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# Executive Summary

* The study methodology pursued for the evaluation was outlined by the TOR where use of different quantitative and qualitative methods is recommended for data collection.
* Evaluation objectives include assessment of achievements, implementation strategy and impact and to provide recommendations and document case studies.
* The project was designed through participatory approaches which involved all program staff members and grassroots-organizations. It has got strengths and weaknesses.
* To have functional Village Development Committees (VDCs) for effective community participation the project formed and supported capacities of VDCs. Inclusion of women and youth and democratic process were considered.
* Similarly, capacities of CBOs and LNGOs have been supported financially, technically and institutionally.
* LEAP included 3 components for improving livelihood of targeted households. These were IGAs (1000 HHs), small scale irrigated schemes (500 HHs) and rain-fed agriculture (3000 HHs). The former 2 components were successful but the latter didn’t succeed. Failure is attributed to insufficient rainfall and delays in seeds distribution and pests.
* LEAP also included improvement of livelihood of 1,000 pastoral households through access to animal health services. It includes livelihood enhancement, peaceful co-existence, paravets training and awareness-raising. They have been included as direct beneficiaries in other components (IGAs and small scale irrigated schemes) and as indirect beneficiaries in water supply. More than 9,000 heads of animal were vaccinated.
* Water supply was one of LEAP components. The number of water points rehabilitated or constructed is very small. There are two mini-water yards in Kass and two in Gereida in addition to 7 hand pumps. This achievement is far below the target which was improving access of 80% of targeted population in the two Localities. The target was 4,000 households and the actual number of beneficiaries is about 2,500 households.
* The main elements of hygiene component were creation of awareness on sanitation and hygiene practices, construction of institutional latrines, production and distribution of concrete slabs for household latrines and TOT for Women Clubs on good hygiene practices. This was relatively successful in Gereida and failure in Kass. Criteria used to measure success or failure are the number of slabs used by beneficiaries to construct household pit latrines and number of beneficiaries reached by awareness-raising activities.
* The peace building component consists of formation of representative Peace Committees and training community leaders on relevant issues such as conflict resolution, mediation and leadership skills. These efforts aimed at reduction of conflict over natural resources and trust building. Documentation and endorsement of customary laws are missing.
* Central to the LEAP implementation strategy is partnership with local NGOs, CBOs and VDCs. This entailed building capacities of local NGOs and establishment and supporting CBOs and VDCs. The objectives of creating partnership with LNGOs and CBOs were to ensure community participation, success of the implementation process, cost effectiveness and enhanced sustainability. An intermediate objective is to qualify local actors for long term local development interventions.
* The project was relevant to community needs and priorities, MDGs and CIS strategy in Darfur. Activities of the project were implemented with reasonable effectiveness and efficiency despite the fragile external context.
* The impact of IGAs, irrigated schemes and water supply was remarkable; however, other components achieved less impact. On the other hand, two factors of sustainability (ownership and in-built strategy) are reliable while follow up factor is not.
* The surrounding environment was very volatile and witnessed simultaneous tribal conflicts and political armed conflict. The project implementation process has, also, been facing several difficulties and logistical constraints.
* The project is a good manifestation of inter-relationship between peace and development. It has broken the vicious circle of the dilemma which is first peace or development by an intervention that addresses recovery and long term needs. It has coincided with a voluntary return of IDPs to the targeted areas and played a role in attracting more returnees.
* The organization of the targeted communities through formation of VDCs and CBOs and the associated capacity building was the platform for the demonstrated achievements. With more technical and institutional support they can lead local community development.
* The livelihood activities were successful and supplemented each other as the beneficiaries of each component are different to a chance for wider coverage. The irrigated small schemes, IGAs and water supply are the most successful components followed by hygiene, capacity building, peace building and livestock health services.
* ***Recommendations:***
* *It is strongly advisable to devote adequate time, efforts and expertise for project design and updating.*
* *Establishment of follow up mechanism for effective TOT is highly recommended.*
* *The recommendation is to set up monitoring and evaluation system before implementation process starts.*
* *Recommend broadening the scope of peace building component to include more leadership training, expanding the coverage of culture of peace campaigns and documenting the customary laws (Capacitate Dimlij).*
* *It advisable to invest more in construction of mini-water yards for both sedentary and nomadic populations.*
* *It is recommendable to establish at least one horticulture nursery in each Locality for provision of fruit tree seedlings.*
* *Timely distribution of seeds is strongly recommended and should be in May up to mid June.*
* *The recommendation is to increase the amount of small grants from SDG350 to SDG500.*
* *It is recommendable for mass improvement of livelihood of rural households to provide more pumps for irrigation and reduce the number of partners from 10 to 5.*
* *More systematic campaigns on hygiene and sanitary issues are recommended.*
* *It is advisable to make special design of pit latrines for Kass area in consultation with WES.*
* *It is necessary to strengthen coordination mechanism with line ministries and other partners.*

1. **Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of the final evaluation of the Livelihood Enhancement for Agro-pastoral and Pastoral rural communities (LEAP) to CIS. LEAP is an intervention that aimed at balancing services between IDPs and sedentary rural populations in Localities of Kass and Gereida, South Darfur State. The contents of this report will also be shared with The Royal Netherlands Embassy who funded the project.

