

# Evaluation of NRC Food Security and Livelihoods Projects in Chipinge and Chiredzi Districts, Zimbabwe, 2011-12

Consultancy Report to the Norwegian Refugee Council



*Dr. Deborah Gourlay*  
BSc, MSc, MBA, PhD  
Consultancy Services

Final Report, 16<sup>th</sup> October 2012

## Acknowledgements

The consultant would like to thank the NRC Zimbabwe country team, District and Ward officials, and the people of Chiredzi and Chipinge for their participation in providing the information required for this study. In particular the consultant is indebted to Tonderai Mushipe, NRC Food Security and Livelihoods M&E Officer and Mugove Mutukwa, NRC Livelihoods Project Officer, for the considerable time spent assisting with mobilization of communities for evaluation visits, supporting the evaluation team in undertaking field visits, for their insights into the local conditions and the history of the NRC food security and livelihoods programs, and for their hospitality. Thanks also to Dr William Murdoch for technical assistance in consolidating returns and inputting of the considerable amounts of data collected.

## Glossary

ARDA	Agricultural and Rural Development Authority
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CBP	Community Based Planning
CCT	Conditional cash Transfer
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
GAS	Global Agricultural Services
HAPPDA	Humanitarian Assistance and Protection to People Displaced in Africa
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
ISAL	Internal Savings and Lending
LIG	Low Input Gardens
NMFA	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
UCT	Unconditional Cash Transfer

## Contents

1.	Rationale.....	1
2.	Methodology .....	1
3.	Relevance / Appropriateness .....	1
4.	Impacts.....	3
4.1	Impacts On Household Nutrition and Food Security.....	3
4.2	Impacts On Household Income and Expenditure .....	4
4.3	Impacts On Household Assets .....	5
4.4	Impacts On Household Relationships.....	6
4.4	Impacts On Community Relationships.....	7
4.4	Impacts On Integration of IDPs / Returnees.....	8
4.4	Other Impacts .....	8
5.	Efficiency .....	8
5.1	Overview.....	8
5.2	Conditional Cash Grants .....	9
5.3	Unconditional Cash Grants .....	10
5.4	Low Input Gardens (LIG) .....	10
5.5	Market Linkages / Partnerships with the Private Sector .....	11
5.6	Small Livestock Pass-On Program .....	12
5.7	Conservation Agriculture (CA) .....	13
5.8	Monitoring and Evaluation .....	14
5.9	Project Management and Administration .....	15
6.	Effectiveness .....	15
7.	Sustainability / Connectedness.....	16
8.	Cross-Cutting Issues .....	18
9.	Adherence to Sphere Standards .....	19
10.	Partnerships with Government Stakeholders.....	20
11.	NRC Project Staff Support and Development.....	20
12.	Conclusions.....	21
	Appendix 1: Review of Existing Data Sources .....	22
	Appendix 2: Persons Interviewed and Places Visited .....	24
	Appendix 3: Additional Background to Recommendations Efficiency .....	25
	Appendix 4: Causes of impacts on household and community relationships .....	30
	Appendix 5: Breakdown of Beneficiary Numbers and Demographics .....	31
	Appendix 6: Evaluation Terms of Reference.....	33

## Executive Summary

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and results/impact of the NRC's food security projects to the targeted IDPs and host communities in Zimbabwe.

The scope of this evaluation was defined as NRC food security and livelihoods projects in Chiredzi and Chipinge Districts of Zimbabwe from January 2011 to August 2012. In particular, this included conditional cash transfers linked to income generating activities, unconditional cash transfers, small livestock pass on project, low input gardens, conservation agriculture, and market linkages to support displaced communities to achieve self-reliance and household food security.

A total of 717 beneficiaries (310 in Chiredzi, and 407 in Chipinge) participated in the evaluation process, through a mixture of Focus Group Discussions, individual interviews and visits to some income generating projects established.

**Overall, the project was successful in its primary goal of contributing to the durable resettlement and integration of internally displaced people and returnees by improving their food security and access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities.**

- 84% of beneficiaries reported increased acceptance of IDPs / returnees within the host community.
- 99.6% of beneficiaries rated the type of assistance they received as "good" (11%) or "very good" (88.6%) at meeting their needs.
- 84% of beneficiaries reported consuming an increased quantity of food, and 77% reported consuming an increased variety of food. Most of those not reporting an increase were goat recipients, where income benefits have not yet been realized.
- Average number of meals eaten per day is estimated to have risen from 1.9 to 2.6.
- 26% of beneficiaries reported an increase in the number of assets owned. In 1% of cases assets declined, mainly due to the need to provide inputs for livestock project (e.g. medicines / feeds).

Community based planning was effective in identifying local needs and priorities, and was successful in gaining acceptance and ownership of the Ward Plans by key stakeholders including beneficiaries and local government agencies.

There was a clear consensus that the same targeting process should be used in future as it was 'fair' and 'unbiased' and was understood by all.

Strong positive impacts were identified on the quantity and variety of food consumed within households, which increased overall in 83.5% and 77% of households respectively. The strongest improvements were found within the Low Input Garden program where 100% of households interviewed reported that both quantity and variety of food consumed had increased, and the Conditional Cash Transfer where over 99% increased both the quantity and variety of foods consumed. In contrast, in the small livestock program (particularly the goat component) the benefits of the program on income and nutrition are largely yet to be realized.

Most households had increased their income, with the greatest impact being for conditional cash transfers / IGAs and low input gardens, where 92% and 79% respectively reported an increase. However, this may partially reflect the fact that where households produced more of their own food (e.g. LIGs), thus releasing income previously spent on food for other purposes, this was not usually seen as an increase in income by beneficiaries as cash coming into the household had not changed. Most additional income received was spent on food (50.2%) and education (36.1%) (Table 4.6). A significant proportion was also invested in productive assets contributing to long term self-sufficiency.

The impacts of the programs on household relationships have been overwhelmingly positive, with 94% stating that relationships within the households had improved. Significant improvements in relationships within the communities were also recorded, with 77.7% stating that these had

improved a little (12.2%) or a lot (75.5%). Only 1.4% of respondents felt that relationships had got slightly worse, mainly due to jealousy amongst those excluded. 84% of beneficiaries reported increased acceptance of IDPs / returnees within the host community. Factors affecting acceptance of IDPs / returnees mirrored those cited above as influencing community relationships. Key aspects specific to IDP acceptance included improvement of living standards and livestock ownership led to them being better regarded, and they were seen as bringing positive benefits to the community. Increased self-sufficiency amongst IDPs had also reduced begging, which improved integration and enabled them to help out others in need / contribute to funerals, increasing acceptance.

Overall, the NRC program has operated efficiently and has achieved significant progress in delivering its objectives within tight constraints of resource availability and short project duration.

Overall, sustainability of the livelihood programs was high. Around 97% of beneficiaries stated that they planned to continue with the livelihood activities initiated by the NRC project after the end of the program. The only livelihood activity where a small number of beneficiaries said they would not continue was layer poultry activities initiated under the market linkages program. The reason for not continuing was given as inability to access inputs (birds on credit) after the end of the project, since although GAS is willing to continue providing layers to farmers 'on credit', they will require larger numbers (e.g. 200 per farmer) in order to achieve higher profitability.

The main concerns identified were:

- Unlike the conditional cash program, the unconditional cash program lacks a defined sustainability component or exit strategy and the funds provided were insufficient to enable beneficiaries to plan ahead. Consequently they consistently reported difficulty in maintaining food consumption when payments ended. In many cases, children who had enrolled in school during the payments were withdrawn again when the payments ended.
- The low number of goats distributed per beneficiary, combined with the pass-on element, meant that gains in beneficiary nutritional status or income have not yet been realized by beneficiaries. This further exacerbated by disease incidences and significant mortality rates partly due to neglect and lack of supervision or monitoring.

The implementation period of 1 year was not adequate to achieve all the intended impacts. In some cases this resulted in projects terminating before they were yielding the intended benefits (e.g. small livestock) or before a complete 'life cycle' could be completed (CA / crop rotation). Key recommendations for improvement of future projects are listed below.

#### Conditional Cash Grants

- Support beneficiaries to obtain the required trading permits / licences to avoid them coming into conflict with the law.
- Consider potential for supporting beneficiary-led solutions to accessibility / transport difficulties through joint input sourcing and transportation of produce.

#### Unconditional Cash Transfers (2011-2012 only)

- Future unconditional cash transfer programs should include an exit / sustainability strategy.
- To ensure fairness and transparency, ensure adequate and easily accessible systems for dealing with beneficiary concerns, especially in relation to non-receipt of the correct cash grant amount. If for some reason the beneficiary is no longer entitled to the payment, the reasons must be made clear to them. Follow-ups should be made where non-collection occurs, especially amongst vulnerable groups.
- The capacity of the markets to respond to increased demand generated by the cash transfer should be assessed before implementing future unconditional cash transfer programs.

#### Low Input Gardens

- Consider providing separate boreholes for community use and LIG use in areas where demand for water is most intense. This would relieve pressure on LIG use of boreholes, and the enhanced community gains from the project may further improve community relationships.
- Improve timing of garden establishment / planting to reduce pest and disease problems.
- Consider increasing the number of tools / equipment distributed.

### Market Linkages

- All future partnerships should be clearly defined in an MOU between the private sector partner and NRC, to clearly articulate the responsibilities and obligations of both parties.
- Support beneficiaries to obtain the required trading permits / licences to avoid them coming into conflict with the law.
- Consider providing marketing training / training in establishing links with private sector, to enable them to diversify their outlets independently and thus increase sustainability.
- Consider facilitating the establishment of Coordinating Committees to negotiate with buyers.

### Small Livestock Distribution (2011-2012 only)

- Consider adopting a voucher-based, or conditional cash grant approach in future goat distribution programs. Goat purchases should be timed to help goats adapt to the climate.
- Consider providing a larger number of does (ideally 5), and omit the pass on element to ensure impacts are achievable over a shorter time-frame.
- Proper advance vaccination, care in transport / minimising stress on birds, and need for quarantining should all be addressed in future projects to minimise disease outbreaks.
- Consider providing support for training in feed production from own crops in future projects.
- Improved monitoring to ensure project resources are not being misused.

### Conservation Agriculture

- Ensure inputs (seeds and tools) are provided at the correct time.
- Ensure input quantities are matched to the land area cultivated and beneficiaries are adequately trained in the correct planting densities / application rates to avoid shortages.
- Ensure cultural acceptability of seed types by advance consultation with community.
- Continue use of demonstration plot approach in training for conservation agriculture.
- Consider measures to reduce labour intensity, such as mechanised CA trials, or by issuing more hoes to allow “team-working” by families.

### Monitoring and Evaluation:

- Ensure that adequate budgetary provision for M&E activities is built into all project proposals, including provision for appropriate staffing resources.
- Enhance existing M&E structures by increased in-house provision or partnership approaches.
- More frequent field monitoring visits involving District level stakeholders would help reinforce capacity building / participation of local stakeholders in continuing support to beneficiaries.

### Management and Administration

- Consider adopting a single work plan approach, covering both Food Security and Livelihoods programs and other NRC Core Competences, particularly Community Based Planning (CBP). The strong synergies between these Competences could be strengthened through a single work plan approach.
- Better coordination with other NGOs providing TOTs to the same stakeholders could be achieved by increased sharing of information, to avoid duplication of trainings for the same target stakeholder groups.
- Consider adopting standardized reporting structures / frameworks
- A longer term approach is required to increase and consolidate the tangible benefits achieved.

### Cross Cutting Issues

- There is a need for staff to consciously address issues of ensuring adequate inclusion of women in meetings, decision making and registration processes.
- Ensure mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS awareness and create a secure and accessible environment that enables /supports vulnerable groups to come forward and participate.

## 1. Rationale

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and results / impact of the NRC's food security projects to the targeted IDPs and host communities in Zimbabwe. The scope of the study was defined as NRC food security and livelihoods projects in Chiredzi and Chipinge Districts from January 2011 to August 2012. This included conditional cash transfers linked to income generating activities, unconditional cash transfers, small livestock pass on project, low input gardens, conservation agriculture, and market linkages to support displaced communities to achieve self-reliance and household food security. Full details of the Terms of Reference for the study are contained in Appendix 4.

## 2. Methodology

The methodology for this study included:

- a desk based review of relevant secondary data sources, including: project proposals, reports and other documents associated with the program. Relevant documents are listed in Appendix 1.
- field visits to various project sites in Chiredzi and Chipinge.
- interviews with stakeholders, including key Government departments, Ward officials, and beneficiaries in each district. The latter included household surveys, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. A list of stakeholder interviews conducted is contained in Appendix 2.
- Interviews with NGOs working in the vicinity who are not partnering with NRC.

Independent enumerators conducted beneficiary interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) between 3<sup>rd</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> September 2012. A total of 717 beneficiaries (310 in Chiredzi, and 407 in Chipinge) participated in the evaluation process, through a mixture of Focus Group Discussions, individual interviews and visits to some income generating projects established (see Appendix 5 for details).

