterrupted drug supply through local vendors limited their capacity; and the delay of linking them with project supported local drug vendors limited full achievement of the intervention and the expansion of service with full quality.
	Improved pasture availability	There are signs of improvement on pasture availability and hay making skills. As observed from the field, the partners have to do a lot to fully achieve this result
<b>R2:</b> Increased crop production and productivity	Increased areas in cultivation	No data to measure this result
	Increased crop productivity	Some agro-pastoralists have succeeded with increasing productivity
	Improved availability of seeds	This has not been achieved. The anticipated seed supplying cooperatives were not organized and individual farmers were not also motivated to produce seed because of the low price of the seed provided in the market. Some of them have also been affected by rain shortage.
<b>R3:</b> Increased income diversification and household asset building	Diversification of income sources	Small number of households has diversified their income from small business like petty trade, solar mobile phone charging business and fattening. This result needs significant progress so as to reach the target in the remaining period of the project. Some of the activities like beekeeping are not successful.

	Organisations of farmers and pastoralists strengthened	Good progress in supporting Cooperatives and increased number of cooperatives have improved saving mobilization and providing loans to their members. The number of IGAs and VSLAs have increased and started running small businesses.
<b>R4:</b> Enhanced community managed disaster risk reduction	Community groups who have prepared or reviewed a disaster mitigation plan	Very limited plan preparation and realization of the plans into action. Early warning information sharing has improved.
<b>R5:</b> Strengthened community-based peace-building and co-existence	Documents produced on existing traditional peace building practices	Very much limited progress except few discussions documented. Assessment on causes of conflict conducted and documented.
	Improved work on peace-making by institutions.	Very much limited movement by the government and no documented evidence of peace building initiatives by institutions.

### 3.4.2 Sustainability of Outcomes

Sustainability is related to whether the positive outcomes of the action and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after the project funding ends. Sustainability is an essential criterion to measure long term benefits of a project after it has ended. In this regard, the CR2B project activities are integrated with the PDO activities and hence will be fully taken over when the project phases out although it was not possible to see handing over documents during the field visit. The project activities are in line with the government strategy of supporting pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Hence, as mentioned by the KII participants of government offices, the PDO planned to enable the community to take over the management of the completed activities through awareness creation and capacity building in the remaining period of the project as it is the office's responsibility.

RESET II is also coming and a proposal has been prepared and submitted to build on the achievements of this project (RESET-I). Moreover, all trainings are given by woreda sector experts to ensure sustainability. The monitoring visits conducted with government partners also helped them own the interventions.

The project deliverables like ponds/ellas are approved by the government and when completed they will be transferred to the community. However, this has not been done though there are completed ponds which are not transferred to the community so far.

Furthermore, the project is working on a system for sustainability through training and awareness creation. There is a document for handing over of tools and other supports but not for activities or schemes completed. The MoU is considered as handing over document. However, there is no handing over so far although there are some completed projects.

Linking CAHWs with private drug vendors is another area that ensures sustainability of the livestock health intervention. Similarly, linking IGA groups to cooperatives solves the shortage of loan by individual beneficiaries on a long term basis. However, the interest rate looks too low to ensure the sustainability of the loanable fund. It is also good to include hay storage facility for storing hay and using it for longer term specifically during the drought season so that collected hay will serve longer and not unnecessarily lost.

### 3.5 Cross-cutting Issues

The project design has identified gender, nutrition and environment as a cross cutting and mainstream issues. Accordingly, it was noted that the action that seeks to address resilience must consider the issue of nutrition. Many activities under results 1, 2 and 3 of the CR2B project will contribute to improved

productivity and incomes for the target groups. However, good nutrition happens as a result of behaviours as well as access. In order to maximise the beneficial impact on nutrition of project gains, it was planned to mainstream nutrition behaviour change throughout all aspects of the project. Accordingly, ACF has brought in its care practice approach into the project through an integrated awareness raising approach. Care practice approach is implemented by ACF as a cross cutting issue supporting all the four result activities. The implemented care practice has components of the following:

- Care for women
- Hygiene practice
- Food preparation
- Psychosocial care
- Home health practice

Each component has a guide for project staff and a separate implementation modality. This approach was jointly implemented by ACF staff and government including HEWs and DAs. There are care support groups which are provided training and they in turn cascaded the training to their community members. ACF planned to establish 60 such groups and so far 48 groups were established in 10 kebeles. The group is composed of 30 women and 10 husbands. The group members include PLWs, mothers, husbands, mothers with under five children etc. It is also linked with the activity of HEWs and HDAs. To strengthen the care practices, ACF established 40 care support groups and 10 school hygiene clubs in Dhas and Miyo Woredas. Seventy nutrition-sensitive discussion sessions were conducted including cooking and baby bathing demonstration sessions. Awareness creation activities were conducted to 400 (300F) CSG members on the topic of care for women and IYCF practices. House to house visits were conducted to 681HHs and awareness raising sessions were conducted to 1709 (1036F) HHs with issues discussed on observed gaps mainly hygienic, exclusive breast-feeding and complementary feeding practices. Furthermore, training was conducted for 10 (2F) ACF CDAs and team leaders on care practices and IYCF.

The group conducts weekly meeting focusing on issues related to prenatal, pregnancy, postnatal and children care including breast feeding and feeding practice for younger than 6 months children. The group members also conduct visits to community members every Wednesday per week.

The benefits obtained from this intervention include:

- Improvement in feeding practice
- Behavioural change in hygiene, feeding, health care and child care.
- Replication of the practice by other community members in the kebele since the demonstration is done with their presence. The group members also cascade the training to their fellow community members.

Gender was very much considered in the targeting of beneficiaries. Accordingly women are involved in almost all of the project interventions including hay making, cooperatives, VSLAs, IGAs and DRR committees. The Nutrition Promotion Messaging (women) NPM targets children and care takers. Moreover, selected the seed varieties, Haricot bean, are nutritious for children and PLWs.

ACF has provided training to staff on cross-cutting issues and gender is mainstreamed in all operations. GOAL has a child protection and gender policies which are provided through induction and training to all staff. Environment effects have been minimized on rangeland management activities through selective bush thinning which was conducted with the support of experts from the woreda.

As indicated in GOAL's report, training was provided for selected group leaders and community members (e.g., model farmers, cooperative members and CMDRR Committees) on Nutrition

Promotion Messaging (NPM) and development of specific NPM related to WASH (NPM-W) – impact of water, sanitation and hygiene on nutrition- were undertaken.

### 3.6 Factors Affecting Outputs and Outcomes/Results

The major factors that affect the achievement of the project targets and consecutive results are briefly mentioned below.

#### Project Design

- Over and under budgeting of activities due to under estimation/market price increment and devaluation of Euro.

#### Activity Implementation

- Observed delay of the implementation of activities related to result 4 was due to the sensitive nature of the activities; and the main implementing actors (government experts) were highly engaged in other government priorities resulting less attention given to the peace building activities;
- Unanticipated migration of bee colonies will affected the expected results on beekeeping unless remedial measure taken by the organization;
- Absence of reliable and legal seed suppliers as per the seed preference of the agro-pastoralists;
- Although pastoral drop outs were targeted, their involvement in the project actual intervention was not visible;
- Lengthy procurement process for vehicle and motor cycle purchase by GOAL affected the rate of budget utilization;
- Inconsistent and low per-diem rates (e.g., GOAL 93 birr per day) brought less interest to engage and participate in the project activities, especially for those coming from long distance up to 50 kms;
- Targeting of model agro pastoralists undermines the objective of focusing on poor HHs; and
- Community participation in crop seed variety selection was limited and mainly selection was done depending on recommendation of the expert.