The scope of this report is limited to the assessment of achievements against the overall objective “conditions within selected pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in South Darfur better support longer term recovery from conflict”; and the specific objective that reads “by May 2010, the livelihoods of 4,000 agro-pastoralist and pastoralist households in South Darfur have improved through increased income, access to sufficient clean water and peaceful co-existence within their communities” and delivery of the subsequent results.

The evaluation was meant to closely review, assess and record the progress made towards achieving the results and objectives of LEAP. The evaluation focused on the specific objectives, as stated below under study objectives, to measure project performance in order to help the implementing partners understand reasons that led to success or failure for future improvements.

The planning process of this report has faced several constraints represented by the difficulty to find an expert on SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) in Nyala. Another challenge faced the evaluation team was that the respondents were not transparent. It is has become part of their survival strategy to be skeptical. They also assumed that the objective of the survey was to reimburse IGAs loan.

This report is composed of 10 sections including the introduction as section one. Section two is the study methodology that describes the methods used for data collection and analysis. The third section lists the objectives of the study and the forth one provides brief criticisms to the project design.

The main body of the report is section five where findings under each of the programmatic themes of LEAP are discussed. It consists of seven subtitles covering all project components. The implementation strategy was separately tackled in section six followed by assessment of project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Key measures used for performance assessment were explained in terms of clarity of goals; logical linkages of objective hierarchy; achievements of objectives and availability and accuracy of information.

Section 8 is a list of conclusions derived from the main body of the report. Next to it are two case study generated from an interview with one of the IGA beneficiaries in Singita village in Kass Locality. Finally, there are appendices.

1. **Study Methodology/implementation process**

The study methodology pursued for the evaluation was outlined by the TOR where use of different quantitative (to ensure systematic investigation through measurement) and qualitative (to ensure broader and in-depth analysis) methods is recommended for data collection. These methods involved interviews with informative key person (IKP) and focal group discussions (FGD) in all project sites. Whereas LEAP is a rural development project that consists of a variety of components, the evaluation methodology had to include – in addition to above methods - field visits to gather data from beneficiaries through pre-structured questionnaires and from VDCs and partners through FGD and interviews with CIS staff members involved in LEAP management. However, these sources of information don’t rule out the importance of the secondary sources of information, mainly project document, progress reports and baseline survey.

Field work began with an internal consultation with CIS staff members in Nyala Office. It was an opportunity to understand the programming context and to discuss the evaluation plan in more details. This consultation was followed by an interview with the Programme Manager and Livelihood Area Manager (Kass) where in-depth discussion of the planning and implementation process was held.

Four enumerators (two males and two females) were hired by the consultant from Kass and received adequate orientation on the purpose of the assignment and techniques of data collection.

Central to the adopted methodology was the critical analysis of the available information and reports. This necessitated in-depth understanding of LEAP through interviews with project managers and reading the project document together with understanding the external context where LEAP has been implemented.

The focus of the evaluation, as outlined in the TOR, is the assessment of the programme design and the main five aspects: Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Field visits were made to Kass and Gereida Localities.

At the desk level the following reports have been reviewed:

* Mid-term Progress Report 2009;
* Project Proposal;
* Project Logical Framework;
* Project Work Plan;

### Sample Design

It is important to explain the process of calculating the sample size and sampling process as an integral part of the methodology. Since the project targeted households as beneficiaries, the household was used as sampling unit.

### In order to achieve reasonable accuracy in deriving conclusions - given the availability of time and resources and surrounding circumstances – we used the following factors for calculating the sample size:

Confidence Level: 95%

Confidence Interval: 10%

### I have used the total number of beneficiaries of each sector and distributed it proportionally between the targeted communities. A combination of clustering and systematic approaches was applied for random sampling. Clusters were used as sample frames.