## 3. Relevance / Appropriateness

**Overall, the project was successful in its primary goal of contributing to the durable resettlement and integration of internally displaced people and returnees by improving their food security and access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities.**

- 84% of beneficiaries reported increased acceptance of IDPs / returnees within the host community.
- 99.6% of beneficiaries rated the type of assistance they received as "good" (11%) or "very good" (88.6%) at meeting their needs.
- 84% of beneficiaries reported consuming an increased quantity of food, and 77% reported consuming an increased variety of food. Most of those not reporting an increase were goat recipients, where income benefits have not yet been realized.
- Average number of meals eaten per day is estimated to have risen from 1.9 to 2.6.
- 26% of beneficiaries reported an increase in the number of assets owned. In 1% of cases assets declined, mainly due to the need to provide inputs for livestock project (e.g. medicines / feeds).

Community based planning was effective in identifying local needs and priorities. It ensured acceptance / ownership of the Ward Plans by key stakeholders, e.g. beneficiaries and local government agencies.

Key learning points related to the appropriateness of project components were:

- the short term nature of the unconditional cash program and absence of a formal exit strategy meant that 66% of beneficiaries had problems maintaining food consumption after cash distributions ended, and children who had been enrolled in school were thus withdrawn again.
- the low number of goats distributed per beneficiary (2 does), combined with the pass-on element, means that income and nutrition benefits have not yet been realized. Some beneficiaries have experienced reductions in income and assets due to costs of livestock medicines, etc.
- the ability of markets to respond to increased demand was not assessed prior to the cash-based programs, leading to shortages of some commodities. Whilst adverse effects were not significant on this occasion, future response planning should include an assessment of response capacity.

**Selected Beneficiary Responses:**

- “Only those who can cooperate with others should be included, and those who cannot do group work left out.”
- “Everyone should be made aware of the project so they also make efforts to be included.”
- “Some people included did not yield anything, some because of laziness.”
- People should be “given turns, so that those who were not included are also given a chance to benefit”
- “some are too old to walk far to attend the meeting”
- “Chronically ill patients / HIV did not want to come out for fear of stigmatisation.

**Targeting of Beneficiaries**

The use of community based processes in targeting of beneficiaries seems in general to have been very successful and accepted by beneficiaries. The targeting process was understood by everyone, and was adjudged to be fair by all.

Exclusion problems cited mainly concerned those left out due to limited funds / numbers eligible. In the target communities many others are at similar levels of need, and beneficiaries sympathised with those excluded and wished the project to be expanded to include more of the community members.

There were several reports that some deserving people did not attend selection meetings (due to old age, illness, disability, or not being aware of the meeting), and were therefore missed out. This seemed particularly prevalent within the unconditional cash program in Chipinge. Some chronically ill patients / HIV were reported not to have come out for fear of stigmatisation, and several reports stated the physically disabled were not included. In some cases ID

requirements excluded people from the beneficiary list (“chronically ill patients had no cards when selection took place”). There was one report of a specific household which should have been included but was not (an “orphan in need”, Ward 15 Chipinge) .

Almost all beneficiaries felt no one had been wrongly included. The few adverse observations included:

- one Conditional Cash Grant beneficiary disappeared shortly after receiving the cash;
- one household in Chipinge Ward 12 was reported as included without clear reasons;
- several reports of people who ‘do not want to work’, or are ‘not willing to cooperate with others in group work’, and “should be excluded”;
- one Market Linkages beneficiary interviewed was in a relatively high wealth group, with a monthly income of \$500 before the project and \$800 / month after participation.
- Some conservation agriculture beneficiaries allegedly emigrated to South Africa during the period between registration and distributions.
- too many host community were included in the beneficiary list in one Ward in Chipinge, to the detriment of NRC’s key target groups of IDPs and Returnees. This was due to failure of project staff to verify beneficiary lists developed by the community processes.

**There was a clear consensus that the same targeting process should be used in future as it was ‘fair’ and ‘unbiased’ and was understood by all.**

Key Recommendations:

**Checks to make sure vulnerable groups are aware of the selection process and able to attend future targeting meetings are recommended.**

**All beneficiary lists arising from external or community processes should be verified by NRC.**

## 4. Impacts

### 4.1 Impacts On Household Nutrition and Food Security

Strong positive impacts were identified on the quantity and variety of food consumed within households, which increased overall in 83.5% and 77% of households respectively. The strongest improvements were found within the Low Input Garden program where 100% of households interviewed reported that both quantity and variety of food consumed had increased, and the Conditional Cash Transfer where over 99% increased both the quantity and variety of foods consumed. In contrast, in the small livestock program (particularly the goat component) the benefits of the program on income and nutrition are yet to be realized, and expenses such as livestock medications have in a few cases actually decreased income and thus nutrition. The only other incidence recorded of a decline was one individual in the Market Linkages program who had shifted their resources into the farming of the sorghum seeds distributed, which then failed to yield the expected output due to adverse weather conditions (drought).

Excluding the Small Livestock component from the total figures indicates that across all other program elements the quantity of food consumed has increased in 98.2% of households, and variety of food consumed has increased in 90% of households. Thus it is likely that once the benefits of the small livestock program start to accrue the combined average will rise significantly.

**Table 4.1 How has the quantity of foods consumed in the household changed during the project?**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	99.3	0.7	0.0	143
Low Input Gardens	100.0	0.0	0.0	132
Small Livestock	26.7	72.6	0.7	146
Market Linkages	92.8	6.2	1.0	97
Income Generating Activities /CCT <sup>1</sup>	98.4	1.6	0.0	62
Unconditional Cash Transfer	99.2	0.8	0.0	129
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>709</b>
<b>Total Excluding Small Livestock</b>	<b>98.2</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>563</b>

1. CCT = Conditional Cash Transfer

**Table 4.2 How has the variety of foods consumed in the household changed during the project?**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	69.9	30.1	0.0	143
Low Input Gardens	100	0.0	0.0	139
Small Livestock	26.0	74.0	0.0	146
Market Linkages	92.8	7.2	0.0	97
Income Generating Activities /CCT	90.3	9.7	0.0	62
Unconditional Cash Transfer	99.2	0.8	0.0	129
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	<b>77.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>716</b>
<b>Total Excluding Small Livestock</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>570</b>

For all programs except unconditional cash, specific questions were asked to identify changes in consumption of project-related produce had increased (Table 4.3). Again, there was a marked increase in consumption of these products, the exception being small livestock where only 22% of households reported an increase in consumption of livestock products.

**Table 4.3 Changes in consumption of project-related produce.**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)	Number (N)
<b>Has the variety of Home Grown Crops consumed changed?</b>				
Conservation Agriculture	97.9	2.1	0.0	143
Low Input Gardens	100	0.0	0.0	139
Market Linkages	69.1	29.9	1.0	97
<b>Has the quantity of Livestock Products consumed changed?</b>				
Small Livestock	21.9	76.7	1.4	146
<b>Has the variety of Home Produced Foods consumed changed?</b>				
Income Generating Activities /CCT	82.4	17.6	0.0	17

Average number of meals eaten per day is estimated to have risen from 1.9 to 2.6. However, some households reported that even though the number of meals were eating had remained static the quantity of food consumed at those meals had increased. The projects were also seen as increasing people's access to a balanced diet.

In spite of the clear benefits indicated above, showing that immediate food insecurity has fallen considerably, very few households classed themselves as having achieved longer term food security (5.3%) in terms of being secure for the coming year. Most have enough food supplies to last them for less than 3 months. This is perhaps unsurprising in that most of the livelihood activities provide an ongoing monthly income rather than an annual yield, and so rely on the continuing success of those activities to maintain food availability. Any shocks to the household or its livelihood activity would thus find the household with only a limited food stockpile to fall back on.

The main concern in relation to nutritional impacts relates to unconditional cash beneficiaries, where the short term nature of the payments, and lack of a clear sustainability component, meant that 65.6% had difficulty in maintaining food consumption after the cash distributions ended. In these households the number of meals consumed per day rose from 1.7 before the project to 2.9 during the cash distributions, then fell back to 2.15 after the cash distributions ended. This does however indicate some residual impact, which may be attributable to the fact that some invested at least part of the productive assets.

## 4.2 Impacts On Household Income and Expenditure

Most households had increased their income, with the greatest impact being for conditional cash transfers / IGAs and low input gardens, where 92% and 79% respectively reported an increase. However, this may partially reflect the fact that where households produced more of their own food (e.g. LIGs), thus releasing income previously spent on food for other purposes, this was not usually seen as an increase in income by beneficiaries as cash coming into the household had not changed.

**Table 4.4 Has your household income changed due to the project?**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	42.2	57.8	0.0	147
Low Input Gardens	79.1	20.9	0.0	139
Small Livestock	17.7	81.6	0.7	147
Market Linkages	70.1	29.9	0.0	97
Income Generating Activities /CCT	91.9	8.1	0.0	62
Unconditional Cash Transfer	75.2	24.0	0.8	129
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>721</b>
<b>Total Excluding Small Livestock</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>574</b>

**Table 4.5 Changes in average monthly income**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Before the project (US\$)	Now (US\$)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	25.95	44.63	147
Low Input Gardens	27.40	70.60	139
Small Livestock	24.78	39.18	147
Market Linkages	21.10	38.87	97
Income Generating Activities /CCT	21.22	72.48	62
Unconditional Cash Transfer	12.89	28.80	128

Most additional income received was spent on food (50.2%) and education (36.1%) (Table 4.6). A significant proportion was also invested in productive assets contributing to long term self-sufficiency.

**Table 4.6 What was any extra income spent on? (%)**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Food Items (%)	Edu-cation (%)	Health (%)	HH Assets (%)	Productive Assets / IGAs (%)	Constru -ction/ Shelter	Other (%)
Conservation Agriculture	47.0	38.8	4.5	1.6	3.3	4.8	0.0
Low Input Gardens	47.8	35.0	3.2	3.0	9.8	0.9	0.2
Small Livestock	55.2	31.2	12.7	0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Market Linkages <sup>1</sup>	35.4	32.3	7.6	1.1	13.4	9.1	1.1
Income Generating Activities	39.6	37.5	5.2	5.2	9.9	0.0	2.6
Unconditional Cash Transfer	53.0	25.9	8.0	7.1	6.1	0.0	0.0
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	<b>50.2</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>

1. Excludes one outlier of a wealthy household which spent \$500 on 2 cows, 2 donkeys and 5 goats.

“We survived hunger as we could buy food. Also my wife was able to survive as we could send her to hospital. Without the cash from NRC I would have lost my wife.” *Unconditional Cash Beneficiary, Ward 16 Chiredzi*

Unsurprisingly, unconditional cash and small livestock beneficiaries spent a greater proportion of the income on food items. The other main component of expenditure was health, including one case where the beneficiary stated his wife would have died if he had not had access to the unconditional cash grant received from NRC.

### 4.3 Impacts On Household Assets

Slightly over a quarter of beneficiaries had seen an increase in their household assets. This was most marked amongst Low Input Garden beneficiaries and Conditional Cash Transfer beneficiaries.

**Table 4.4 Have your household assets changed since the start of the project?**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	9.0	91.0	0.0	89
Low Input Gardens	66.2	33.8	0.0	136
Small Livestock	3.2	94.9	1.9	156
Market Linkages	27.6	69.7	2.6	76
Income Generating Activities /CCT	48.4	50.0	1.6	62
Unconditional Cash Transfer	12.3	86.9	0.8	130
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	<b>26.2</b>	<b>72.7</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>649</b>

In cases where a decline was recorded, this was due to selling assets to buy inputs (medicine for goats, feed for chickens), or plates being broken by use as chicken feeders. The exception to this was unconditional cash beneficiaries, where assets were sold to buy food and pay health expenses.

#### 4.4 Impacts On Household Relationships

The impacts of the programs on household relationships have been overwhelmingly positive, with 94% stating that relationships within the households had improved. A few in each group saw no change, some stating that their household was already happy before the project. The most significant causes of improvements were related to food, primarily in terms of increased availability and then of variety and quality. The latter was most prominent amongst Low Impact Gardeners. There was also significant mention of improvements related to school attendance, mostly due to related to fees now being affordable, but also increased ability to provide uniforms and materials for school.

The exception to this was in the Small Livestock beneficiaries, who have not yet seen an improvement in income. This group do not mention significantly relationship factors due to food or school attendance, but do indicate a strong improvement in levels of happiness, satisfaction and in some cases status / self esteem as a result of livestock ownership. This aspect is not mentioned significantly by any other group.

**Table 4.5 Has participating in the project had any impacts on relationships in the household?**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Much Worse (%)	Slightly Worse (%)	No Change (%)	Improved Slightly (%)	Improved a Lot (%)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	0.0	0.7	3.4	17.8	78.1	146
Low Input Gardens	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	98.6	139
Small Livestock	0.0	0.0	14.2	7.1	78.7	155
Market Linkages	0.0	1.0	2.1	4.1	92.8	97
Income Generating Activities	0.0	0.0	16.1	4.8	79.0	62
Unconditional Cash Transfer	0.0	0.0	2.3	4.6	93.1	130
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	0.0	0.3	5.9	7.0	86.8	729

Reasons for impacts on relationships in the household (ranked according to the frequency with which they were mentioned) were:

1. Less worry about food / more food in the household
2. Increased affordability of school fees / improved school attendance
3. Joy from possession of livestock
4. Increased income and living standards
5. Better quality and variety of food
6. Increased happiness and peace of mind
7. Working together / shared decision making / helping each other
8. Increased access to soap, clothes and other non-food items
9. Decreased conflict / better relationships
10. Increased ability to afford school materials and uniforms
11. Better health / access to medicine
12. Increased status from livestock ownership
13. Access to clean water.