#### Partnership

- Less attention by some consortium members in attending meetings and timely reporting due to emerging priorities of each partner;
- Irregularity of joint monitoring visits by partners as a result of other priorities within their own respective organizations.

## 4. OBSERVED LESSONS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 Observed Lessons

In the course of project implementation, important lessons have emerged from good practices and challenges faced. The key observed lessons are the following.

- Local forage seed variety was found to be more productive and acceptable by the target beneficiaries than improved forage seed provision by the project for reseeding. The seed provision was not successful in all of the 6 woredas due to moisture stress and the variety was less adaptable to the agro-ecology.
- The forage production would have been more successful if it was supported by area closure so as to protect the grass. Grass seeds available in the rangeland can grow well if the area is closed (protected).
- As indicated by project beneficiaries, kulo (Kenyan variety) haricot bean seed, which was planted by the agro-pastoralists, is found to be good in terms of fast growing, drought resistance, market price, and length of cooking time compared to haricot bean which was provided by the project. Hence, it is good to improve engagement of the community in seed variety selection.
- Harmonizing the implementation modalities, employing similar cash for work payment modalities, and community participation approach among the consortium members is found as an important lesson for the project, which the government is also using it, enhancing project efficiency and effectiveness.
- The beekeeping intervention would have benefitted the beneficiaries if a detailed study was conducted ahead of starting the intervention. A detail study has not been conducted whether or not beekeeping is feasible in the area; it was recommended just based on traditional practices of beekeeping in the kebele.

### 4.2 Conclusion

Despite many challenges faced during the project implementation, the CR2B project was able to achieve most of the target outputs and results stipulated in the project document. Accordingly, the project design was appropriate to the local needs of the target beneficiaries as well as to the government Food security strategies while at the same time linked to partners overall mission of addressing the needs of vulnerable communities. The project was designed in-line with the EU resilience agenda and the implementation has been progressing according to resilience building activities designed at the start of the project. The project activities are found relevant and complementing government annual plan as indicated by government partners. During the course of implementation, the project is guided by appropriate approaches like CAHWs while at the same time the partners formed technical working groups and tried to standardize implementation modalities like range land management, CAHWs support, and developed training and targeting criteria which have contributed for the successful implementation of the project.

Though there was no active engagement of government and beneficiary community at the design phase, except the need assessment conducted to identify beneficiary needs, this has changed in the course of project implementation. Accordingly, during the course of implementation, these stakeholders were engaged in identifying beneficiaries while the PDO was engaged in provision of training and extension services to beneficiaries. This stakeholders engagement complemented project implementation while at the same time has created a room/linkage for sustainability of project outcomes.

In-terms of achievement of project outputs and higher level results/outcomes, the project was successful in achieving outputs and outcomes mostly under result one and result four, while result two and five were not significantly achieved because of internal and external challenges faced during the course of implementation, in some case related with inappropriate project design(e.g., under budgeting of project

activities) and lack of effective planning of activities that goes with the local context, e.g., seed variety selection.

Though the partners have developed targeting criteria/checklists, the programme was not guided by a comprehensive targeting guideline, as a result of which exclusion errors were observed. In this regard, the model agro-pastoralists selected are much better off than the poorest households which are less resilient. Moreover, the targeting and selection process employed lacks clear guideline on the inclusion of pastoralist dropouts, who have been primary target groups during the design of the project. In this regard, there is no a clear indication/measurement to report on the inclusion of pastoralist dropouts.

Regarding operational efficiency, in most cases, the partner were effective in implementing the activities and achieving set targets. However, as clearly stated in review meeting reports, meeting minutes and the Mid-Term Evaluation observations, seeds and tools distribution was late and in most cases not aligned with the agricultural seasonal calendar. Seed has not been yet distributed to beneficiaries, except ACF at the time of evaluation while it was the real time to plant. As the lion's share of the budget under Result II was allocated for this sector, inability to implement it in a timely manner will to some extent affect the achievement of outcomes in the remaining period of the project.

As learnt from beneficiary discussions, one of the effective approaches employed by the partners is creating access to seeds. Agro-pastoralists received seeds for free within their locality provided by partners. However, beneficiaries have not got sustainable seed sources (a community based seed supply system) like through local suppliers/cooperatives as planned by the project. Some also complained that there was no adequate supply of seeds while at the same time, the locally available seed variety imported from Kenya provides better yield and price during sell of crop produced. The consultants learned that the partners have provided locally available quality seeds. However, the prevailing change of climate demands provision of short maturing and high yielding seeds. There is potential inclination by the agro-pastoralists to use the Kenyan variety than the improved seed provided locally. Unless seeds selected by beneficiaries are provided, this will negatively affect attainment of project result.

The planned support to government tree nurseries to produce selected forage species has not been achieved to bring the expected results due to lack of well-prepared plan, and assessment on practicality of introducing forage species; the activity itself is more related to demonstration. It could be a source of income for the government nurseries to partially cover their running costs. Nevertheless, the partners have not achieved their plan of forage seed supply through supporting government nurseries. Most importantly noted here is that the forage seeds provided by the partners were not productive and acceptable by the target beneficiaries. The local forage seeds were found more appropriate and acceptable. However, it doesn't mean that there is no room to use this activity in areas where the specific varieties are tested and found adaptable.

One of the successful achievements is the work done through the CMDRR approaches, which was verified during the field visit with target beneficiaries and key informants of government partners. The establishment/strengthening of DRR committees and support provided to DRR taskforces has enabled better early warning information sharing between the kebeles, woredas and the Zones. However, the information flow lack systematized documentation of information into a central information pool system. One of the activities to enhance better information flow and documentation was the use of mobile phones for digital information collection and sharing. Nonetheless, the provision of mobile apparatus to partners was considered risky and yet not fully agreed/decided by the consortium partners. GOAL should have been giving serious consideration for this and making decisions on alternative mechanisms. This is possible if GOAL manages to discuss and agree with the consortium partners, government

partners, and DRR committees to reach at a consensus on effective and sustainable mechanisms of using the mobile apparatuses.

The capacity building activities to sector offices, especially to PDO was an important instrument for enhancing their implementation capacity and sustains the project activities. Target beneficiaries have benefited a lot from the capacity building activities (training, seed, and tools provision) to enable them increase food availability and develop livelihood alternatives. Supported agro-pastoralists were able to test new agricultural techniques and cultivate multiple varieties of vegetable and staple crop seeds in their farms. GOAL and the consortium partners achieved in enabling a significant number of target beneficiaries increase their production and intensify their IGAs.

Employed successful approaches that goes with the community need were found to be one of the contributing factors for sustainability. In this regard, the consultant has learned that successful IGAs and VSLAs are becoming exemplary and model for all the surrounding community. However, a lot has to be done in the remaining period of the project to link successful businesses and cooperatives to credit facilities and institutionalizing the credit system by linking them with formal financial institutions. The efforts so far made by the project with this regard are very limited. GOAL and the partners have to learn from successful approaches tested by other organizations like CARE and within the partners through their coordination in cluster meetings.

The internal and external coordination mechanisms so far made are good. GOAL is the lead for Borena Cluster while ACF and CISP are members. Meetings and discussions between the partners and information sharing at cluster level were conducted. There is good information sharing and technical support by the consortium partners. Assessments are jointly conducted by the partners. Though resilience building is a long-term effort and goal, the coordination and linking of the CR2B project with projects run by partners is very much limited. In this regard, ACF is recipient of ECHO fund for emergency response. However, there have not been concrete measures taken to complement and create synergy between the two projects.

### **4.3 Recommendation**

In order to address the constraints and complete the project within the remaining period of the project, enhance the progress towards ensuring sustainability, and pave the way for proper exit strategy, the following recommendations are forwarded for consideration.