The samples are distributed as follows: Table (1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Description of Targeted Population | Estimated Targeted Population | Targeted Households | Sample Size  HHs | | |
|  |  |  | Total | Kass | Greida |
| Beneficiaries of IGAs | 6,000 | 1,000 | 82 | 41 | 41 |
| Beneficiaries of small scale irrigated schemes | 3000 | 500 | 72 | 36 | 36 |
| Beneficiaries of seeds and tools | 18,000 | 3000 | 92 | 46 | 46 |
| Hygiene | 2000 | 400 | 78 | 39 | 39 |
| Pastorals | 6,000 | 1000 | 88 | 44 | 44 |
| **Total** | **35,000** | **5,500** | **412** | **206** | **206** |
| Beneficiaries of water intervention | 24,000 | 4000 | 94 | 47 | 47 |
| **Grand Total** | **59,000** | **9,500** | **506** | **253** | **253** |

Rapid household survey was also used to assess the impact on livelihood of beneficiary households.

1. **Study Objectives**

The main objectives of this final project evaluation are the following:

* Assess whether the project has achieved the proposed objectives and goals.
* Evaluate how far the implementation strategy has been effective into achieving the proposed objectives.
* Evaluate how the project has impacted in people’s lives as per the project objectives and the set of verifiable indicators listed in the log frame.
* Assess how the community participation level was and how it has contributed to the project achievements.
* Document lessons learned through the implementation process, and identify the main factors that influenced the project implementation.
* Provide recommendations that could be adopted for future similar projects.
* Document at least two case studies from both Kass& Gereida that could be shared out.

Achievement of above evaluation objectives will be through assessment of the project design and the progress against the following results:

* 8 Functional Village Development Committees (VDCs) are in place and contributing to improved livelihoods and peace.
* Improved capacity of 3 local NGO partners and relevant government departments
* 4,000 households increase their food and income security
* 4,000 households have improved year-round access to clean drinking water.
* Communities participating in the project demonstrate increased awareness of and improved practice in relation to basic household hygiene.
* Participating communities demonstrate increased capacities for mitigating and resolving local conflicts in a non-violent manner.

1. **Project Design**

The project was designed through participatory approaches involving all program staff members and grassroots organizations. It was designed as a continuation of the previous programme being implemented by CARE International.

The project proposal has a comprehensive and strong background. It presents logical flow of information quite relevant to the subject and leads to strong justifications.

The overall goal is mentioned in the summary of the proposal but not in the main document. The specific objective seems to be only one but in fact it encompasses three specific objectives.

It reads: *By the end of August 2009, the livelihoods of 7,000 agro-pastoralists and 3,000 pastoralist households in conflict affected areas in South and West Darfur has improved through increased income, access to sufficient clean water and peaceful co-existence within their communities.*

It is smart objective, however, it involves an impeded word “through” followed by three separate specific objectives which are; i) income increment, ii) access to sufficient clean water and iii) peaceful co-existence within agro-pastoral and pastoral communities. The targets of each are mentioned in the respective result(s).

The description of the direct beneficiaries is good but a differentiation between the agro-pastorals and pastorals would have been appropriate. Numbers of beneficiaries of each sector were not mentioned.

The project proposal is not well-organized and not thoroughly updated. The logframe was updated after CIS took over from the expelled CARE without updating the narrative proposal. The expulsion of NGOs had resulted in a sudden halt of implementation process of activities and thus created a so complicated situation. As far as LEAP is concerned the complications had resulted in clear variation between the two documents in regards to names of targeted areas and numbers of beneficiaries.

The implementation process highlighted the importance of monitoring and updating the assumptions.

1. **Findings**
   1. **Functional Village Development Committees (VDCs) are in place and contributing to improved livelihoods and peace.**

The evaluator has noticed that LEAP recognized the fact that community organization is one of the pre-requisites for launching recovery and development programmes. This was evident by the embarking of the project, at the initial stage, on supporting the communities to constitute their VDCs. Through FGDs the evaluator has concluded that targeted communities in Kass and Greida have elected VDC members through what we can call democratic process. They had elected potential candidates to add up to the given seats of the community leaders. In order to ensure equal representation of different community categories in the VDC and its subcommittees some seats were devoted to pastoralists, women and youth. The percentage of women representation ranges between 25% and 50%. In one case it exceeded 50%, in addition to a subcommittee for women. However, the pastoralists complain of under representation and domination of residents. The specialized subcommittees are for peaceful co-existence and culture of peace, agriculture, water, women, sanitation, livelihood and IGAs. The pastoralists are fairly represented in the peace building subcommittee.