Most groups had seen benefits from working together as a result of the project activities. Most also saw some improvement in standards of living and the ability to procure health care and non-food items such as soap and clothing. The one reason cited for a worsening of relationships was due to children forgetting to care for hens or stealing eggs because they felt it was unfair they could not eat eggs although they were looking after the chickens.

A detailed breakdown of the number of times the factors were mentioned disaggregated by project type is contained in Appendix 4.

#### 4.4 Impacts On Community Relationships

The projects have generated significant improvements in relationships within the communities, with 77.7% stating that these had improved a little (12.2%) or a lot (75.5%). Only 1.4% of respondents felt that relationships had got slightly worse.

**Table 4.7 Has participating in the project had any impacts on relationships in the household?**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Much Worse (%)	Slightly Worse (%)	No Change (%)	Improved Slightly (%)	Improved a Lot (%)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	0	0	2.6	27.6	69.8	116
Low Input Gardens	0	0	2.1	0.7	97.2	141
Small Livestock	0	5.8	31.4	2.6	60.3	156
Market Linkages	0	1.0	1.0	35.1	62.9	97
Income Generating Activities	0	0	21.3	3.3	75.4	61
Unconditional Cash Transfer	0	0	7	12	109	128
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	0.0	1.4	10.9	12.2	75.5	699

A significant number in all groups agreed there has been benefits to the community arising from increased working together, and an increase in sharing, exchanging and lending between community members. This related not just to material goods, but also to sharing of ideas and skills. Increased trust within the community had increased opportunities for borrowing and lending and the giving of credit. There has also been increased interactions between different members of the community, leading to new friendships and a strengthening of existing friendships. The community has also benefited from a decrease in the level of begging and a reduced feeling of dependence on others. This was particularly noted by recipients of conditional and unconditional cash grants.

Reasons for improvements in community relationships (ranked according to the frequency with which they were mentioned) were:

1. Increased sharing / lending / exchanging, and helping each other
2. Working together
3. Sharing skills and ideas
4. Increased friendships / strengthening of existing friendships
5. No longer begging / dependent of others
6. Happy for others
7. Ownership of animals / more animals / better quality animals in the community
8. Increased esteem in the eyes of the community
9. Increased sense of belonging together
10. Improved trust / more ability to borrow or give credit
11. Sharing of the borehole
12. More interaction due to trade / passing on livestock
13. Reduction in theft

The exception was small livestock beneficiaries who saw the ownership of livestock and the status that that gives as the key factor enhancing community relationships. One even declared that the community was “now rich”. This group had the most respondents seeing little or no change in community relations.

There were indications of tensions arising from resentment amongst people who were not included from the project (the main cause of worsening relationships, mentioned 14 times). A small number of tensions resulted from isolated incidents such as pigs getting into neighbours gardens, disputes over the sharing of borehole water, and delays / perceived failures to act in good faith in the passing on of goats.

A detailed breakdown of the number of times the factors were mentioned disaggregated by project type is contained in Appendix 4.

#### 4.4 Impacts On Integration of IDPs / Returnees

84% of beneficiaries reported increased acceptance of IDPs / returnees within the host community. In addition to benefits of working together on projects, the Small Community Grant element also benefited relationships by easing pressures on some services (e.g. new classroom / clinic etc. provided).

**Table 4.9 Has the project increase acceptance of IDPs / Returnees within the host community?**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	Increased (%)	Same (%)	Decreased (%)	Number (N)
<b>Total (All Programs)</b>	83.8	15.9	0.3	659

Factors affecting acceptance of IDPs / returnees mirrored those cited above as influencing community relationships. Key aspects specific to IDP acceptance included:

- Improvement of their living standards and livestock ownership led to them being better regarded
- IDPs now seen as bringing positive benefits to the community (livestock, boreholes, livelihood programs, community grants)
- The host community now interact with the IDPs and “view them as people”.
- Greater self-sufficiency amongst IDPs and thus reduced begging has improved integration.
- IDPs are now able to help out others in need / contribute to funerals, increasing acceptance.

#### 4.4 Other Impacts

The projects were seen as bringing ideas and learning which are shared with and benefit the wider community (e.g. mulching of crops under conservation agriculture, which increased yields). Other community members are now copying conservation farming ideas.

One unintended negative impact cited by several livestock beneficiaries was their perception that the indigenous chicken project had “brought disease” which affected the poultry within the community leading to many deaths amongst the birds already owned by the community. More details of this are covered in Appendix 3. It is probable that the poultry distributed were struck by disease already within the community, as health checks were conducted by the Ministry of Livestock Health and Development prior to distribution, which declared the birds disease free. However errors, particularly in transportation and vaccination, led to them being highly susceptible to disease, and they therefore acted as a reservoir for the rapid spread of the existing disease pool. Local perceptions are that the NRC birds brought and spread the disease.

Beneficiaries saw the increase in numbers of livestock in the community as a major benefit and equated this with increased wealth. Increased food security resulting from the ability to slaughter livestock in the event of food shortages was mentioned by beneficiaries. Other benefits identified by beneficiaries were manure for the gardens, increased production from the garden, more breeding stock, better breeds introduced, and the satisfaction of owning livestock.

## 5. Efficiency

### 5.1 Overview

Overall, the NRC program has operated efficiently and has achieved significant progress in delivering its objectives within tight constraints of resource availability and short project duration.

The political sensitivities of a locally unfamiliar agency working within the resettlement areas and targeting displaced persons led to initial resistance and delays from authorities. Since the program’s inception NRC has been very successful in building the trust of authorities and communities which is necessary to operate within these areas, and is now an established and accepted development partner.

The key findings related to efficiency of the programs, and recommendations for enhancing efficiency in future programs of a similar nature, are summarised below. For additional details of the project background leading to these recommendations, refer to Appendix 3 of this report.

## 5.2 Conditional Cash Grants

All of the beneficiaries interviewed felt the conditions attached to the grant were clearly explained, fair and easy to comply with. However they all felt the amount of money received (\$50 the first month, and \$25 the second month) was not adequate. Most (70.2%) travelled less than 5km to receive the cash and none travelled more than 10km. All walked to the site. Most walked for not more than one hour (51%), and 93% walked not more than 2 hours. A minority (7%) took between 2 and 4 hours to walk to the site. Beneficiaries were quickly and efficiently dealt with at the distribution site, with 41% taking less than 1 hour to receive their money, 82% less than 2 hours, and only 3.6% took more than 4 hours.

Due to the remoteness of some of the target wards distances travelled to purchase inputs were high, with 84% of beneficiaries travelling 20 km or more to purchase inputs, and 30% travelling more than 30km. Some, such as dressmaking enterprises, were sourcing materials from as far as Harare. In spite of this, only 13% felt they had problems in accessing the goods they required for their business. Only 3% of beneficiaries reported price changes they attributed to the project – an increase in the prices of pigs and chickens needed to start the project.

All beneficiaries rated the help they received in establishing their IGA as “good” (10.7%) or “very good” (89.3%). 83.3% were able to pursue their preferred IGA, although 16.7% reported being unable to do so due to the funds provided being insufficient. Some reported that buying inferior equipment, or a lack of equipment due to the low level of funds available was affecting their business (e.g. second hand sewing machines which break down, lack of poultry feeders and solar lights for tending livestock at night).

A key issues was distances to viable markets for selling produce and sourcing inputs. In remoter areas (e.g. Chipinge Ward 15) the development and expansion of IGAs is hampered by the long distances to viable markets, poor road infrastructure and transport services, and a lack of coordination amongst beneficiaries (e.g. in transporting inputs and outputs from / to markets).

The addition of Internal Savings and Lending (ISAL) components to the IGA programs has increased participants access to funding for enterprise development and expansion. This has enhanced the gains from the conditional cash transfers component and should be continued in future projects.

### **Summary of problems identified by beneficiaries:**

- Problems finding markets and distances to viable markets resulting in high transport costs were a problem for many beneficiaries.
- Disease and death of chickens. This was treated with indigenous chemicals or bought medicines.
- Lack of sufficient funds to cover the inputs, and a shortage of food for both pigs and layers.
- Conflicts with police due to lack of vendors licences.
- The need to borrow money / do casual labour / sacrifice other expenditures to address these issues.
- Livestock (especially pigs) raiding neighbours gardens, necessitating the building of fences or use branches to prevent this.
- Low prices for thin cattle and debt from cattle purchase led one beneficiary to move from cattle to goat production.

### Key Recommendations

**Beneficiaries participating in IGAs, market linkages and other projects involving vendor activities need to be supported to obtain the required trading permits / licences to avoid the project putting them into conflict with the law.**

**Consider potential for supporting beneficiary-led solutions to accessibility / transport difficulties though joint input sourcing and transportation of produce.**

### 5.3 Unconditional Cash Grants

Most (76.3%) travelled less than 3km to receive the cash, and 92.7% travelled less than 5 km. None travelled more than 10km. Although most walked to the site, some required transport (bicycle (1.7%) or minibus(11%) incurring travel costs of \$2 to \$4. 36% travelled less than one hour to reach the site, 77% less than 2 hours. 22.6% travelled more than 2 hours, but none more than 4 hours. Beneficiaries were again quickly and efficiently dealt with at the distribution site, with most (54.8%) taking less than 1 hour to receive their money, 87.9% less than 2 hours, and only 2.4% took more than 4 hours.

Although the vast majority of beneficiaries (95.9%) received their cash on time, a few (4.1%) experienced delays due to lack of communication between the group members regarding the distribution date. There was one report of a beneficiary who failed to receive one payment (\$25) due to missing the distribution, and who did follow-ups but never received the cash. Complaints procedures involved phone calls or visits to NRC offices by beneficiaries. As many beneficiaries are between 25 to 60km from the offices, this is onerous, involves financial costs, and lacks accessibility. Appeals and complaints procedures should be able to be easily completed locally by the beneficiary, possibly through nominated independent focal persons, or members of NRC field staff.

98.4% reported no problems in accessing the goods they needed to purchase, and 99.2% reported no impacts on prices due to the project. There were one-off reports of nearby shops increasing prices, problems related to “buying in bulk”, and having to travel a long way to buy maize seed.

NRC’s program during 2012-13 does not include an unconditional cash program (2011-2012 only).

#### **Summary of problems identified by beneficiaries:**

- Beneficiaries felt the transfer amount was insufficient to meet basic needs. Some resorted to piece work, casual labour, food for work programs, borrowing or begging to supplement income.
- Deaths of animals purchased.
- Resentment from those excluded.

#### Key Recommendations

**To ensure fairness and transparency, ensure adequate and easily accessible systems for dealing with beneficiary concerns, especially in relation to non-receipt of the correct cash grant amount. If for some reason the beneficiary is no longer entitled to the payment, the reasons must be made clear to them. Follow-ups should be made where non-collection occurs, especially amongst vulnerable groups.**

**The capacity of the markets to respond to increased demand generated by the cash transfer should be assessed before implementing future unconditional cash transfer programs.**

### 5.4 Low Input Gardens (LIG)

LIG project has had considerable success in achieving both improved nutrition levels and also marketed produce. The main problems encountered have related to the adequacy of some boreholes, due to poor output and one having to be abandoned due to salinity of the water. High demand is putting considerable pressure on some boreholes, with some complaints that community demand was negatively affecting the borehole’s use for LIG purposes. However, there is considerable unmet demand for water and sanitation infrastructure in the resettlement areas, and the community benefit of the boreholes has had positive impacts on community relations.

Due to delays in drilling boreholes, gardens were established late into the main gardening season, leading to increased pest and disease problems. Hot weather required increased frequency of watering, further exacerbating tensions between those using the boreholes for LIG and domestic purposes.

**Summary of problems identified by beneficiaries:**

- Borehole problems involving too many people using a limited source and one breakdown. The breakdown was sorted by collectively paying for a repair but other issues remain unresolved.
- Pest and disease problems. Chemicals provided were seen as not being strong enough. Problems were tackled by buying pesticides, using locally produced ones, using sprays provided by NRC, and even using surf powder.
- Lack of availability of fertilizers.
- Shortages of tools, e.g. wheelbarrows, hoes and rakes.