1. Some of the project activities as indicated in the conclusion part were found under budgeted while significant steps has not been taken so far. In this regard, immediate budget revisions have to be conducted as per the donor regulation and revision of budget and activities have to take place so as to accomplish remaining activities and contribute to the expected results.
2. The good result gains on early warning information sharing and local level DRR preparedness planning has to be further strengthened. In this regard, the information flow should be systematic like using digital data gathering mechanisms employed and appropriate documentation techniques like the use of mobile phones and other gadgets. The alternative to the mobile phones could be providing tablets and computer to each woreda so that data collected through paper based formats could be imputed into tablets and computers for analysis and documentation. Facilitating mobile mapping and implementation for further strengthening of early warning system is also recommended.
3. The remaining seed provisions have to be according to the seed varieties preferred by the target beneficiaries so as to be successful on increasing productivity and increase agro-pastoralists income. Though Haricot bean seeds imported from Kenya are accepted by the majority of the agro-pastoralists, it is not yet certified by the PDO. However, most of the agro-pastoralists indicated that

most farmers are planting these seed purchasing from the local market. The consortium partners can discuss with the PDO and facilitate the provision of these seed varieties or can provide the cash equivalent to the seed amount to be provided as an alternative.

4. Timing of bush clearing and pond rehabilitation should be done during the dry season as it will have technical limitations if it is done during rainy season. During the rainy season, bush thinned (trees cut) regenerate immediately and limit the grass growing well while ponds will get silted up if it is done during the rainy season. This has to be considered in the remaining pond rehabilitation and range land reclamation activities.
5. Small business supports and VSLAs haven't been matured enough and the plan of revolving loans to other beneficiaries within the group might require more time than anticipated. To make sure this is happening in the remaining period of the project and beyond that, appropriate exit strategy has to be designed and concrete tri-partite (Consortium partners, Cooperatives and Government sector office) MoUs signed and followed-up.
6. Though the support to local drug vendors is found to be a sustainable solution for veterinary drug supply to CAHWs, this has not been realized so far for factors mentioned in this report. However, the partners have to consider alternative mechanisms like supplying the drug on a revolving scheme through the government structure. This can be done by signing MoU with the government to supply drug to CAHWs through its Veterinary posts using the money on a revolving basis.
7. Important lessons from project implementation have to be considered for the remaining project period. For instance, though the beekeeping support is a good initiative, the beneficiaries are not able to get the expected honey yield and income because of bee colony migration. The steps taken by CISP to understand the root causes of the problem should be further strengthened while at the same time the remaining activity budget should be shifted to other types of IGA support, like small business/fattening.
8. Activities related to result 5 are still lagging behind since they require the time of responsible government sectors. This has to be given attention to complete the activities in the remaining time or consider re-planning to shift the budget to other activities as a last resort.
9. To enhance implementation and completion of remaining activities, regular review of project activities and grant review meetings should be more frequent and efficient. Accordingly, the lead agency, GOAL should take the initiative of organizing regular meetings as well as conducting one big review meeting so as to identify major challenges and to roll out recommendations from this mid-term evaluation.
10. Finally, since this is a new intervention and approach for consortium partners in Borena, we suggest that documentation and dissemination of best practices in the end of the project would be helpful to build on the lessons for further expansion and scale up, and to share the experience for other development actors working in similar interventions as well.

## ANNEXES

### Annex I: Term of Reference

#### A mid-term participatory evaluation of the Project: EC SHARE Coordinated Recovery to Community Resilience in Borana (CR2B), Ethiopia

##### I. Background

Borana is a predominantly pastoral zone located in the southern part of Ethiopia bordering Somali region in the east, Northern Kenya to the south, Guji zone to the northeast and SNNPR in the West. It is the largest of the 18 zones in Oromiya regional state located in the arid and semi-arid southern lowlands. Livestock is the vital source of food and income in a population of about 1 million residing in the zone. In normal years the zone is one of the major sources of livestock supply in the local and international markets. During the recent years, Borana has repeatedly experienced complex humanitarian crises as a result of drought, conflict and disease. More frequent and severe droughts and flooding are among the critical consequences of changing weather patterns in the Greater Horn of Africa. Massive livestock death due to drought, particularly in the last five years, has badly affected the livelihoods of the communities and the overall food security in the area. For example, Borana was one of the most affected areas in Ethiopia by the 2011 drought. It has been difficult to obtain official estimates of the actual damage (e.g. loss of animals) resulting from the severe drought. However, according to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the total death rate was as much as 60%, 40%, and 25-30% (an average of 27%) for cattle, sheep and goats respectively.

Table I-Intervention woredas Population; Emergency relief and PSNP Beneficiaries of the Target Woredas

Woreda	Population	PSNP		Emergency Relief Bef.	
		Nr of Ben.	As % of Pop	2013	2014
Dire	70,159	7,912	11.28	10000	5000
Dillo	41,300	2,315	5.61	5321	3010
Dhas	46,837	5,257	11.22	3211	1000
Moyale	142,965	17,530	12.26	7000	5000
Miyo	71,269	13,165	18.47	10000	5000
Arero	73,500	13,015	17.71	3048	2015
<b>Total</b>	<b>446,030</b>	<b>59,194</b>	<b>13.27</b>	<b>38580</b>	<b>21025</b>

Pastoralists and agro-pastoralists of the six target woredas typically pursue low-input/low-output business models that are high risk in terms of outputs over the long term, but attractive due to their low input nature, and hence perceived low risk, in the short term. Many are therefore barely able to produce enough food to sustain their families. These groups rely on key ecological systems that have been degraded over many years and face increasing pressures from shifting weather patterns. The combinations of rangeland degradation, soil erosion, and high surface-run-off and low rainfall make livelihoods highly marginal. Wakening social systems such as natural resource governance, extension services, and conflict mitigation mechanisms compound high rates of vulnerability and mean even modest deficit or excess rainfall can impact negatively on already low outputs. Additionally communities have very little access to savings or credit facilities. As vulnerability to external shocks and stresses grow, communities become either increasingly risk averse, sticking resolutely to traditional approaches which limit their ability to adapt to climate change. Consequently, communities resort to negative coping strategies, such as the increased encroachment of grazing pasture for agricultural use or collection and sale of fuel wood and charcoal, undermining long-term sustainable livelihoods and local natural resources. Communities in the target woredas are dependent on livestock and agri-livestock for their

livelihood, as both an income and food source. Repeated drought has put severe stress on these livelihood sectors and income loss has been recorded across all the target Woredas.

**Total Duration:** 30 Months

**Total Budget of the Action:** Euro: 2,500,000

**Target beneficiaries:**

**Pastoralists:** live in all the six targeted woredas and purely depend on livestock rearing. The Action targets 20,670 HHs (total 103,350 people) including pastoral dropouts 4,005 HHs with focus to improve their livelihoods and build their resiliency capacity through various integrated measures.

**Agro-pastoralists:** These also live in all the target woredas and practicing both livestock and crop production. The action targets 9,880 HHs (total 49,400 people) to improve their livelihoods and increase their productive capacity through various integrated measures.

**Target Groups:** A total of 34,555 HH pastoralist, agro-pastoralist and pastoral dropout communities within the six target woredas

**Primary Beneficiaries:** 172,775 pastoralist, pastoral dropouts and agro-pastoralist people and potentially all HHs and communities within the six target woredas.

**Objectives of the Action**

**Overall Objective:** To contribute to the strengthening of disaster resilience and food security of pastoral, agro pastoral and pastoral dropout communities in Borana Zone

**Specific Objective 1:** To Reduce vulnerability to external shocks and increased productive and income generating capacity of target communities

**Specific Objective 2:** To enhance capacity of local government and community /traditional institutions to improve their service delivery and Disaster Risk Management for sustainable peace and development in the target areas.