Most of the VDCs have been newly formed by CIS and the few existing ones have been activated. Then CIS started implementing the component of capacity building which included technical and institutional support. The technical support was training of VDC members on the following simplified topics:

* Leadership
* Project cycle management,
* Management of small-scale business,
* Selection of feasible income generation activities,
* Conflict resolution and peace building,
* Bookkeeping.
* Hygiene

In response to the question how VDCs benefited from CIS organizational support they confirmed that now they have a formal entity that represents them in front of NGOs and Government. They have, also, acquired from CIS training courses new knowledge. In general, the training courses were useful as reported by the majority of the interviewees; however, there are some limitations including the following: -

* The duration of each training workshop was only one day which is too short except the training workshops for Peace Building Committees which were 3 days.
* Most of the trainees don’t remember the contents of the courses very well. This raises a question about the appropriateness of the methodology pursued for delivering the training.
* The training package was not simplified enough for the illiterates to grasp.

These limitations are linked to two major external constraints which are the insecurity situation and the difficulty to bring the VDC and subcommittee members together into the classroom. They are always too busy to spare one day off job.

The project has, also, delivered institutional support to the VDCs in the form of construction of centers (offices) of local materials and furnished them with plastic chairs, tables and mats. These centers have become vibrant meeting spaces where the committees discuss their affairs. It provided a space and avenue that was not available for rural communities. It is likely that these centers will develop and help in community development.

It is observed that the VDCs work in harmony with the native administration at all levels Sheikhs in each village are often members of the VDC. On the other hand, the relationship with the LGA (Admin Unit and Locality) seems to be parallel or weak. The LGAs don’t have a strategic plan and delivery of public services is not on top of their priorities. They focus on tax collection and prioritize security over the delivery of social services.

The organizational, technical and institutional support provided by LEAP to the targeted rural communities has played a major role in rebuilding their structures, mobilizing them towards self-reliance and has contributed to the return of IDPs. The targeted areas – particularly Kass – have much potential and can exceed self-reliance provided stability of security situation and systematic recovery support to the livelihood mechanisms.

* 1. **Improved capacity of 3 local NGO partners and relevant government departments**

Central to LEAP implementation strategy was CBOs capacity building. Besides supporting the capacities of the VDCs LEAP has formed two CBOs one for each Locality. In Kass the “National Association for Peace and Development (NAPD)” and in Gereida the “National Association for Development (NAD)” were formed to represent all VDCs and to lead the community development as local non-governmental organizations.

During a FGD in Kass (CIS office) with the Executive Office of NAPD we came out with the following conclusions:

* The CBO and the VDCs had been involved in the project cycle from the initial stage of identification (needs assessment, prioritization of community needs and stakeholder analysis).
* LEAP team together with CSPD and VDCs formed the subcommittees for Water and Sanitation; Agriculture; Health; Women Affairs and Peace Building. The participation of women in these committees ranges between 25% and 45%.
* The beneficiaries have identified their priority needs. For example, the farmers asked for, irrigation, seeds, tools and agricultural extension while pastorals prioritized training of local paravets and a revolving supply of drugs. Women headed-households and the disadvantaged households preferred the IGAs.
* The role of CSPD in the success of the peace building events was crucial because the members are enthusiastic and the formation of CSPD is representative and inclusive.
* The training courses were good and useful but more refresher training courses are needed.
* VDCs were actively involved in the planning and implementation phases of LEAP and were very cooperative in conducting this evaluation.

Two local NGOs have been selected through certain criteria, their capacities were supported and they were involved in the LEAP implementation process. Those were National Organization for Care and Development (NOCD) and Peace Corps Organization (PCO). Both have offices in Nyala and representation in Kass and Gereida.

NOCD stated that they have been selected because they are competent and that they have institutional support in terms of office furniture and training on Project Cycle Management (PCM). In order to implement LEAP activities LNGOs received financial support as well. They have, also, received indirect cost.

PCO received similar institutional, technical and financial support but, unfortunately, they failed to carry on their responsibilities. The capacity assessment didn’t include investigation on the reputation of the managers as I understood from the Programme Officer. However, PCO was recommended by HAC and CIS was obliged to take HAC’s recommendation as a partner.

* 1. **4000 households increase their food and income security.**

This chapter presents the evaluation findings in regards to improvement of food security and livelihood of targeted households. It includes three parts Income Generation Activities (IGAs), small scale irrigation schemes and rain-fed agriculture.

* + 1. **1000 households realize significant benefit from income generation activities (IGAs).**

LEAP has supported 1099 (596 in Kass and 503 in Gereida) rural households through Income Generating Activities (IGAs). A small grant of SDG375 was given to each beneficiary household. The project managed to reach 109.9% of the total number of proposed beneficiaries. The IGAs component has proven to be one of the best strategies that enhance livelihood of rural people.