Key Recommendations

**Consider providing separate boreholes for community use and LIG use in areas where demand for water is most intense. This would relieve pressure on LIG use of boreholes, and the enhanced community gains from the project may further improve community relationships.**

**Improve timing of garden establishment / planting to reduce pest and disease problems, and consider promoting natural approaches to pest control which reduce / do not require the purchase of chemical inputs (e.g. permaculture).**

**Consider increasing the number of tools / equipment distributed.**

### **5.5 Market Linkages / Partnerships with the Private Sector**

Private sector partnerships can have considerable benefits in both adding expertise, resources, and sustainability to projects. The partnerships with ARDA Seeds and Global Agricultural services were generally positive in establishing market linkages and enabling beneficiaries to access credit for inputs (e.g. accessing seeds or point-of-lay chickens, to be paid for once output was achieved.)

Overall, 98.9% of farmers regarded the project as “good” (19.6%) or “very good” (79.3%) at helping them to market their produce. However, there were clear issues with NRC and ARDA Seeds both feeling that the other had failed to fulfil commitments made during discussions held at the start of the project. Full details are in Appendix 3. Similar issues arose regarding payment arrangements for farmers by ARDA in return for sorghum seeds. These issues highlight the need for a clear MOU / formal agreement with private sector partners to ensure both sides are aware of and abide by their commitments. There were also technical issues, related to farmers harvesting too early / too late and planting too early (at first rains), and inadequate fertiliser application. This, combined with adverse weather conditions resulted in depressed yields. Only 98 farmers delivered sorghum seed to ARDA Seeds Company out of the 588 that were supported to grow it, due to yields being affected by drought and delayed collection of the seed by ARDA which resulted in some households consuming the seed before collection took place. Beneficiaries felt that marketing training would have helped them to market their produce without NRC help, but that this was not provided because NRC had already arranged the marketing.

**Summary of problems identified by beneficiaries:**

- Problems drought, with one having to replant.
- Pest problems, including birds.
- Shortages of seeds, or late arrival of seeds. Solutions used included raising money or borrowing money to purchase seeds.
- Shortages of tools, labour, chemicals and pesticides, with one recipient selling a goat in order to buy chemicals.
- Problems transporting produce / inputs to/from markets..
- Amongst the layer chicken rearers, deaths and illness were the most commonly reported problem. Seeking help from the animal health adviser, or using traditional treatments were the most common response. Some layers were not laying well, and some complained that the birds were too old.

- Other problems were, late arrival of layers, lack of feeding cans, poor housing, breakages of eggs and difficulty repaying loans.
- Problems of being pursued by police for not having trading licences were reported by egg vendors.

### Key Recommendations

**It is essential that all future partnerships are clearly defined in an MOU between the private sector partner and NRC, to clearly articulate the responsibilities and obligations of both parties.**

**Beneficiaries participating in IGAs, market linkages and other projects involving vendor activities need to be supported to obtain the required trading permits / licences to avoid the project putting them into conflict with the law.**

**Consider providing marketing training / training in establishing links with private sector, to enable them to diversify their outlets independently and thus increase sustainability.**

**Consider facilitating the establishment of Coordinating Committees to negotiate with buyers (e.g. ARDA) to coordinate production, pass on information to farmers, ensure correct timing of planting / harvest, and arrange for farmers to deliver produce to central collection points for the collection date. This removes the need for buyers to negotiate individually with farmers, and could offer efficiency gains in future projects.**

## **5.6 Small Livestock Pass-On Program**

The livestock programs encountered significant disease and mortality issues. In addition, the low number of livestock distributed per beneficiary combined with the pass-on element has meant that this program has been the least successful in achieving gains in beneficiary nutritional status or income.

Disease and death of livestock was the most common problem encountered. Some felt the disease was present when the livestock were handed over by NRC. The most common remedy used was treatment with their own or locally produced chemicals, followed by treatment with bought medicines (one person sold assets to afford this), traditional treatment, and the use of vaccines provided by NRC. Some reported the problem has not been solved. A few sought advice from Community based Animal Health Workers, but some felt they were not very helpful (the animals died anyway) and often unavailable.

### **Goat Distribution**

Sourcing goats from distant areas and other agro-ecological zones caused adverse health effects and some either died due to failure to adapt, or reproduced more slowly. Late sourcing of goats, and competition from other NGOs, led to a lack of quality control in goat purchases. In Chiredzi more bucks than does were supplied, with beneficiaries then having to 'swap' these locally. Poor transport also caused significant mortality, and a lack of monitoring to ensure livestock were being adequately cared for by beneficiaries led to further losses. There was significant evidence that failures of beneficiaries to fulfil their commitments, or even misuses of project resources by beneficiaries (e.g. deaths of livestock due to negligence such as not feeding or not treating diseases) were not adequately followed up due to pressures on staff time or transport.

### **Summary of problems identified by beneficiaries:**

- Death and disease of livestock
- Goats being slow at producing, miscarriage, and theft, and
- Long distances to water for livestock.
- There were some tensions over delays in passing on livestock and some individuals not acting in good faith with regard to the passing on process.

### Key Recommendations

**Any future goat distribution projects should consider adopting a voucher-based, or conditional cash grant approach. This would enable beneficiaries to select goats to meet their preferences and are adapted to local agro-ecological and climatic conditions. Goat purchases should be timed to help goats adapt to the climate (i.e. not during the hot season).**

**Improved monitoring to ensure project resources are not being misused.**

**The negative effect on impacts low livestock numbers and the pass-on element needs to be weighed against increased beneficiary numbers in future projects. It is recommended that future projects consider providing a larger number of does (ideally 5), and omit the pass on element to ensure impacts are achievable over a shorter time-frame.**

### **Poultry Distribution**

Problems were experienced with disease and mortality of poultry, particularly amongst the indigenous chickens distributed, where mortality was 100%, and also affected existing local poultry stocks. This was due to a number of causes, details of which are in Appendix 3. NRC responded well to this crisis, compensating affected beneficiaries with cash grants and/or goats, so that in spite of this occurrence, all those interviewed who had been affected expressed high levels of satisfaction with the NRC project. However, stricter precautions are required to prevent disease outbreaks in future poultry projects.

Beneficiaries experienced problems in sourcing funds for inputs for livestock activities, including poultry feeds and medicines for poultry / goats. In some cases the beneficiaries responded to feed shortages by using their own inputs to make poultry feed. This can provide an integrated approach and a sustainable alternative to travelling large distances (20+ km each way) to procure commercial feed. However, to ensure home made feed production is able to provide adequate quality feed (i.e. nutrients, medicinal considerations), NRC should consider including providing support for training in feed production from own crops in future projects.

### Key Recommendations

**Proper advance vaccination, care in transport / minimising stress on birds, and need for quarantining should all be addressed in future projects to minimise disease outbreaks. The benefits of buying chickens during the rainy season when disease is less prevalent were highlighted by beneficiaries.**

**Improved monitoring to ensure project resources are not being misused.**

**To ensure home made feed production is able to provide adequate quality feed (i.e. nutrients, medicinal considerations), consider providing support for training in feed production from own crops in future projects.**

## **5.7 Conservation Agriculture (CA)**

CA crops withstood the drought which occurred better than conventionally grown crops. Some complained that mulching increased weeds, and in one location termites in the mulch damaged the seeds. The use of demonstration plots for training was effective, and liked by beneficiaries. Although there was education on crop rotation, there was no practical application, and farmers have still not tried the technique. Long delays between training and practical application risk of loss of learning. Trainees shared learning and techniques with the community, some of whom are adopting conservation agriculture. The community gained knowledge of a new kind of farming and new crop types.

Seeds and tools issued were of good quality, but arrived after the start of the farming season, and there were complaints that the fertiliser was insufficient for the seeds given. Planting the sorghum late reduced yields and increased losses to birds. Several reported that the ground nut seeds given were inadequate

for the area cultivated. In one community the planting of sorghum seed was not allowed (taboo). Beneficiaries felt the process was labour intense, and giving only one hoe per household did not enable work to be done by the whole family. Some felt ploughs and draught cattle should have been provided. Although there were expectations that beneficiaries would be supported by NRC with seeds etc. for a second year, this is not planned for the current planting season.

**Problems identified by beneficiaries:**

- Late provision of inputs.
- A lack of chemicals (fertilizer and pesticides) which they felt should have been provided.
- Pests, including birds were a major concern. Scarecrows, guarding crops, and pesticides were used.
- The amount of hard work/energy required in digging. One reported attending hospital for back pain.
- Shortages of seeds led some to use their own seeds and some germination problems are recorded.
- Unavailability of rippers promised by NRC for mechanized CA trials.
- Lack of markets, and transport problems getting to markets.

Key Recommendations

**Ensure inputs (seeds and tools) are provided at the correct time.**

**Ensure input quantities are correctly matched to the land area cultivated and that beneficiaries are adequately trained in the correct planting densities / application rates to avoid shortages.**

**Ensure cultural acceptability of seed types by advance consultation with community.**

**Continue use of demonstration plot approach in training for conservation agriculture.**

**Seek to minimise problems of labour intensity to reduce risk of ‘drop-outs’, possibly through mechanised CA trials, or by issuing more hoes to allow “team-working” by families.**

### **5.8 Monitoring and Evaluation**

A number of sources raised concerns about monitoring structures. During 2011 monitoring was affected by the absence of any full time M&E staff, leading to a reliance on Project Officers and Agritex staff. Project officers were primarily focused on project implementation, limiting the time spent on M&E tasks, whilst Agritex staff lacked mobility and thus failed to adequately monitor. There was evidence of failures of beneficiaries to fulfil their commitments, or misuses of project resources which were not adequately followed up due to pressures on staff time. This resulted in beneficiaries “taking advantage of limited monitoring visits by NRC”, and “livestock deaths increased during periods when NRC staff were absent”. M&E tasks were not prioritised in staff workloads.

In Chipinge both Social Services and Agritex District staff expressed dissatisfaction with the current arrangements, and wanted to be taken on regular field visits (e.g. quarterly) to ensure they are adequately updated on progress.

NRC has already made good progress on addressing M&E issues, including appointing an M&E Officer, and enabling two staff to undertake an M&E Course at the University of Zimbabwe. However the scale and diversity of NRC activities, and their geographical spread, mean that further reinforcement of M&E capacity is required. Potential solutions include :

1. Increasing NRC’s in-house M& E capacity, e.g. by having separate M&E officers for the two districts, and an M&E coordinator, potentially based at HQ in Harare. .
2. Strengthen monitoring partnerships with Government stakeholders by supporting Agritex officers with motor bikes and fuel to enable them to fulfill monitoring duties. NRC Project Officers could then focus on verifying and directing the M&E activities. This could improve sustainability of Agritex support of beneficiaries after the end of the project, and capacity build local structures.

Key Recommendations:

**Ensure that adequate budgetary provision for M&E activities is built into all project proposals, including provision for appropriate staffing resources.**

**Enhance existing M&E structures, either through increased in-house provision or partnership approaches.**

### **5.9 Project Management and Administration**

NRC is a newly established organization in Zimbabwe, having begun its Zimbabwe operations at the commencement of the programs being reviewed here. Consequently there was an initial lack of established systems and procedures. Several of the problems identified below may be attributable to the newness of the local organization during 2011. Progress has since been made in addressing these problems, and some of the issues identified may therefore to some extent be regarded as historic.

There was a lack of coordination and monitoring of budgets, combined with authorization from 3 different offices (Chipinge, Chiredzi and Harare) resulted in delays in reconciliations and budget overspends.

Reports reviewed varied considerably in format quality, use of qualitative data, focus on impacts, etc. Many were heavily activity focused, rather than addressing impacts or outcomes.

Key Recommendations

**Ensure timely reconciliations and improved coordination of approval processes.**

**Consider adopting standardised reporting frameworks, and increasing staff awareness of the importance of a results-based monitoring / reporting approach.**

## **6. Effectiveness**

Overall, the project was successful in its primary goal of contributing to the durable resettlement and integration of internally displaced people and returnees by improving their food security and access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities.

- 84% of beneficiaries reported increased acceptance of IDPs / returnees within the host community.
- 99.6% of beneficiaries rated the type of assistance they received as “good” (11%) or “very good” (88.6%) at meeting their needs.
- 84% of beneficiaries reported consuming an increased quantity of food, and 77% reported consuming an increased variety of food. Most of those not reporting an increase were goat recipients, where income benefits have not yet been realized.
- Average number of meals eaten per day is estimated to have risen from 1.9 to 2.6.
- 26% of beneficiaries reported an increase in the number of assets owned. In 1% of cases assets declined, mainly due to the need to provide inputs for livestock project (e.g. medicines / feeds).

The period of implementation of the initial program (1 year) was not adequate to achieve all the intended impacts. In some cases this resulted in them terminating before they were yielding the intended benefits (e.g. small livestock) or before a complete ‘life cycle’ could be completed (CA / crop rotation).

Key Recommendations

**A longer term approach is needed to increase the tangible benefits secured.**

**A holistic ‘life cycle’ approach would be better able to consolidate gains and / or provide support beneficiaries up the productive phase of the livelihood activity.**

## 7. Sustainability / Connectedness

Overall, sustainability of the livelihood programs was high, with around 97% of beneficiaries stating that they planned to continue with the livelihood activities initiated by the NRC project after the end of the program. The only activity where a small number of beneficiaries said they would not continue was layer poultry activities initiated under the market linkages program. The reason for not continuing was given as inability to access inputs (birds available on credit) after the end of the project.