**Main Results**

**Result 1.** Increased Livestock productivity through better access to water, animal health services and rangeland management

**Result 2.** Increased Crop Production and productivity

**Result 3.** Increased income diversification and household asset building

**Result 4.** Enhanced Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction

**Result 5.** Strengthened Community Based peace building and co-existence

The core of the project is to enable communities to become capable and responsible for making the local level decisions that will determine their ability to cope with on-going climate change. This will extend from communal activities such as area closure and water resource management to community DRM action planning. A stakeholders' planning workshop will be organised to define roles and responsibilities and foster mutual understanding, followed by regular Kebele and Woreda level review meetings. Therefore, conducting a mid-term participatory evaluation is one of the project planned activities.

**2. Objectives of the Midterm Evaluation**

The objective of this evaluation is to carry out a process evaluation, a theory of change/results framework analysis based on all given information and hosts a "Project Review Exercise" with all partners. This exercise will be an opportunity to bring in external expertise and allow partners to "step

back” from project delivery and look at progress at an impact level. It is a chance both to address where delivery is deviating from design and to incorporate new learning or changes to the external context and as such will substantially contribute to the aims of the project as being iterative, responsive and flexible.

This Midterm evaluation exercise is also aims to jointly review and reach to consensus with the consultant on the findings and recommendations of the evaluation. The mid-term evaluation will also allow for assessing relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact-trend and sustainability of the project. To assess the level of the intended synergy/integration/complementarities as well as the coordination of the project interventions with other on-going similar resilience building and food security initiatives including the PSNP implemented in the respective project intervention woreda by both government and other actors; and to draw lessons and give recommendations having strategic significance for improvement in the remaining implementation period.

### **3. Scope of the Midterm Evaluation**

The mid-term participatory evaluation should cover all relevant activities, accomplishments, processes and results achieved by the programme to the present date, and also the progress to the impact and sustainability in the program area.

Key priority/focus areas:

- An evaluation of assessing relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact-trend and sustainability of the project.
- Present critical analysis (with grounded & specific recommendations) around key areas of program could have been further strengthened, modified or changed.
- An objective analysis of the quality and appropriateness of the project design to achieving the expected results.
- Critique on the management of the project by GOAL, ACF and CISP.
- The identification of strategic strengths and weaknesses in order to guide consortium on internal and external strategic learning.
- An assessment of how gender and environment issues have been addressed within the programme.
- An analysis of progress and achievements in relation to national and regional targets (MDG, UAP or any current targets)
- Contribution of the project towards the regional and zonal targets for both the DRR sector.

### **4. Methodology**

The consultant should clearly state the methodology to be followed in the evaluation of the project. The consultant/organization will ensure that the participatory evaluation is realized in line with project design and available project documents. It is proposed that the study will use primary and secondary sources using mixed research/evaluation methods.

Following are some generic steps for evaluation, however the consultants are encouraged to propose specific methodology they think is more feasible:

- Deliver inception report, which include all detail methodologies, the expected outputs and work plan
- Review of literature including project proposal, implementation plan and studies conducted by consortium.
- Propose study design, methodology, tools (Questionnaires, Interview Guide, FGDs, and In-depth interviews of Key Informants etc.).

- Assign core team members and field supervisors in consultation with consortium and head of MEAL for the process.
- Pilot tools in the field and do required adjustments;
- Prepare field data collection plan;
- Collect data reaching every segment of population regardless of the remoteness and difficult locations and complete the targets within each strata of population;
- Ensure quality of the field data by random checks and provide feedback in the initial part of data collection;
- Data analysis and draft reporting
- Prepare validation workshop and final report

## 5. Evaluation criteria

### 5.1. Relevance

An assessment should be made of how well the real problems and needs of the target beneficiaries (rural communities) have been addressed in the design of the programme. And to what extent local absorption capacities and the local implementation capacities were properly taken into consideration in the design.

An assessment should be made of the appropriateness of initial consultations with, and participation by, key stakeholders including the EU, regional authorities, intended beneficiaries, and other donors before the design was confirmed and implementation started. Complementarity and coherence with related activities undertaken elsewhere by government or other donors should be assessed. Any duplication of efforts and/or conflicts should be identified and commented on.

#### Essential criteria

- Valid business licence

#### Award criteria are:-

- Relevant evaluation experience
- Demonstrated understanding of the work proposed in the TOR
- Clarification of methodology
- Price

### 5.2. Efficiency

Analyse the relationship between the objectives sought and the strategies and methods used to achieve them. Assess whether the means of the project (project personnel, infrastructure, equipment, training etc.) have been efficiently progressed/transformed through project activities into the various project results. Could the same or similar results have been achieved at lower cost? This will require an assessment of the following factors, which will affect efficiency:

- Organisation and management
  - An assessment of the general organizational arrangements (structures, responsibilities and contractual arrangements) relating to the project.

The issues to be analysed include, the quality of day-to-day management of the works contract, the budget, of personnel, information etc. Also how relations/coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries, other donors were organized and the respect for deadlines.

- Implementation of Activities
  - An evaluation of the approach and methods used to implement the project and activities of the works contractor, Supervisor, and project personnel will be an important feature of the evaluation.

Assess how far the project helped to provide appropriate solutions and develop local capacities to define and produce results. Also how far costs of the project were justified by the benefits that have/will be generated (whether or not expressed in monetary terms), in comparison with similar projects or known alternatives.

The consultant should also assess the partner country contributions from government, local institutions, target beneficiaries and other local parties.

Were inputs provided as planned, could re-allocation of responsibilities have improved performance?

Assess the quality of communication between the project and the target beneficiaries, relevant government departments and other donors. Also evaluate the role played by the community in implementation of the project and the nature and level of participation.

### **5.3. Effectiveness**

The evaluation will analyse the relationship between the results and the project purpose. It will identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the programme.

Specifically the evaluation should focus on:

- What are the results obtained so far by the programme and in what number are the beneficiaries in relation to the project targets set.
- To what extent have these results contributed to achieving the project purpose, or can be expected to do so in the future? Have the planned benefits been delivered and received, as perceived mainly by the key beneficiaries, but also taking account the views of responsible national Government authorities, donor management, and other concerned parties (NGOs, business associations etc)?
- What is the progress of each consortium member in terms of achieving targets in terms of indicators set?
- Have there been unforeseen beneficiaries and if yes to what extent and what type of demographic profile do they fall into?
- Have any intended beneficiaries been missed and if yes do they make up a specific demographic profile?
- Has the sectoral and geographic distribution of project activities been appropriate to the needs of rural communities analysed in the context of the wider political, socio-cultural, economic and environmental situation in the target area.
- Have any shortcomings at this level been due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation?
- More specifically, is there any national policy support not in place that has hindered the project achieving the planned results?

### **5.4. Sustainability**

The consultant will assess the extent to which the results of the programme will be maintained at government, service supply and community level, and whether the longer-term impact on the wider development process can also be sustained at the level of the sector and of the country.

The analysis of sustainability will therefore focus on the following aspects:

- Ownership of objectives and achievements, e.g. how far stakeholders were consulted on the objectives from the outset and whether they agreed with them.
- Financial sustainability of the sector, e.g. whether the services provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and remained so after funding.

- WASH Infrastructure issues, e.g. whether the infrastructures provided fit in with existing needs, skills, knowledge, traditions and culture. Whether the beneficiaries are able to maintain infrastructures (or technology) acquired without further assistance, with minimal maintenance, operating and replacement costs.

### **5.5. Coordination and complementarities**

To what extent the project objectives, targeted beneficiaries, timing, etc is complementary and co-ordinated as well as creating actual synergy (or duplication) with similar on-going intervention of the respective woreda/regional state;

### **5.6. Visibility**

## **6. Conclusions and Recommendations**

Having evaluated the project in terms of relevance, efficiency, progress to the proposed impact and sustainability, summarise the outcome and draw conclusions. Formulate what policy, organisational and operational lessons are to be learnt.

Identify any future actions required by consortium, communities, government or donors that are necessary to realise maximum positive impact and sustainability of the project.

## **7. Plan of Work**

The evaluation necessitates **one and half month**, including report writing. The following are the key phases of the review:

- Review of project documents (GOAL, ACF and CISP).
- Interviews with all relevant actors.
- Data collection and observation in the sample areas of the project,
- Consultation with representative beneficiaries in the rural communities.
- Debriefing with the EU and consortium.
- Draft report and submission to GOAL Ethiopia (within 15 days of completing the field assignment).
- Develop and share analysis plan and evaluation report structure with Consortium for inputs and feedbacks.
- Analysis of available data, synthesis of findings, matching observed different available facts to identify difference & inconsistencies. Formulation of draft conclusions and recommendations and initial write up of the draft report
- Comments on the draft report by GOAL Ethiopia, and consortium partners (ACF, CISP)
- Submission of Final Report (within 15 days of submission of comments by the Consortium).
- Evaluation findings and recommendations validation workshop for all stakeholders (by consultant). It should be held before the final report in order to incorporate the feedback

A list of key documents and persons to be consulted will be provided and arrangements to meet relevant personnel will be facilitated by the GOAL, ACF and CISP.

## **8. Expertise Required**

Consultants with competencies covering the following areas:

- Proven experience and knowledge in project management, particularly for that of consortium related projects;

- Proven experience in development work and consortium programs/ project evaluations;
- Experience in DRR sector reform process;
- Competence in social and economic cost benefit analysis;
- Independence from the parties involved;
- Good communications skills and experience of workshop facilitation;
- Proven ability to write clear and useful reports.

## **9. Reporting**

The consultant will prepare the following reports written in English language:

- Inception report after 5 days of the signing of agreement
- A brief end of mission note, incorporating the preliminary conclusions of the field mission at the end of it
- A draft final report, 2 weeks after completing the field mission.
- A final evaluation report 15 days after receipt of comments related to the draft report.
- The consultant shall facilitate an evaluation findings and Recommendation workshop for all stakeholders (Government, CISP, ACF and beneficiaries) in 15 days of submission of the completed evaluation document.

## **10. Proposal details and submission**

The deadline for submission of application (both Technical and financial proposal) is before or on January 29, 2016 4:00PM.

Candidates interested in the position will be expected to provide the following documentation:

- Detailed response to ToR, with specific focus addressing the scope of work, methodology to be used and key selection criteria
- Initial work plan based on methodology outlined, and availability of applicant
- Company profile or CV including a minimum of 3 references
- Detailed budget breakdown based on expected daily rates and initial work plan

The evaluation criteria are based on technical and financial responsiveness. The key technical evaluation criteria are:

- Qualification of the Firm in the field of the assignment/Livelihoods in Pastoral settings
- Technical and managerial capabilities of the Firm
- Relevance (To the objective of the announced consultancy)
- Methodology
- Qualification and experience of key staff and composition
- A Firm should have valid license for the current year and similar work experience registered by legal authority

## Annex 2: Evaluation Framework: Tools and Key Questions

Tool	Evaluation Theme	Target Group	Key Questions/issues	Number of Participants	Number of FGDs/KIIs
<b>Relevance/Appropriateness</b>					
<b>FGD</b>	Relevant to beneficiary needs	Beneficiary Households (male and female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was the level of participation of the beneficiaries in the design, implementation and review of the project?</li> <li>• How relevant has been the project in addressing the needs of the target groups (pastoralist, agro-pastoralist and dropouts)?</li> <li>• What is the level of outcome achievements in reducing vulnerability to external shocks; food security measurement of change progress in the effect variables in comparison to the situation at the start (baseline)?</li> <li>• How relevant is the project design in addressing the needs of target beneficiaries in the face of changing contexts (climate change, drought)?</li> <li>• How relevant have been the capacity building interventions for government and the community beneficiaries to sustain project outcomes?</li> <li>• Were the various technologies (improved crop varieties, technologies applied to water schemes, etc.) used in the project appropriate to the local context?</li> </ul>	<b>8-10</b>	4 (at four randomly selected kebeles considering sector of interventions)
<b>KII</b>	Relevance to EC/Partners mission	Key Project staff, partner (EC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project facilitated/contributed to linkage with other resilience programs/projects of consortium partners and ECHO?</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	2 (1 at Consortium level and 1 EC level)
<b>KII</b>	Relevance to government policy and strategy	Government partners (Water, Pastoralist/Agriculture, Cooperative /MFIs, health and DPP offices)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent the interventions are in line with government policy and strategy?</li> <li>• Does the project coordinate sufficiently and effectively with other initiatives and projects with similar objectives in the area?</li> <li>• Does the project address priority needs of the government in promoting resilience?</li> <li>• To what extent has Consortium partners' interventions both overall and by sector been relevant and appropriate to the needs and priority of Ethiopia from pastoral and agro-pastoral contexts?</li> </ul>	<b>2-3</b>	5 KIIs (2 KIIs with DAs, Animal health Experts, HEWs, , Kebele administration, 2 KII with sector office at Wereda level, 1 KII with DRMFS at Addis level)
<b>Operational Effectiveness and Efficiency (outputs and quality)</b>					
<b>FGD and KII</b>	Targeting Effectiveness	Beneficiary and non-beneficiary HHs and Rep. from partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the project's targeting criteria effectively target the neediest households including pastoral dropouts?</li> <li>• Is there a guideline to guide selection of the most vulnerable target groups and how effectively the guideline was followed?</li> <li>• Are these targeting criteria being appropriately implemented in the selection process?</li> <li>• Does the level of targeting procedures consider families with a history of recurrent food shortage as a priority target?</li> </ul>	As above	As above

<b>KII</b>	Output quality & delivery	Rep. from partners  Key Project staff (Project and Admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the service provision cycles functioned effectively so far during the implementation of the project?</li> <li>• What have been the main constraints to the appropriate delivery of services?</li> <li>• Did the quality of the support provided (amount and type) correspond to what had been planned? Did it correspond to the needs of the beneficiaries?</li> <li>• Did the frequency of providing support correspond to what had been planned? Did it correspond to the needs of beneficiaries?</li> <li>• Did the transfer modality correspond to the needs of beneficiaries e.g., seed?</li> <li>• Which type of service, frequency and transfer modality proved to be more practical/less expensive/more flexible to implement?</li> <li>• Which type of transfer, frequency and transfer modality proved to be more adequate to beneficiaries needs and the characteristics of the project area?</li> <li>• The quality of training as perceived by the participants (e.g., CAHWs)</li> <li>• Skill and changes in attitude gained (e.g., CMDRR, animal health, VSLA)</li> <li>• Observed changes in animal health service delivery/application of knowledge, Timely delivery (by CAHWs)</li> <li>• Quality of seed (drought resistant and short maturing) as reported by beneficiaries</li> <li>• Provision of cooking demonstration (nutrition mainstreaming) and improved storage promotion as per satisfaction of beneficiaries</li> <li>• How the GOAL DBC framework has been utilized in providing information for better response/behaviour change/planning?</li> <li>• What specific behavior has been identified on what component of this project (e.g., nutrition)? if so, how relevant was the barrier analysis (doers and non-doers in this specific project in relation to behavior change)?</li> <li>• Challenges and recommendations</li> </ul>	As above	As above
<b>Document review</b>	Input output/performance and budget		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review of the available inputs for project management amongst the different actors involved in the implementation</li> <li>• Has duplication been avoided?</li> <li>• Have outputs been achieved within the planned period and budget?</li> <li>• Indicative Budget: Total: €2.5 million</li> <li>• Responsiveness of consortium members to avail their co-funding contributions in a timely manner?</li> <li>• What has been done/ detail activities in relation to this project intervention (seed support, training, rehabilitation of water schemes, capacity building, support to VSLA, support to cooperatives, peace building, support to forage production, etc.)?</li> </ul>		