### Will you continue with these activities / projects after the end of the NRC project?

Food Security and Livelihood Program	No (%)	Yes, but at a Smaller Scale (%)	Yes, at the Same Scale (%)	Yes, at an Increasing Scale (%)	Number (N)
Conservation Agriculture	0	0	1.4	98.6	145
Low Input Gardens	0	0	5.6	94.4	142
Small Livestock	0	4.5	6.4	89.1	156
Market Linkages: Maintain Market Links?	0	4.2	12.5	83.3	96
Market Linkages: Other Activities	7.1	4.3	8.6	80.0	70
Income Generating Activities /CCT	0	3.2	4.8	92.1	63
<b>Total</b>	0.7	2.4	6.1	90.8	674

Concerns voiced by beneficiaries with regard to difficulties in continuing with livelihood programs after the end of the NRC project included:

- Some chemicals required (e.g. pesticides) are difficult to obtain / lack of finance to purchase them (Market Linkages, Conservation Agriculture, LIG)
- Seed availability - may not be able to afford seeds / access quality seeds (Market Linkages)
- May be difficult to link with marketers (ARDA, GAS) (Market Linkages)
- Problems sourcing other inputs, i.e. fertilizer, pesticides, knapsack sprayers, and other tools. (Conservation Agriculture)
- Conservation agriculture is very labour intensive, and they have problems controlling weeds
- Problems identifying diseases of goats and poultry and required treatments (Small Livestock)
- Accessing medicines, especially as income benefits have yet to be realised (Small Livestock)
- Lack of access to water / goats having to travel far for water (Small Livestock)
- No longer able to access training on health and care of poultry (Small Livestock)
- Finding markets for Guinea Fowl if they are to be sold (Small Livestock)
- Problems transporting products to / from markets – distance and cost – is a major problem for many beneficiaries, especially in remoter Wards such as Ward 15 Chipinge (IGAs)
- Lack of licences for selling (IGAs)
- Lack of income for expanding the enterprise / buying inputs (IGAs)
- Buildings (chicken housing, bakery) not adequate / able to withstand rains (IGAs)
- Lack of adequate fencing for gardens / pigs destroying neighbours' gardens (IGAs)
- Lack of lights for feeding / caring for livestock at night (IGAs)

The main concern identified in relation to sustainability relates to the Unconditional Cash Transfer program. Payments were programmed for a very limited time scale (3 months), but no rationale for choosing this time period was identified other than duplicating payments under the conditional cash program. However, unlike the conditional cash program, the unconditional cash program lacks a defined sustainability component or exit strategy. Beneficiaries felt the funds received were insufficient to enable them meet their basic needs or to plan ahead. Consequently they consistently reported experiencing difficulty in maintaining food consumption when the payments ended. In many cases, children enrolled in school when the payments were made were withdrawn from school again when the payments ended.

NRC's Food Security and Livelihoods program is closely linked to interventions occurring under its other Core Competencies, particularly Community Based Planning. The Community Based Planning (CBP) program has been highly successful in identifying needs, achieving community ownership of Ward plans,

and for fostering cooperation with local authorities (who formally adopted the plans). It is a valuable process and should continue to be used in future projects. However CBP and livelihoods elements are currently disjointed, with each having its own action plan and different coordinators. This creates difficulties in planning and coordinating activities, and in particular FSL activities become delayed waiting for completion of CBP processes. As programs currently have a one year time span, delays can compromise staff's ability to fulfil project outcomes in a timely manner. NRC should thus The strong synergies between these programs could thus be improved and strengthened through the adoption of a Single Work Plan approach.

The NRC programs have closely involved local Agritex staff to promote continued support for beneficiaries after the end of the NRC project. In addition, Trainings of Trainers (TOTs) involving local government stakeholders have been undertaken to increase local capacity to maintain gains made by the programs.

### Key Recommendations

**Consider inclusion of an exit / sustainability strategy in future unconditional cash transfers.**

**Consider adopting a single work plan approach, covering both Food Security and Livelihoods programs and other NRC Core Competences, particularly Community Based Planning (CBP). The strong synergies between these Competences could be strengthened through a single work plan approach.**

**More frequent field monitoring visits involving District level stakeholders would help reinforce capacity building / participation of local stakeholders in continuing support to beneficiaries.**

**Better coordination with other NGOs providing TOTs to the same stakeholders could be achieved by increased sharing of information, to avoid duplication of trainings for the same target stakeholder groups. This could be achieved by resurrecting the lapsed NGO coordinating group, or by including information on forthcoming trainings in bulleting / documents shared with other NGOs and training providers.**

## 8. Cross-Cutting Issues

Women participated in decisions about how extra income was spent in 89% of beneficiary households. Men were solely responsible for project work in 15% of households, women in 41%, and both in 44%. Children participated in the project-related work in around 10% of beneficiary households, particularly in relation to conservation agriculture (21% of HH) and looking after small livestock (11%).

### Who decides how extra income is spent?

Husband	Wife	Husband & Wife	Whole Family	Number
10.6%	38.1%	50.5%	0.8%	501

In Chiredzi there was a significant issue with under-representation of women in the registration process. Although most of the main participants in the project work and at trainings are reported to be female (around two thirds), and this was borne out during the evaluation visits, the beneficiary registration process indicates the opposite demographics (68% male). Male household heads attended selection meetings and registered, even where they were not the main participant. Under-representation of women in these processes appears to have been unchallenged by project staff. Future projects should improve sensitization of communities that the main participant (in project work and trainings) should be the one participating in decision making and registration processes.

During some field visits for this study, a tendency was also observed for some NRC staff to be unconsciously addressing themselves primarily to the male end of the Focus Group.

Due to political sensitivities, IDPs and the resettlement areas have not generally been targeted by other NGOs within Zimbabwe. NRC's activities were described by District Officials as 'filling a gap' in targeting areas and communities which were previously 'starved of assistance'.

The inclusion of an unconditional cash component sought to ensure that vulnerable groups and labour constrained households were not excluded from benefiting from the project. However, there were reports that some chronically ill patients / people living with HIV/ AIDS did not come out for fear of stigmatisation.

### Key Recommendations

**There is a need for staff to consciously address issues of ensuring adequate inclusion of women in meetings, decision making and registration processes.**

**There is a need to mainstream HIV/AIDS awareness and create a secure and accessible environment that enables /supports vulnerable groups to come forward and participate.**

## 9. Adherence to Sphere Standards

Adherence to Core Sphere Standards is fundamental to protecting the rights of people affected by conflict or disaster through humanitarian assistance that supports life with dignity and inclusion. The Core Standards define the minimum criteria to be met by humanitarian agencies.

#	Core Sphere Standards & Key Actions	How the Project Met the Standards
1	<b>People-centred humanitarian response:</b> People's capacity and strategies to survive with dignity are integral to the design and approach of humanitarian response - establish mechanisms for regular feedback - ensure balanced representation of vulnerable people in discussions	Community based planning was effective in identifying local needs and priorities and ensuring local ownership of plans developed. Local communities in collaboration with local leadership were active participants in decision making. Feedback / complaint mechanisms would gain from increased local accessibility and need to be clearly articulated to communities. The majority of active beneficiaries were women, but they were under-represented in the registration processes. Representation of vulnerable people was promoted through the unconditional cash transfer, but some may have been excluded due to failure / inability to attend selection process meetings.
2	<b>Coordination and collaboration:</b> Humanitarian response is planned and implemented in coordination with the relevant authorities, humanitarian agencies and civil society organisations engaged in impartial humanitarian action, working together for maximum efficiency, coverage and effectiveness.	Local officials at District, Ward and Community Levels expressed satisfaction with NRC coordination and communication activities. NRC Community Based Planning activities fed directly into local authority Ward Plans. Community funding of projects was in collaboration with communities and included joint funding of projects by NRC and local government. Three Training of Trainers workshops involved both NRC staff and government stakeholders. Agritex staff were closely involved in projects. The project worked with the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, Chiefs and Headmen to obtain offer letters for beneficiaries to enable them to secure land for agriculture and gardens.
3	<b>Assessment:</b> The priority needs of the disaster-affected population are identified through a systematic assessment of the context, risks to life with dignity and the capacity of the affected people and relevant authorities to respond	In January 2011 NRC, with ECHO funding, assessed the possibilities for displaced communities in Chipinge and Chiredzi to find durable solutions to their displacement. Community Based Planning (CBP) was used to assess the situation and identify durable solutions. An independent report into "possibilities for market linkages" was commissioned. No assessment of the ability of markets to respond to increased demand from unconditional cash transfers was carried out.
4	<b>Design and response:</b> The humanitarian response meets the assessed needs of the affected population	99.6% of beneficiaries rated the type of assistance they received as "good" (11%) or "very good" (88.6%) at meeting their needs.
5	<b>Performance, transparency and learning:</b> Performance of humanitarian agencies is continually examined and communicated to stakeholders; projects are adapted in response to performance	Inadequate provision was made for M&E during the 2011 project. M&E was not prioritised and thus reported misuses of project resources / failures of beneficiaries to fulfil their obligations were not adequately followed up. NRC has improve this situation in 2012, with a project staff member now assigned to M&E. Further strengthening of M&E structures is required. Regular reports were produced and shared with partners, donors and local government . District stakeholders in Chipinge wanted more involvement in field visits to assess progress and impacts (quarterly field visits).
6	<b>Aid worker performance:</b> Humanitarian agencies provide appropriate management, supervisory and psychosocial support to enable aid workers have the necessary skills, behaviour and attitude to plan and implement an effective humanitarian response with humanity and respect.	NRC staff worked with professionalism as evidenced from the high satisfaction with their conduct and performance expressed by local officials and beneficiaries. NRC staff showed a high level of commitment to achieving positive outcomes for beneficiaries, and a high level of professionalism in their work. Staff members are able to request trainings for their professional development, and 2 are currently attending courses (M&E) at the University of Zimbabwe. The most frequent request from staff in terms of learning and career development was for implementation of a system of exchange visits to other projects (within Zimbabwe or regionally) to enhance learning and sharing of knowledge.

## 10. Partnerships with Government Stakeholders

Governmental and technical stakeholders interviewed included representatives from Government departments (Agritex, Social Services, District Administrators Office). Government staff reported attending Workshops before the commencement of the NRC project, and coordination and cooperation of NRC projects with activities of Government departments was regarded as good. Inclusion of Government technical staff in Trainings of Trainers was seen as capacitating local support structures, and promoting continuity of support to beneficiaries after the project end. NRC was seen as focusing on increasing capacity of local agencies and Departments to provide ongoing support to local communities, and to provide support in Wards not targeted by NRC. In addition this approach was seen as successful in avoiding duplication of, or conflict with, the work of local government Departments. NRC's projects were described as capacitating local people in life skills, thus enabling them to become self supporting.

NRC's projects were seen as relevant to the needs of the Districts. Community Based Planning activities conducted by NRC led to the development of Ward Plans which were subsequently approved and adopted by the District Council. Many Government Ministries and NGOs were reported to have participated in Ward Plan development, resulting in good levels of inclusiveness. No complaints from communities or local Councillors had been received by District Officers. Key recommendations from Government officials interviewed included:

- Requests for expansion of NRC activities to include more beneficiaries and Wards.
- Continue capacitating of Department staff through inclusion in Trainings.
- More advance notice of NRC plans (e.g. at proposal stage) to allow greater opportunities for input into development of projects. Short notice was cited as resulting in a lack of time for revision, so that projects had to be accepted as they stood in order to get things implemented.
- Extend the duration of the Cash Grants given to promote opportunities to build IGAs and reduce risk of basic needs expenditures eroding opportunities for livelihoods expenditures.
- Increase the amount of the Small Community Grants, as \$5000 is insufficient to meet the cost of the facilities required. In some cases local Government met the shortfall through joint funding.
- A longer term approach was seen as needed to increase the tangible benefits secured.
- Priority areas of need for future NRC interventions were seen as (1) expansion of water and sanitation (WASH) activities. There are very few sanitary toilets in the resettlement areas, and people travel long distances to source water. (2) Educational support, as there is a lack of educational provision in the resettlement areas.
- Agritex felt priorities for future programs should include seed fairs as many people have problems accessing small grains seeds of good quality. They felt NRC should facilitate access to good quality seeds and training in seed multiplication of OPVs.
- Agritex Chipinge indicated that training courses in communities were sometimes implemented without their being notified in advance, and requested that NRC should ensure proper advance notice was always given to District officials.
- District officials (Agritex, Social Services) in Chipinge requested inclusion in regular field monitoring visits (quarterly). Written reports were not felt to be adequate to ensure they were abreast of developments. They were invited to launch events but not follow up visits.