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the key issues in Child protection, Gender, SEA etc policy documents, technical working group documents, standardization of designs, baseline, ToR, DBC framework, KABP, Post-harvest handling research report, post training assessment to be followed in relation to this project?</li> <li>• EU delegation guidelines (Resilience, WASH, Gender, Visibility, etc) and procedures</li> <li>• National Policies and Strategies (resilience, DRR) and others relevant to this project</li> <li>• DRMTWG/Regional Task Force Meeting Minutes</li> <li>• ECHO Cluster Coordination Meeting Minutes and associated guidelines.</li> </ul>		
<b>Capacity, management and organization (inputs/activities)</b>					
<b>KII</b>	Coordination /collaboration and arrangement during project implementation	Rep. from partners  Key Project staff (Project and Admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do implementing agencies have adequate capacities for appropriate operation of the project?</li> <li>• Establishment of Technical Working Groups and standardization of approaches, operation modalities, technical designs, etc.</li> <li>• Are available local capacities for the project administration, both in government offices, NGOs, the private sector and traditional institutions (conflict resolution mechanisms through local systems/Geda) exploited in the best way to improve project implementation?</li> <li>• What is the institutional arrangement that is best suited to achieve the project's objectives in terms of output delivery? What in terms of the outcomes? What is the most easily replicable model?</li> <li>• What institutional arrangements and linkages with the roles of Woredas and Kebele offices, and the participation of NGOs in the project's operation are put in place?</li> <li>• Any potential linkage with existing government and Consortium member's projects?</li> <li>• Regularity and level of coordination and appropriate measures between Consortium members</li> <li>• What are the added values of each Consortium member in terms of sharing experiences and enhancing operational efficiency?</li> <li>• How the coordinated approach contributed to enhanced resiliency of target communities?</li> </ul>	As above	As above
<b>KII</b>	Capacities (human/institutional/)	Rep. from partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How relevant has been the capacity building interventions for animal health workers/CAHWs, DAs, traditional institutions, community members, etc.</li> <li>• How successful was the capacity building activities to enable government authorities to better anticipate recurrent shocks in the future and to respond?</li> <li>• What skills and capacity generated thereby leading to an enhanced ability to anticipate (early warning training, system integration), adapt (HH climate change adaptation) and respond (HH/community level reaction or coping to recurrent shocks) to this stress</li> </ul>	As above	As above

			<p>amongst a very vulnerable target group that are prone to and experience multiple/recurrent shocks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How effective was the training provided for government experts in supporting seed producers groups, beekeeping, VSLAs/IGAs, etc. for maintaining local knowledge/capacity building?</li> <li>• How successful has been the capacity building of government staff to effectively manage the project interventions in their respective facility?</li> </ul>		
<b>Impact effectiveness and sustainability (outcomes)</b>					
<b>FGD</b>	Food security, livelihood, asset protection and resilience	Beneficiary Households (male and female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do beneficiaries use the services?</li> <li>• What is the progress towards achieving impact of the project on beneficiary on the level of increased resilience; minimize dependency effect and vulnerability to risk?</li> <li>• Have there been any functional DRR/early warning systems established at community level?</li> <li>• Any initiation by traditional system/community structure with regard to DRR plans?</li> <li>• What is the relative importance of the direct effects obtained through the project?</li> <li>• Do project activities minimize a dependency effect?</li> <li>• What is the effect of the project on households' income?</li> <li>• What is the effect of the project on households' improvement on nutritional status?</li> <li>• What is the effect of the project on improving livestock productivity and animal health?</li> <li>• What is the effect of the project on improving access to water for livestock and human?</li> <li>• What is the relative importance of the direct effects obtained through the promotion of drought resistant and short maturing crop seed varieties?</li> <li>• What is the effect of the project on enhancing community based peace building?</li> <li>• Any indication of unintended impact? What should be done to avert it?</li> </ul>	<b>8-12</b>	As above
Large group discussion	Community wide effects/capacity	Representatives from beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the attribution of the project: the observed changes to the operation like contribution to enhanced resiliency amongst target beneficiaries;</li> <li>• How does the capacity building component of the project brought about changes on access and improvement on service quality like health and extension?</li> <li>• How did the project intervention support the communities to initiate local level peace building/conflict resolution?</li> <li>• Any indications of change in conflict?</li> </ul>	<b>15-20</b>	2 community discussion (at communities who have initiated local level peace building and DRR)
KII	Sustained flow of benefits	Representatives from partner organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What key mechanisms are set in place to link this EU-funded Project with other resilience building development programmes/projects?</li> <li>• What has been done to ensure sustainability at local level (capacity, knowledge, skill, resource building, institutional strengthening, market linkage, etc.)?</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>	As above

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far the project harmonized with the woreda food security and DRR plan?</li> <li>• What successful lessons have been learnt to sustain the project effects from previous resilience building and food security projects?</li> <li>• Any efforts made in accessing other funding sources and link it with phase in programmes/projects like ECHO/RESET/SHARE?</li> <li>• What exit strategies have been put in place for follow-up action after close out of the project by key stakeholders (Region, Zone and Woreda, community)?</li> <li>• How successful has been the capacity building of government staff to roll out future resilience building interventions deemed necessary?</li> <li>• What are the challenges for ensuring sustainability?</li> </ul>		
<b>Synergy and complementarities</b>					
<b>KII</b>	Project linkage/interface with similar interventions	Key Project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any efforts made in accessing other funding sources and link it with phase in programmes/projects like ECHO/RESET/SHARE?</li> <li>• Efforts made to create synergy between DEVCO-SHARE and ECHO interventions under the framework of Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD)</li> <li>• What successful lessons have been employed to sustain the project effects from previous resilience building and food security projects?</li> <li>• What was the linkage and synergy with other projects implemented by consortium members in the target locations like WASH, Nutrition, Health, DRR, livestock development, etc.?</li> </ul>	As above	As above
<b>KII</b>	Handing over	Key Project staff (Project and Admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have project outputs like rehabilitated schemes, cattle troughs, appropriately transferred to the beneficiaries?</li> <li>• Have communities been supported with capacity building to properly manage the transferred communal facilities?</li> <li>• Any documented evidence/appropriate documentation of handing over project outputs?</li> <li>• Are handing over mechanisms consistent among Consortium members?</li> </ul>	As above	As above
<b>KII</b>	Programming lessons	Key Project staff (Project and Admin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were there major bottlenecks that have been a challenge during project implementation?</li> <li>• What successful lessons have been employed to sustain the project effects from previous resilience building and food security projects?</li> <li>• The level of addressing feedbacks provided by the donor through EU Joint Monitoring Visit?</li> <li>• The regularity of review meetings and grant monitoring/review meetings conducted and measures taken to improve project performance</li> <li>• What was the documented evidence and lessons learnt from this project?</li> </ul>	As above	As above
<b>KII</b>	Replicability/s	Key Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What best practices and lessons can be scale up and</li> </ul>	As above	As above

	caling up of best practices	staff (Project and Admin)	<p>replicated in the remaining period of the project implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What evidences has been generated and documented to link emergency response to recovery and long term development intervention?</li> </ul>		
<b>KII</b>	M&E	Key Project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What M&amp;E system implemented, how regular and frequent, was monitoring activities, what was the reporting mechanism and feedback?</li> <li>• Has there been integrated system for data collection, reporting and dissemination in place?</li> <li>• What timely corrective actions have been taken based on monitoring findings (Joint Partner Monitoring Visits/review meetings, EU Joint monitoring missions, partner monitoring visits by GOAL, etc.?)</li> <li>• What was the mechanism for information dissemination – vertical vs. horizontal to all stakeholders?</li> <li>• How have been the results of baseline surveys and barrier analyses, and progress monitoring used in the project implementation?</li> <li>• Any harmonized efforts by the Consortium Partners to maintain appropriate grant compliance (measures taken to comply with the EU regulations during grant review meeting)</li> </ul>	As above	As above
<b>Cross Cutting</b>					
<b>FGD and KII</b>	Gender/Child protection	Key Project staff, Beneficiary women and children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What mechanisms are put in place to ensure mainstreaming of gender and child protection?</li> <li>• Has there been any risk assessment related to child protection?</li> <li>• Did the Consortium Partners apply the EU guidelines with regard to child protection, gender and environment?</li> </ul>	As above	As above

### **Annex 3: List of contacted persons and organizations**

1. Aurelie Carmelle (ACF, Deputy Country Director –Ethiopia, Program
2. Belay Terefe ( GOAL Senior Livelihood Officer)
3. Diriba Insene (GOAL Project Manager)
4. Dr Kasim Guyo (ACF Animal Health & Rangeland Management Officer/Borena)
5. Fistum Teshome (GOAL RUDP Manager)
6. Frehiwot Mezegebu (ACF Food Security & DRR Advisor)
7. Gemechu Deed (GOAL APM)
8. Girma Getachew (GOAL Programme Manager),
9. Roba Jiso (CISP Field Coordinator)
10. Shimelis Bekele (GOAL Livelihoods Advisor)
11. Sofiya Abdela (CISP MEL Officer)
12. Sophia (ACF)
13. Tewodros Hailu (CISP Country Technical Manager)
14. Yeshambel Kinde (GOAL MEL Officer and Focal person for this Evaluation)

## Annex 4: Beneficiary Target and Selection Criteria

### I. Targeting objective

Due to resource limitation it is impossible to address at once the huge demand for economic support of vulnerable populations. Hence, it is necessary to systematically identify the most vulnerable individuals from amongst the target community. Then, objective of targeting is to enable the neediest population be selected and gain the anticipated supports.

#### I. Basic criteria

##### a. Component based:

##### i. Pond/Ela rehabilitation

The following are beneficiary selection criteria for pond/ela rehabilitation;

- Preferably living near to the selected pond/Ela and also user of the pond.
- Poor household head (some other member of the household) that is not currently involving in a similar labor intensive project activity.
- Willing and has capacity to execute the intended work.
- Preferably beneficiaries of PSNP, ECHO funded cluster recovery program etc., in such a way that the support will ensure complementarities and integration.

##### ii. Bush clearing

The following are beneficiary selection criteria for bush clearing activities;

- Preferably near to the selected bush clearing site and also will be user of the rangeland to be rehabilitated.
- Poor household head (some other member of the household) that is not currently involving in a similar labor intensive project activity.
- Has capacity to execute the intended work
- Preferably beneficiaries of PSNP, ECHO funded cluster recovery program etc, in such a way that the support will ensure complementarities and integration.

##### iii. Cash or in-kind disbursement of startup capital for income diversification

Some of the possible income diversification activities foreseen are; cattle fattening, livestock marketing, rearing of small ruminants, beekeeping, production and sale of incense and gum etc.

The following are some of the selection criteria for income diversification beneficiaries;

- Past experience of the beneficiary; preferably poor households who had been involving in the intended activity but unable to improve his/her activities due to shortage of capital.
- Agro ecology of the site where the beneficiary is living (especially for beekeeping and incense production); preferably those households living in forest areas and who had been using traditional bee hives and those who had been traditionally collecting incense etc.
- Poor household who is willing to reach agreement with the existing saving and credit cooperative of the kebele/the area and also willing to pay back the loan as per the agreement.
- Preferably beneficiaries of PSNP, ECHO funded cluster recovery program etc., in such a way that the support will ensure complementarities and integration.

##### iv. Strengthening Village Saving and Loan Association (VSLA)

The following are selection criteria for VSLA beneficiaries;

- Preferably VSLAs that have legal entity
- Preferably VSLAs that have good saving mobilization

- Preferably VSLAs that have good loan recovery performance.
- Preferably VSLAs that have clear and applicable business plans
- Poor households who are willing to organize themselves in VSLA.

#### **b. Women headed household**

The number of women living in poverty has increased disproportionately to that of men due to lots of socio-economic biases against women in both the market and non-market spheres of life. Much of women's burden of work and poverty remains "hidden" to official policies, resources and strategies for reducing poverty. Because women predominate in non-market household activities, they tend to be more adversely affected by shortage of policy, program and resource support from governments and international organizations. This is also due to the fact that much of women's works, especially in subsistence production, informal employment, domestic and reproductive work tends to be 'invisible'. In support of this argument, the World Bank reported that 66% of female activities in developing countries are not counted in the System of National Accounts, while only 24% male activities are left out. Such invisibility deprives women's work consideration in public policy and budgetary allocations. Women tend to specialize in unpaid reproductive or caring labor compared to men, who tend to specialize in paid production activities. Although it is often stated that labor is the Poor's most abundant asset, women are relatively time-poor and much of their work is socially unrecognized since it is unpaid. Even when they are in a paid work, the return to their labor is lower than the return to men's labor and thus women work more on the average but have less command over income and assets.

There are a number of reasons to deal with the welfare of female-headed households. As quoted above women are subjected to discrimination in labour, credit and a variety of other markets and they own less property compared to men. In many African countries including Ethiopia, there has been a significant increase in the percentage of female-headed households in recent years. The main causes include among others; male migration, the deaths of males in civil conflicts and wars, unpartnered adolescent fertility and family disruption.

Thus, in beneficiary targeting of all the activity components outlined above and other supports, priority will be given to poor household head females. If the household head female unable to participate in the activities due to different problems, some other member of the household can exploit the opportunity and be selected. Here it is worth mentioning that the female household head or some other member of the household will be selected provided that they are not currently involving in other labour intensive project activities.

#### **c. Community members critically affected by the drought**

The impact of the 2011 Horn of Africa drought is still being felt in the target areas and livestock holding have not yet recovered. Erratic rainfall damaging crops, heavy rainfall causing high silting which in turn damaging rangeland and ponds resulted in shortage of pasture and water are the major causes that increased vulnerability of the target community through drastically decreasing the number of livestock the affected household owns and the product obtained from the agricultural activities.

Hence, the affected community members who qualify the following issues will be preferably get prior chance to be selected to be beneficiaries of this project;

- Households who have lost majority of their livestock due to the drought (households who own four or less number of livestock).
- Households whose crops were adversely damaged by erratic or heavy rainfall

#### **d. Malnutrition**

Data of malnourished children and poor lactating females will be collected from the kebele's health post and will be used as a reference for the selection. Apparently, priority will be given to members of households with malnourished children and poor lactating females.

#### e. People living with disability

Due to cultural and other social problems in most cases people living with disability are mostly exposed to discriminations from diversified social and economic services. Hence, they are the most disadvantaged groups of the community. This project will contribute its part to minimize such discrimination through provision of prior chance to people living with disability who can work. If the disable individual cannot work there will be possibility of selecting another member of the household who is committed to support that disable person.