## 11. NRC Project Staff Support and Development

Staff are able to request trainings they feel will assist their professional development and benefit their management of the projects. Areas identified by staff where it was considered that skills development and /or additional training would be beneficial included:

- exchange visits to other projects to share information and learning
- WASH training, and Participatory Health and Hygiene (reflecting the key needs of the Districts)
- training in basic construction knowledge and skills for supervision of construction projects
- climate Change adaptation
- report writing skills

## 12. Conclusions

**Overall, the project was successful in its primary goal of contributing to the durable resettlement and integration of internally displaced people and returnees by improving their food security and access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities.**

- 84% of beneficiaries reported increased acceptance of IDPs / returnees within the host community.
- 99.6% of beneficiaries rated the type of assistance they received as “good” (11%) or “very good” (88.6%) at meeting their needs.
- 84% of beneficiaries reported consuming an increased quantity of food, and 77% reported consuming an increased variety of food. Most of those not reporting an increase were goat recipients, where income benefits have not yet been realized.
- Average number of meals eaten per day is estimated to have risen from 1.9 to 2.6.
- 26% of beneficiaries reported an increase in the number of assets owned. In 1% of cases assets declined, mainly due to the need to provide inputs for livestock project (e.g. medicines / feeds).

Community based planning was effective in identifying local needs and priorities, and was successful in gaining acceptance and ownership of the Ward Plans by key stakeholders. The same targeting process should be used in future as it was ‘fair’ and ‘unbiased’ and was understood by all.

Strong positive impacts were identified on the quantity and variety of food consumed within households, which increased overall in 83.5% and 77% of households respectively. The strongest improvements were found within the Low Input Garden program where 100% of households interviewed reported that both quantity and variety of food consumed had increased, and the Conditional Cash Transfer where over 99% increased both the quantity and variety of foods consumed. In contrast, in the small livestock program (particularly the goat component) the benefits of the program on income and nutrition are largely yet to be realized.

Most households had increased their income, with the greatest impact being for conditional cash transfers / IGAs and low input gardens, where 92% and 79% respectively reported an increase. However, this may partially reflect the fact that where households produced more of their own food (e.g. LIGs), thus releasing income previously spent on food for other purposes, this was not usually seen as an increase in income by beneficiaries as cash coming into the household had not changed. Most additional income received was spent on food (50.2%) and education (36.1%) (Table 4.6). A significant proportion was also invested in productive assets contributing to long term self-sufficiency.

The impacts of the programs on household relationships were overwhelmingly positive, with 94% stating that relationships within the households had improved. Significant improvements in relationships within the communities were also recorded, with 77.7% stating that these had improved a little (12.2%) or a lot (75.5%). Only 1.4% of respondents felt that relationships had got slightly worse, mainly due to jealousy amongst those excluded. 84% of beneficiaries reported increased acceptance of IDPs / returnees within the host community. Key aspects increasing acceptance of IDP included improved living standards and livestock ownership led to them being better regarded, and they were seen as bringing positive benefits to the community. Increased self-sufficiency amongst IDPs had also reduced begging, which improved integration and enabled them to help out others in need / contribute to funerals, increasing acceptance.

Overall, sustainability of the livelihood programs was high. Around 97% of beneficiaries stated that they planned to continue with the livelihood activities initiated by the NRC project after the end of the program. However, the unconditional cash program lacks a defined sustainability component or exit strategy, and the funds provided were insufficient to enable beneficiaries to plan ahead.

The implementation period of 1 year was not adequate to achieve all the intended impacts. In some cases this resulted in projects terminating before they were yielding the intended benefits (e.g. small livestock) or before a complete ‘life cycle’ could be completed (CA / crop rotation).

**Appendix 1: Review of Existing Data Sources**

Existing information sources contacted, and the types of data obtained relevant to this market assessment are summarised in Table A.1.

**Table A.1: Key Secondary Data Sources**

Description	Author	Details
NRC MOU with IOM	International Organisation for Migration	Agreement Between the International Organisation for Migration and Norwegian Refugee Council on "Essential Emergency and Basic Livelihoods Restoration for Vulnerable Population in Flood and Drought Prone Areas" 01/04/2011 – 31/12/2012
ECHO Single Form for Humanitarian Action	NRC	ECHO Single Form for Action on "Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons in Zimbabwe" 13/12 2011
Project Proposal to the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA)	NRC	Project Proposal for "Food security and Livelihoods Project for Internally Displaced People and Returnees from South Africa and Mozambique in Chiredzi and Chipinge Districts, Zimbabwe. 01/01 2011 – 31/12/2012
Consultancy Report on Market Linkages	Thandiwe Henson	"Possibilities for Market Linkages Within the Livelihoods and Food Security Programme of NRC" Consultancy Report.
Annual Progress Report 2011.	NRC	Projects: Conservation Agriculture, Livestock and Market Linkages
Conditional Cash Grants & IGA Profitability Analysis	NRC	NRC Chipinge Conditional Cash Grants IGA Profitability Analysis. Internal NRC Report
Baseline Report 2012	NRC	Baseline Report: Livelihoods and Food Security Programme April / May 2012
Activity Progress Report, May 2012	FSL Program	Chipinge and Chiredzi Small Livestock, IGAs, ISALs, Gardens, M&E
Activity Progress Report, June 2012	Tonderai Mushipe	Activity Progress Report: Food Security and Livelihoods Consolidated Report.
Activity Progress Report, July 2012	Tonderai Mushipe	Activity Progress Report : Food Security and Livelihoods Consolidated Report. 03/08/2012
Activity Progress Report, Dec 2012	Olivia Musa, NRC	Activity Progress Report: Cash Transfers, LIGs and IGAs, Market Linkages. Dec 2012. Chiredzi
Cash Transfers Workshop Report.	NRC	Cash Transfers Workshop Report. Chiredzi Office Workshop. 22-23 May 2012.
Activity Progress Report, 23/01/2012	Utete, NRC	Activity Progress Report: Small Livestock and LIGs
Activity Progress Report, 18/01/2012	Tonderai Mushipe, NRC	Activity Progress Report : Conservation Farming and Nutrition Gardens.
Post Distribution Report	NRC	Post Distribution Report for Conservation Farming in Ward 12 Chipinge
Field Day Report	Chiredzi Livelihoods Team, NRC	Report on Field Day at Mr & Mrs Takavada Homestead Ward 16 Chiredzi, 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2012
Sentinel Survey Report	NRC	NRC Food Security and Livelihoods Unconditional Grant Sentinel Survey Report – Chipinge District.
Telethon Funds: Project Outline 2012	NRC	Project Outline (internal): Income Generating Projects for Resettled IDPs
NRC Ward 15 Grant Handover Ceremony Report	NRC	NRC Ward 15 Grant Handover Ceremony Report. 21 May 2012. Mosocha Village Ward 15
NRC Ward 7 Grant Handover Ceremony Report	NRC	NRC Ward 7 Grant Handover Ceremony Report. 6 June 2012. Magodoro Secondary School.
ISAL Training of Trainers Report May 2012	NRC	Internal Savings and Lendings Training of Trainers Workshop Report. Rupangwana Training Centre. 14-18 May 2012

Field Day Report	NRC	Conservation Farming Field Day Report. Chipinge. March 2012
Training of Trainers Report	NRC	Report on Training of Trainers Course: Goats and Guinea Fowl.
Update Report form 2011 Communities	NRC	Update Report from 2011 Communities
ECHO Intermediate Report	NRC	ECHO Final Report Intermediate Report 30/04 2011. Improving the protection of Internally Displaced Persons in Zimbabwe through Resettlement and Sustainable Durable Integration
ECHO Final Report	NRC	ECHO Final Report Intermediate Report 14/01/2012. Improving the protection of Internally Displaced Persons in Zimbabwe through Resettlement and Sustainable Durable Integration
IOM Monthly Report May 2011	NRC	Livelihoods Implementing Partner Monthly Report. Chipinge Wards 20 & 22
IOM Monthly Report June 2011	NRC	Livelihoods Implementing Partner Monthly Report. Chipinge Wards 20 & 22
IOM Monthly Report July 2011	NRC	Livelihoods Implementing Partner Monthly Report. Chipinge Wards 20 & 22
IOM Monthly Report September 2011	NRC	Livelihoods Implementing Partner Monthly Report. Chipinge Wards 20 & 22
IOM Mid Term Report April-July 2011	NRC	Livelihoods Implementing Partner Mid Term Report. Chipinge Wards 20 & 22. 01 April – 31 July 2011
Final report to IOM	Eddington Chinyoka	Final Report to IOM. Essential Emergency and Basic Livelihoods Restoration for Vulnerable Population in Flood and Drought Prone Areas
Annual NMFA Progress Report	NRC	Humanitarian Assistance and Protection to People Displaced in Africa (HAPPDA). Annual Progress Report to Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

**Appendix 2: Persons Interviewed and Places Visited**

Existing information sources contacted, and the types of data obtained relevant to this market assessment are summarised in Table A.2.

**Table A.2: Stakeholders Met With / Interviewed and Locations Visited**

Date	Name	Position	Location
31 Aug. 2012	Miss Muzenda	District Administrator, Chiredzi	District Administrator's Office, Chiredzi
3 – 6 Sept 2012	Beneficiary individual interviews and Focus Group Discussions, Chiredzi		Ward 16 Chiredzi
3 Sept. 2012	MrsChidangure	Representing the Chairperson LIG Group (wife)	Budiro Garden Project, Ward 16 Chiredzi
3 Sept. 2012	MrMugwagwa	Vice Chairperson, LIG Group	Budiro Garden Project, Ward 16 Chiredzi
3 Sept. 2012	Mr Emmanuel Nyathi	Councillor, Ward 16, Chiredzi	Ward 16, Chiredzi
3 Sept 2012	Mr John Dohwai	Chairperson, LIG Group	Kugutakushanda LIG, Ward 16 Chiredzi
6 Sept 2012	Mr Gibson Dzoro	AGRITEX Crops Officer / Acting District Agricultural Extension Officer	District Agricultural Offices, Chiredzi
6 Sept 2012	Mr Emmanuel	District Social Services Officer, Chiredzi	Social Services Office, Chiredzi
6 Sept 2012	Mr Chrispin Kazuva	HelpAge Project Officer	HelpAge Office, Chiredzi
10–13 Sept 2012	Beneficiary individual interviews and Focus Group Discussions, Chipinge. Visits to Livelihood Projects (IGAs)		Ward 12 and Ward 15, Chipinge
12 Sept 2012	Edgar Shumba	NRC Livelihoods Project Officer, Chipinge	NRC Offices, Chipinge
12 Sept 2012	Utete Chikwara	NRC Livelihoods Project Officer, Chipinge	NRC Offices, Chipinge
6 Sept 2012	Patience Makotore	NRC Livelihoods Project Officer, Chiredzi	NRC Offices, Chiredzi
12 Sept 2012	Mugove Mutukwa	NRC Livelihoods Project Officer, Chiredzi	NRC Offices, Chiredzi
12 Sept 2012	Tonderai Mushipe	NRC FS&L M&E Officer	NRC Offices, Chipinge
10 Sept 2012	Mr Chiraichirai	Ward 15 Agritex Officer, Chipinge	Ward 15, Chipinge
10 Sept 2012	Mr Chikaka Mhlanga	Ward 15 Councillor, Chipinge	Ward 15, Chipinge
14 Sept 2012	Mr Rwafa	ARDA Seed Company	Harare
14 Sept 2012		ARDA Seed Company	Harare
14 Sept 2012	Mr Charamba	Global Agricultural Services	Harare
11 Sept 2012	Mr Dennis Zimunya	M&E Deputy Program Manager, HelpAge, Chipinge	ACF Office, Chipinge
11 Sept 2012	Mr Chakona	District Social Service Officer, Chipinge	Government Offices, Chipinge
11 Sept 2012	Mr Moyo	District Agritex Training Officer, Chiredzi	Government Offices, Chipinge

## **Appendix 3: Additional Background to Recommendations Efficiency**

### **1. Conditional Cash Grants**

Trading Licences **Beneficiaries participating in IGAs, market linkages and to the projects involving vendor activities need to be supported to obtain the required permits / licences to avoid the project putting them into conflict with the law.** Problems cited by these beneficiaries included “being chased by the police”. (The current solution being adopted is “running away”, or “giving goods to those with a licence as police come, then paying those people”.)

### **2 Market Linkages / Partnerships with the Private Sector**

Private sector partnerships can have considerable benefits in both adding expertise, resources, and sustainability to projects. The partnerships with ARDA Seeds and Global Agricultural services were generally positive in establishing market linkages and enabling beneficiaries to access credit for inputs (e.g. accessing seeds or point-of-lay chickens, to be paid for once output was achieved.) However, **it is essential that all future partnerships are clearly defined in an MOU between the private sector partner and NRC, to clearly articulate the responsibilities and obligations of both parties.**

Project staff indicated that problems with cow pea yields due to drought led to ARDA seeds deciding during the project it was not cost effective to collect the crop from multiple remote locations in Chipinge, and thus requiring farmers to deliver the crop to Chiredzi at their own expense. This led to perceptions amongst some beneficiaries that “NRC had promised to buy the crop but had not done so” (beneficiaries still have these cowpeas), in spite of the fact that NRC’s role was as facilitator, and contracts were between ARDA and the farmers. ARDA’s perception was that when the project was discussed NRC was to provide farmers with fertiliser, but failed to do so resulting in depressed yields for sorghum and cow peas. ARDA also indicated that due to aphid problems the cowpea crop needed sprayed but farmers didn’t know what chemicals to use and couldn’t afford them. ARDA also stated that they had agreed they would collect and pay later, but farmers subsequently demanded on-the-spot cash although ARDA had not yet been able to verify weights or quality. Also, ARDA offered to exchange maize for seeds, but some farmers changed their mind at point of payment as poor cotton sales meant they needed cash. The above differences in perceptions highlight the need for a clearly defined MOU to be in place.