## 2. Targeting techniques

The following are some of the beneficiary household targeting techniques:

- **PRA Techniques/wealth ranking/**

PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal) is an operational tool used to map and identify the resources, capabilities, potentials as well as the problems, gaps, and intervention areas and possibilities based on the specific interest area with in any rural community. Accordingly, in our case this technique was selected to identify appropriate targets pertinent to the project to be implemented. Moreover this technique insures the participation of relevant community groups and stakeholders and enables us implement our activities based on the actual problems prioritized by the target communities which subsequently helps us to achieve the intended results. This technique also enables the project to identify individuals, households, groups, and community beneficiaries for all specific project activities.

While selecting beneficiary households using PRA technique (triangulation technique) list of all the households living in the Kebele is necessary and will be collected from Kebele Administration office. This name list of beneficiary households will be categorized as per the number of zones (usually 3) in the Kebele. Once the total name list of the households living in the Kebele is obtained, name of each household will be written three times on a piece of paper (card). To carry out the beneficiary targeting three different groups will be established at Kebele level namely; (1) **Kebele Administrative group**, (2) **Women group** and (3) **other community representatives like elders, traditional leaders, Abba Herega etc as one group**. These three groups will not be informed as if why we need to categorize households (if we inform them ahead of the selection about the specific activity that we need to select households, there might be a bias on allocating households on the category). The reason will be informed for them at the end during mixed group meeting.

All the three groups will be provided with the name list of households living in the Kebele and will first agree on classification categories; **Very poor, Poor, Moderate** and **Rich**. Once they agree on the classification category all the three groups will begin categorizing households as very poor, poor, moderate or rich simultaneously and separately. Facilitators either from NGO staff (Community Facilitators/Development workers) or other partners in the Kebele will be assigned for each group to assist in reading and writing.

Once all the three groups accomplish categorizing households then meeting will be done by mixing participants from all the three groups. At this moment for example if our targets are very poor households then those households categorized under the very poor column by all the three groups will be identified, prioritized and selected first. The result will be triangulated from all the three groups. If the number we need is still not fulfilled we will consider those households categorized as very poor by only two of the groups. Then name list of households targeted for the specific activity will be announced

for the meeting participants and a comment/suggestion/ will be asked from the community about the selected households and the selection will be finalized.

It is advised to conduct targeting using PRA technique at zone level in the Kebele, this can be manageable and it will be conducted on each of the three zones per the Kebele.

The project also has activities in which case we select kebeles among all the target kebeles of the project; therefore in such case we will compare and prioritize based on the findings of PRA from each Kebele.

- **Participatory approach /Community meeting/**

So as to facilitate community ownership of the project emphasis will be given to ensure community participation. Therefore this will be realized through enabling different community groups during undertaking PRA. On such type of beneficiary targeting relevant community members living in the Kebele will be announced and appointed to participate on the targeting process.

- **Verification at household level**

The result obtained from the PRA technique of beneficiary household selection will be verified by a committee through rounding and checking the status of each of the targeted households house to house.

- Focus group and peers group discussion as complimentary action: can also be conducted for further verification of the status of targeted households.

### **3. Methodology**

- **Establish woreda technical committee**

The general objective is to strengthen cooperation among woreda level sectorial line office and EU-share project consortium organizations in implementation of the project in Dire, Dillo, Miyo, Dhas, Moyale and Arero woredas through establishing Woreda Level technical working committee.

The members technical committee offices are composed those sectors which their mandate is in line with consortium's thematic areas of project implementation. The representatives are Woreda Health, Water resource, Pastoral development, cooperative promotion, DPPO, Women & children affairs and Admin Offices are members of this committee.

- **Establish Keble level project committee to support targeting & monitoring of activities & strengthening level of participation.**

The kebeles established committee level supports beneficiary targeting for different project activities. Also, they take part in day to day project implementation and monitoring. The committee members should free any political influence and should not members Kebele cabinets. They should elected by community in general meeting.

- **Establish Keble level partnerships committee :-**

The members of the committee are (Gov- DA, Manager, NGO Staff , HEW, Animal health worker ,Kebele project committee chair person, Kebele chairman, kebele women affairs head) and other actors operating in the area. The objective of building partnership with this people is to acquire the technical support and to make synergy among different development activities intervening in the kebeles by different actors.

- **Establish kebele level appeal committee:**

The main objective is when any problems raised in related to project; the committee investigate the cause and lead the mechanism to find a solution for the problems. Also, when the compliance come from beneficiaries, community and Kebele administration they are responsible to verify, reject and manage the issue with project staffs.

**4. Disclosure of the targeting result**

- Post list of the people will be selected on areas where all can read it
- If possible read list of selected people to community gatherings
- If there will be an appeal on any of the selected beneficiary, the appeal should be presented to the appeal committee within three consecutive day etc.

**5. Cancel (dismissal) of any of the selected individual**

- If the appeal is proved to be true
- If he/she does not properly discharge his/her responsibilities (after getting into works)
- Others (if any)

**6. Replacement of canceled beneficiary**

## Annex 5: List of Reviewed Documents and References

1. CR2B Baseline Assessment Report, May 2015, Borena
2. EU CR2B Logical Framework
3. EU SHARE Status Report as of Dec. 2015
4. EU-CR2B Project Interim Report, July 2014-July 28, 2015
5. EU-CR2B Project Consortium members Meeting minutes, Nov. 10, 2014
6. GOAL Ethiopia-SHARE –ARCE e3b-Full Proposal-Revised Final 04062014
7. ACF EU Cr2B Quarter Report, Oct-Dec. 2015
8. Activity Mapping Report
9. Borena Cluster Field Level ToR-Final 14,2014 (2)
10. Edited Beneficiary Targeting (2)4
11. EU-SHARE Field Level Technical Working Group ToR
12. Implementation Guideline
13. ToR for Internal Joint Monitoring of CR2B Project
14. GOAL 2<sup>nd</sup> Year, 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter (Oct.-Dec. 2015) Activity Progress Report, Dec. 2015, Yabello
15. Different Cluster and Consortium meeting minutes
16. Borena ARCE Assessment , August 2013
17. Borena Interim Evaluation Report
18. EU CR2B Project April 2015 monthly report
19. Field Visit report-Dirre Project Office, March 13, 2015
20. GOAL EU SHARE Project Plan Vs Accomplishment for BoFED
21. The EC SHARE call for proposal and a brief presentation on the Ethiopia Programme, European Union Delegation to Ethiopia Document, February 2013.
22. A grant Contract Agreement, European Union Delegation to Ethiopia and GOAL, December, 2013.
23. EC SHARE Guideline for applicants, European Union Delegation to Ethiopia, July 2013.
24. The EU approach to Resilience: Learning From Food Security Crises, European Commission, October 2012
25. Humanitarian Protection, DG ECHO Funding Guideline, September 2009.
26. DG ECHO, Thematic Policy Document No 5, DRR, Increasing Resilience by Reducing Disaster Risk in Humanitarian Action, DG ECHO, September 2013
27. DG ECHO, Thematic Policy Document No 5, Cash and Vouchers, Increasing efficiency and effectiveness across al sectors, DG ECHO, 2013.
28. DG ECHO, Thematic Policy Document No 2, Water Sanitation and Hygiene, Meeting the Challenges of rapidly increasing humanitarian needs in WASH, ECHO, May 2014.
29. Gender and Age Marker Toolkit, 2013 ECHO
30. Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action in, Child Protection Working Group, 2012
31. Communication and Visibility Manual for European Funded Humanitarian Aid Actions, Echo, January 2014
32. Commission Staff Working Document- Children in Emergency and Crisis Situation, Commission of the European Communities, 2008.
- 33.
34. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia ,Ethiopia’s Climate-Resilient Green Economy Strategy, June 2011
35. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, National Policy and Strategy on Disaster Risk Management, March 2009.