ARDA have now concluded that cowpeas is not a suitable crop for the area, and future projects should look at more drought resistant alternatives such as millet. ARDA also identified technical problems with farmers harvesting too early / too late and planting too early (at first rains). ARDA are running similar projects in other areas, where communities have appointed a Coordinating Committee to negotiate with ARDA, ensure things are running smoothly, to pass on information to farmers, and to arrange for farmers to deliver their produce to central collection points by the collection date. This removes the need for ARDA to negotiate individually with farmers, and is seen as offering potential benefits in future projects.

Only 98 farmers delivered sorghum seed to ARDA Seeds Company out of the 588 that were supported to grow it, due to yields being affected by drought and delayed collection of the seed by ARDA which meant that some households had consumed the seed before the collection took place.

### **3. Small Livestock Pass-On Program**

Beneficiaries experienced problems in sourcing funds for inputs for livestock activities, including poultry feeds and medicines for poultry / goats. In some cases the beneficiaries responded to feed shortages by using their own inputs to make poultry feed. This can provide a sustainable alternative to travelling large distances (20+ km each way) to procure commercial feed. However, to ensure such activities are able to provide adequate quality feed (i.e. nutrients, medicinal considerations) support for training in feed production may be worth considering in future projects.

### Goats

Sourcing goats from distant areas and other agro-ecological zones caused adverse health effects and some either died due to failure to adapt, or reproduced more slowly. Late sourcing of goats, and competition from other NGOs, led to a lack of adequate discrimination in selecting goats for purchase, and in Chiredzi more bucks than does were supplied, with beneficiaries then having to try to 'swap' these locally. If goat distribution projects are implemented in future consideration should be given to adopting a voucher-based, or conditional cash grant approach. This would enable beneficiaries to select goats to meet their preferences and are adapted to local agro-ecological and climatic conditions.

A goat production at the scale implemented (2 females, with pass on) is a long term project which is slow to show impacts on nutrition or income. Whilst a Pass-on approach increases the number of beneficiaries, it also considerably delays achievement of impacts. In the NRC case, the adoption of a pass-on approach, and the low number of goats distributed, meant that beneficiaries interviewed were not yet realising the benefits in terms of increased income or nutrition, and were even experiencing a decline in income and / or other assets due to purchase of inputs / medicines. However they were experiencing increased status in the community, and significant satisfaction from the presence of goats in their yard. Very few goats have yet been passed on, and some 'pass-on' recipients interviewed only received 1 goat because the other had died before being passed on. Goats also died during transport for initial distribution, due to overcrowding / poor transport conditions. A greater number of goats would require to be distributed to achieve meaningful income or nutrition gains for beneficiaries in less than a period of many years, particularly given the pass-on of the initial goats. The negative effect on impacts of the pass-on element needs to be weighed against increased beneficiary numbers in future projects.

An analysis of PRP projects (Killian Mutiro, GRM, 2011<sup>1</sup>) indicated that in relation to goats, increasing the number of breeding females most viable option for creating a 'jump' (hysteresis) to a higher wealth group, and that the critical number of breeding females to achieve this was 5. Based on a cost of breeding females of US20 to US30 each, Mutiro therefore identified the appropriate options for small livestock schemes as (a) Conditional cash transfer of US150 (5 x \$30), (b) Livestock vouchers worth US150. ActionAid in Chiredzi have been giving out groups of 5 goats in their livestock projects to achieve quicker results.

### Chickens

Problems were experienced with 100% mortality of indigenous chickens distributed. This was due to a number of causes. The chickens were transported with goats, arrived late at night and were not unloaded until the following day. This caused considerable stress, increasing susceptibility to disease. In addition, the chickens were vaccinated against Newcastle disease the day before distribution, although the vaccine takes 2 weeks to become effective. The birds were therefore not protected, and in their stressed state they were easily struck by the Newcastle disease already in the area. Numerous other birds the beneficiaries already owned also died within a day or two of the NRC birds being distributed. **Proper advance vaccination, care in transport / minimising stress on birds, and need for quarantining should all be addressed in future projects.**

It is important to note that NRC responded well to this crisis, compensating affected beneficiaries with cash grants and/or goats, so that in spite of this occurrence, all those interviewed who had been affected expressed high levels of satisfaction with the NRC project.

## **4. Low Input Gardens (LIG) / Boreholes / WASH**

The LIG project has had some considerable successes in achieving both improved nutrition levels and also marketed produce. The main problems encountered have related to the adequacy of some boreholes, due to poor output and one having to be abandoned due to salinity of the water. In other areas, the boreholes have been very successful and are not only supplying water for the gardens but are also providing clean water to the wider community who were having to previously travel long distances to access water. This high demand is putting considerable pressure on some of the boreholes, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Killian Mutiro, 2011. Determining the Value of Cash Transfers – Experiences from PRP. Paper presented at the CaLP Workshop on "Determining the Value of Cash Transfers, November 2011, Cresta Hotel, Harare.

some complaints were made that community demand was negatively affecting the borehole's use for LIG purposes. However, there is considerable unmet demand for water and sanitation infrastructure in the resettlement areas, and the community benefit of the boreholes has had positive impacts on community relations. Government officials (from Ward Councillor to District Social Services) expressed a desire for NRC to implement WASH projects in the Wards. One possibility would be to provide separate boreholes for community use and LIG use in those areas where demand for water is most intense. This would help relieve pressure on LIG use of boreholes, and by enhancing community gains from the project may be expected to improve community relationships and attitudes to IDPs / returnees.

Borehole problems were experienced in some of the low input garden projects. One borehole had to be abandoned due to salinity problems, and some others were low yielding and heavy to operate, leading to some beneficiaries leaving the project (e.g. 15 members of Tagarika garden including the Chairman had left by July 2012). Due to delays in drilling boreholes, gardens were established late into the main gardening season, leading to increased pest and disease problems. In addition, hot weather in Chiredzi required increased frequency of watering, which was hard to maintain in some cases due to low yielding boreholes combined with increased pressure from communities using the boreholes for domestic purposes. This reduced the availability of water for irrigation purposes, and created some conflicts due to competing demands.

## 5. Conservation Agriculture

The benefits of conservation agriculture techniques were recognised by the beneficiaries and by other members of the community, particularly as there was a drought and mulched crops were seen to withstand the dry conditions better than conventionally grown crops. However, there were some complaints that mulching increased weeds, which competed with the crops, and in one location there was a problem with termites in the mulch eating the seeds. Beneficiaries shared learning and techniques with other community members, some of whom are now reported to be adopting conservation agriculture. The community thus benefitted from knowledge of a new kind of farming and new materials. The use of demonstration plots for training of beneficiaries was well received and made it easy for beneficiaries to understand the application of the conservation agriculture techniques. It also resulted in exchange of ideas between beneficiaries, which was felt to benefit knowledge and learning. Seeds and tools issued were considered to be of good quality. Because of reduced yields due to drought, many consumed all of their produce, whilst others sold some within the villages. Although there was education on crop rotation, because the project was only of one year duration there was no practical aspect, which is a significant disadvantage in ensuring correct application of the technique. Farmers

“Mulching helped preserve moisture, which made crops grow and ripen despite harsh weather conditions”

“The training approach was perfect – it was easy to understand”

*Beneficiary FGD, Chiredzi Ward 16*

have still not tried the technique, indicating long delays between training and practical application, with a risk of loss of learning. Although there was some expectation that beneficiaries would be supported by NRC with seeds etc. for a second year, this did not occur.

Beneficiary complaints included the labour intensity of the process, and problems with weeds. Beneficiaries indicated that there was a shortage fertiliser and tools, particularly hoes. Most felt that giving only one hoe per household does not enable the

work to be done by the whole family, which was a particular issue given the labour intensity of the process and the fact that NRC cancelled plans to provide rippers for mechanised conservation agriculture trials due to resource constraints. Some said that “NRC promised us chemicals but they did not supply us with those chemicals”. A common complaint was that seeds were provided late, as they arrived after the start of the farming season, and that the amount of fertiliser was insufficient for the seeds given. Farming the sorghum late (after the start of the farming season) not only reduced yields but was thought by beneficiaries to increase pest problems / high losses from birds eating the crop. Many felt the type of sorghum provided was particularly prone to bird damage. There were several reports that the amount of ground nut seeds given was inadequate for the area cultivated. Some processed the groundnut crop into peanut butter, which sold for \$1 per pot. Some felt ploughs and draught cattle should have been provided to reduce intensity of labour requirements, whilst others would have liked

other seed types provided (e.g. maize and sorghum rather than millet). In one community the planting of sorghum seed was not allowed (taboo).

## 6. Monitoring and Evaluation

A number of sources raised significant concerns about monitoring structures and procedures for the projects, including local government partners (Social Services and Agritex), NRC staff, beneficiaries, non-partner organisations working in the area, and past project monitoring reports / progress reports. Although Government stakeholders in Chiredzi seemed broadly satisfied with NRC interaction and communication, in Chipinge both Social Services and Agritex District staff complained of a lack of their involvement in monitoring visits, and a desire was expressed for regular field visits (e.g. quarterly) to ensure they are adequately updated on progress. It was indicated that although they were, for example, invited to goat distributions and similar events they had never been taken back to see progress.

There was significant evidence that failures of beneficiaries to fulfil their commitments, or even misuses of project resources by beneficiaries (e.g. deaths of livestock due to negligence such as not feeding or not treating diseases) were not adequately followed up due to pressures on staff time. ActionAid in Chiredzi also reported NRC beneficiaries trying to sell “NRC pass-on goats” to an ActionAid goat project. The annual review of FSL projects noted that “beneficiaries are taking advantage of limited monitoring visits by NRC”, and that livestock “deaths increased during periods when NRC staff were absent. Instances of misuse/consumption of animals were reported. It is also possible that some reported “deaths” may in fact have been unofficial sales. Progress reports in 2011 included reports of failure to undertake monitoring due to pressures on staff time, giving an impression that M&E was something undertaken if time permitted, rather than an essential activity. NRC has already begun to make commendable progress on addressing M&E issues, including appointing an M&E Officer, and enabling two staff to undertake an M&E Course at the University of Zimbabwe. However the scale and diversity of NRC activities, and their geographical spread, mean that further reinforcement of M&E capacity is required. Potential solutions include :

1. Increasing NRC’s in-house M&E capacity, e.g. by having separate M&E officers for the two districts, and an M&E coordinator, potentially based at HQ in Harare. ACF has a staff structure of this type for its Chiredzi operations, supplemented by data entry staff as required (ACF operations are similar in scale to NRC, but less varied in project types or geographical spread being limited to Low Veldt areas of Chiredzi).
2. Strengthen monitoring partnerships with Government stakeholders like Agritex. At present Agritex are supposed to support on monitoring but are not mobile (no transport), so they only monitor those who come to the Agritex offices. It was reported that there are some areas where other NGOs support Agritex officers with motor bikes and fuel to enable them to undertake monitoring of beneficiaries for most project activities. NRC Project Officers could then focus on verifying and directing the M&E activities. This could improve sustainability of Agritex support of beneficiaries after the end of the project, capacity build local structures, improve relationships with Government departments, and be a cost effective alternative to in-house staff.

During 2011 monitoring was affected by the absence of any full time M&E staff, leading to a reliance on Project Officers and Agritex staff. Project officers were primarily focused on project implementation, limiting the time spent on M&E tasks, whilst Agritex staff lacked mobility and thus failed to adequately monitor. There is a need to ensure that adequate budgetary provision for M&E activities is built into all project proposals, including provision for appropriate staffing resources.

## 6. Management

NRC is a newly established organization in Zimbabwe, having begun its Zimbabwe operations at the commencement of the programs being reviewed here. Consequently there was an initial lack of established systems and procedures. Several of the problems identified below can be attributed to the newness of the organization during 2011. Progress has since been made in addressing the sources of the problems, and the issues identified may therefore to some extent be regarded as historic.

The period of implementation of the initial program (1 year) was not adequate to achieve all the intended impacts.

There was a lack of coordination and monitoring of budgets, combined with authorization from 3 different offices (Chipinge, Chiredzi and Harare) resulted in delays in reconciliations and budget overspends. This led to some unnecessary expenditures, depleting program budgets. Budgetary constraints led to the cancellation of some important program elements such as purchases of agricultural chemicals and fertilizers, and purchasing of rippers for mechanized Conservation Agriculture trials.

Many reports were reviewed during this study. These varied considerably in format quality, use of qualitative data, focus on impacts, etc. Some lacked basic information, such as period covered by the report, author, date produced, etc. Many were activity focused, rather than addressing impacts or outcomes. This makes comparing and consolidating information from different program reports problematic. NRC Zimbabwe may wish to implement standardised reporting frameworks, and increasing staff awareness of the importance of a results-based monitoring / reporting approach.

**Appendix 4: Causes of impacts on household and community relationships**
**Table A4.1 Reasons for impacts on relationships in the household (number of times mentioned)**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	LIG	Conser- vation Agric	Small Live- stock	Market Links	Condi- tional Cash	Uncon- ditional Cash	N
<b>Causes of improvements in Household Relationships</b>							
More food / less worry about food	15	17	2	18	12	18	82
Better quality / variety of food	8	2	2	4	3	1	20
General happiness / peace of mind	2	2	6	7	2	1	20
Working together / shared decisions / helping each other	4	4	4	0	4	0	16
Better relationships / decreased conflict	4	0	1	1	1	1	8
School attendance / paying fees	8	1	0	9	5	4	27
School materials / uniform	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
Increased income / living standards	6	4	3	1	6	0	20
Better health / access to medicine	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
Soap, clothes and other assets	2	0	6	0	1	1	10
Clean water	1	0	6	0	0	0	1
Increased status from livestock ownership	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Joy from possession of animals	0	0	19	0	0	2	21
<b>Causes of Worsening of Household Relationships</b>							
Children forget to care for poultry / steal eggs	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Table A4.2 Reasons for impacts on relationships in the community (number of times mentioned)**

Food Security and Livelihood Program	LIG	Conser- vation Agric	Small Live- stock	Market Links	Condi- tional Cash	Uncon- ditional Cash	N
<b>Causes of improvements in Community Relationships</b>							
No longer begging / dependent on others	0	1	0	1	4	7	13
Reduction in theft	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sharing/lending/exchanging/helping others	8	11	0	10	2	11	42
Working together	10	4	4	5	8	4	35
Sharing skills and ideas	1	0	4	7	2	0	14
Sharing the borehole	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Able to borrow or give credit/improved trust	0	0	0	3	0	1	4
Increased friendships	3	0	4	4	3	0	14
More interaction due to trade / passing on	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Belonging together	0	4	2	0	0	0	6
Happy for others	0	0	1	2	2	4	9
Ownership of animals	0	1	7	0	0	1	9
Increased esteem in eyes of community	0	1	5	0	1	1	8
<b>Causes of Worsening of Community Relationships</b>							
Resentment at being left out of project	3	3	0	4	1	3	14
Conflict caused by aspects of project	1	0	1	0	2	0	4

## Appendix 5: Breakdown of Beneficiary Numbers and Demographics

### Chiredzi Ward 16 Beneficiary Statistics

Intervention	NRC H/H Category	Male	Female	Subtotal	Grant Total	Survey Participants	%
LIG	IDPs	32	31	63	107	53	50%
	Returnees			0			
	Host	22	22	44			
Goats	IDPs	42	16	58	97	115	44%
	Returnees			0			
	Host	28	11	39			
Guinea Fowls	IDPs	10	1	11	18		
	Returnees			0			
	Host	6	1	7			
Conservation Agriculture	IDPs	152	85	237	396	62	16%
	Returnees			0			
	Host	102	57	159			
Market linkages	IDPs	347	122	469	782	65	8%
	Returnees			0			
	Host	231	82	313			
Conditional cash transfer / IGAs	IDPs	34	18	52	80	24	30%
	Returnees			0			
	Host	18	10	28			
Unconditional Cash Transfer	IDPs	83	65	148	170	55	32%
	Returnees			0			
	Host	11	11	22			
Total		1118	532	1650	1650	310	19%
		68%	32%	100%			

Sources: NRC Project Reports and Evaluation Survey Statistics

CHIREDZI 3-7th Sept 2012	Group Interviews	No. Of People	Individual Interviews	Total # Participants Interviewed	Number of Beneficiaries in Project	%
Market Links	3	53	12	65	782	0.08
Unconditional Cash	4	44	11	55	170	0.32
Conditional cash /IGA	2	12	12	24	80	0.30
Low Input Gardens	3	43	10	53	107	0.50
Conserv. Agriculture	3	52	10	62	396	0.16
Small Livestock	3	40	11	51	115	0.44
TOTAL				310	1650	0.19

Note:

The demographic breakdown indicated in the above Table is not an accurate representation of the gender balance of participants in the program, as the male head of household was frequently the person participating in initial meeting for registration and project planning even where the actual participants in the trainings and work of the project (e.g. tending Gardens) was their wife. Thus it has not been possible to accurately identify the ratio of men to women amongst actual participants.

Efforts should therefore be made in future programs to achieve greater inclusion of women in planning meetings and registration, to enable them to be full and equal participants in decisions that affect their lives and that of the household.

### Chipinge beneficiaries

Intervention	NRC H/H Category	Male	Female	Sub Total	Total	Survey Participants	%
LIG	N/a	73	254	327	327		
Small livestock (goats)	N/a	60	140	200	200		
Small livestock (guinea fowls)	N/a	6	45	51	51		
Conservation farming	IDPs	67	181	248	308		
	Returnees	0	0	0			
	Host	38	22	60			
Market linkages	N/a	204	177	381	381		
Conditional cash grant	N/a	47	152	199	199		
Unconditional cash grant	N/a	46	105	151	151		
Safety nets	IDPs	81	198	279	279		
		622	1274	1896	1896	0	0

<b>CHIPINGE</b> <b>13th Sept 2012</b>	10-	Group Interviews	No. Of People	Individual Interviews	Total # Participants Interviewed	Number of Benef'ries in Project	%
Market Links		2	20	8	28	381	0.07
Unconditional Cash		3	63	10	73	151	0.48
Conditional cash /IGA		2	30	10	40	199	0.20
Low Input Gardens		2	77	9	86	327	0.26
Conserv. Agriculture		3	66	8	74	308	0.24
Small Livestock Goats & Indigenous Poultry		2	70	12	82	200	0.41
Small Livestock G-Fowl		1	19	5	24	51	0.47
Safety Nets		2	68	14	82	279	0.29
<b>TOTAL</b>			413	76	489	1896	0.26

### ECHO IGAs and ISALS beneficiaries for 2012

District	Host	Returnees	IDPs	Male	Female	Total
Chiredzi Ward 17	17	8	185	56	154	210
Chiredzi Ward 23	46	10	134	52	138	190
Chipinge Ward 9	30	11	84	49	76	125
Chipinge Ward 6	27	12	108	57	90	147
Chipinge Ward 7	14	9	105	42	86	128
<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>800</b>

## **Appendix 6: Evaluation Terms of Reference**



TERMS OF REFERENCE	
Evaluation of the food security and livelihoods project in Zimbabwe	
Project/Program:	ZWFK1101/ZWFK1202 Food Security and Livelihoods
Country:	Zimbabwe
Duration:	January 2011- December 2012

### **1. Project background**

In 2011, the NRC livelihoods programme aimed to support displaced communities to achieve household self-reliance and household food security. The programme worked in 6 geographical areas (“wards”) in Chipinge and Chiredzi district targeting 2,770 households with low input gardens (910 HH), small livestock (500 HH), conservation agriculture (760 HH), conditional cash transfers (279 HH) and unconditional cash transfers (321 HH). Market linkages were also created for 370 farmers in Chipinge and 398 farmers in Chiredzi.

Beneficiaries were provided with support in the form of cash/inputs/trainings and these activities were done in partnership with government stakeholders. In the current year, only a few beneficiaries in community gardens and conditional cash transfer/income generating activities will be supported with inputs and cash respectively.

#### **Project objectives (main elements of the log frame (LFA):**

The overall objective / expected impact of the project is to contribute to the durable resettlement and integration of internally displaced people and returnees by improving their food security and access to sustainable livelihoods opportunities.

### **2. Purpose of evaluation and intended use**

The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and results/impact of the NRC’s food security projects to the targeted IDPs and host communities in Zimbabwe. This will enable the organisation to engage in effective policymaking, planning, programming and implementation and also feed into the Country Strategy document.

The evaluation results will inform the on-going food security activities in Zimbabwe as well as similar operations in other countries where NRC is implementing livelihoods projects.

Its findings and conclusions will be shared with other NRC national staff, NRC head office in Oslo, the Food Security and Livelihoods Advisor, and other interested stakeholders.

### **3. Scope of work and methods**

**Sector:** Food security and livelihoods including the cash transfer project (conditional/income generating activities and unconditional), small livestock pass on, community gardens, conservation agriculture, and market linkages to support displaced communities to achieve household self-reliance and household food security.

**Period:** 01 January 2011 to August 2012.

**Location:** Chiredzi and Chipinge districts in Zimbabwe.

The methodology will include:

- Desk studies. As a general background, the consultant should study relevant material in NRC, such as review of proposals, reports and other documents associated with the programme.
- Field visits and other travel: Visit project sites in both districts.
- Interviews with stakeholders: Interviews with key government departments e.g. Agritex, beneficiaries and community representatives working with the target population in each district. This can include household surveys, focus groups and interviews. Also interview other organisations working in the vicinity who are not partnering with NRC.

**Evaluation principles:**

The evaluation will be guided by the following ethical rules/considerations:

- Openness-of information ethical rules/considerations
- Publicity/public access to the results when there are not special consideration against this broad participation-the interest parties should be involved when relevant/possible.
- Independence. Not subject to control or interference of NRC staff.
- Reliability and independence. The evaluation should be conducted so that findings and conclusions are correct and trustworthy. Professional and personal standards are maintained.

**4. Issues to be covered**

The evaluation team will assess the performance of the interventions by applying the following criteria defined in the NRC Evaluation policy. The question under each criterion is meant to guide the evaluation team in focussing on key issues for NRC.

**Relevance/appropriateness:**

- What is the evidential basis for the design of the programme?
- To what extent does the NRC programme respond to the needs and priorities of the target beneficiaries?
- Are NRC's targeting criteria appropriate and well implemented?

**Efficiency:**

- Could similar results have been achieved by other means at lower costs but in the same time?
- What constraints and opportunities existed or developed which have, could have influenced resource costs (e.g. particular problems which may have reduced efficiency, or opportunities which may have increased efficiency)?
- Were the right staff and materials (logistics and procurements) available in the right place at the right time?
- Going forward, could NRC reduce costs without sacrificing quality?

**Effectiveness:**

- Did the project meet the objectives and targets set out in the project documents and proposals?
- How did the project perform against key indicators and standards such as SPHERE, HAP.

**Impact**

- How did the programme effect the target population?
- In particular, did the programme have an impact on the food security of beneficiary households.
- Are there unintended consequences of the programme on beneficiaries, other humanitarian organisations and key stakeholders?
- Did the programme have any negative consequences for beneficiaries, other humanitarian organisations or actors?

**Connectedness/sustainability**

- To what extent did the intervention plan for the transition from emergency to longer term recovery
- Are the changes that have been achieved likely to be sustained?
- To what extent have national and local capacity been supported and developed

**Cross cutting issues:**

- **Gender-** Has the project adopted a gender sensitive approach?
- **Protection-** How has the project ensured that concerns have been incorporated and rights based approach adopted?

**5. Evaluation team**

An evaluation will be conducted by the consultant. NRC will help in hiring local enumerators if needed. The team leader will be the consultant and will lead the work of the team and be responsible for completing the report. The team leader should have skill and proven background in humanitarian assistance evaluations.

The team members should have the knowledge and expertise in carrying out evaluation surveys.

**6. Time frame and budget considerations**

The whole process of the evaluations will have a time frame of **2 weeks**, starting on 27 August and ending 07 September

The evaluation team is scheduled to start its work on 28 August conducting field visits to Chipinge and Chiredzi during the period of 2 Weeks.

**7. Reporting**

A draft work plan with a summary of the primary information needs, the methodology to be used, work plan/schedule for field visits and major deadlines should be submitted before the survey for planning purposes. Also stating how data will be collected, sampling framework, data sources, drafts of data collection tools such as questionnaires and interview guides.

A draft report should be submitted not later than 16 September. The completion date for the Final Evaluation report will be 8 October, the consultant having addressed NRC's comments as appropriate. Difference of opinion between team members regarding conclusions/recommendations will be reflected in the report.

The size of the report should be approximately 12 pages, clearly written in English using Arial 11 point.

The evaluation report should consist of:

- Executive summary and recommendations not more than 3 pages
- Main text to include evaluation methodology, commentary and analysis addressing evaluation purpose and outputs to include a section dedicated to the issues of particular lessons-learning focus, conclusions (not more than 7 pages)
- Appendices

All material collected in the undertaking of the evaluation process should be lodged with the livelihoods coordinator prior to the termination of the contract).

### ***8. Follow up***

The final evaluation report will make the basis for a management response and an action plan to follow up recommendations provided by the evaluation team.

For the follow up of the evaluation the livelihoods Coordinator is the main responsible, involving M&E officer where relevant. The management response, responding to the recommendations, including an action should be prepared by the livelihoods Coordinator not later than two months after receiving the final report. It is the responsibility of livelihoods Coordinator to ensure that the realisations of these plans are monitored and documented.

The final evaluation report will be shared with interested stakeholders and be available for all NRC staff.