The targeted beneficiaries and the VDCs have been adequately involved in the selection of feasible activities through consultation. A preparatory phase preceded the selection exercise was training of identified candidates by a local NGO partner on market assessment, market niche, bookkeeping and organization. The partner NGO who conducted the training workshops was NOCD. They trained 41 candidates in Kass and 60 in Gereida. It was a TOT meant to train the rest of the beneficiaries. NOCD managed, through local trainers, to reach the target which was 1,000 trainees. Local trainers effectively used their local languages to deliver the messages of the training. However; there are some limitations that could be attributed to the following reasons: -

* + The trainees of the “TOT” didn’t grasp the subject and one training workshop was not enough to qualify them as trainers,
  + The training package was not tested due to pressure of time.
  + The potential trainers and the beneficiaries were too busy to organize the training themselves,
  + Lack of will and understanding of the importance of training among beneficiaries,
  + High illiteracy rates,
  + The follow up was not effective,

The identified opportunities were focused on agriculture and petty trade with some other crafts such as blacksmith, butchering, barbering and photographing.

Women have invested in farming and petty trade. The percentage of women beneficiaries is 46% of the total number of beneficiaries. All female beneficiaries have reported an increase in income between 25% and 50%.

* + 1. **500 households realize significant benefit from their participation in small scale irrigated agriculture schemes.**

Constructionof small-scale irrigation structures was another successful strategy for improving the food security situation and enhancing the livelihood of rural people. The two targeted Localities have potential for irrigated agriculture, particularly, Kass. The opportunities include fertile lands, easy access to surface water (Shallow wells), experience with irrigation and availability of markets within the State.

The project supported construction of 46 irrigated farms for 460 households (250 in Kass and 250 in Gereida). This figure represents 92% of the proposed targets. The beneficiary farmers organized into groups, each one is consisting of 10 farmers. The number of women in each group is 3 or 4. There are two groups in Sarambanga not involving women contrasted by a group of women only in Karandi Kusolo.

The distribution of the immersible pumps and other agricultural inputs was not simultaneous. Some of the beneficiaries were organized and received the inputs in ample time in the first season while others had to wait for the second season. Generally, the beneficiary farmers in Kass received their inputs earlier than the beneficiaries in Gereida. Some of the works are still pending in Kass Locality while in Gereida the farmers had recently finished installation of the pumps and have started using their pumps in some wells while digging continues in some others.

The component of the irrigated schemes has improved the livelihood of those farmers (Those who had completed their works and started cultivation) through increasing their income. The incomes of the members of each group have increased by 25% – 50%. The extension services provided by the project have also contributed an increase in productivity, in particular the production of vegetables. Production was supported by the availability of access to markets in close-by urban centers.

It was not possible to assess the progress or impact of the small-scale irrigated schemes in Gereida as results are only expected during the next season. However, the farmers are very optimistic about achieving significant results.

The project has selected the right beneficiaries by pursuing a participatory approach. The majority of them are returnees, farmers, have access to land at the bank of wadis and need assistance to restore the normal functioning of their household economy.

Although this activity was quite successful, two components were not achieved. The first is the establishment of a tree nursery which was planned to benefit from the small scale irrigation schemes along the ward to help targeted rural communities support environmental conservation.

The second missing element, in Gereida, is the training of farmers on water conservation. This was proposed to complement the construction of appropriate systems for small irrigation.

* + 1. **3000 households ensure rainy-season agricultural productivity through access to necessary seeds and tools.**

This component was implemented in Kass only for a proposed number of 3,000 beneficiary households. The project managed to reach 100% of the beneficiaries in addition to 441 women headed households provided with groundnut seeds for establishing seeds bank. All of the targeted beneficiaries have, also, received hoes and 700 households received donkey plough, this was in the first season. In the second season CIS distributed groundnuts, maize, sorghum and okra seeds to all targeted beneficiaries in addition to seeds and tools from FAO. FAO agricultural tools were distributed to 57% of the total number.

LEAP intervened in rain-fed agriculture in the two previous rainy seasons. The first intervention was successful. The beneficiary farmers have reported an increase of income ranging between 25% and 50%. All respondents (individual interviewees and participants of FGDs) attributed the improvement of production to the agricultural inputs distributed by CIS and the extension services provided by CIS in collaboration with State Ministry of Agriculture (SMOA). These necessary factors for success of rain-fed cultivation in the first season coincided with other factors adequate rainfall and absence of pests that contributed to the success.

Unfortunately, the second season (2011) was different. The beneficiaries have unanimously reported that the rain-fed cultivation in the second season had failed. They have attributed the failure to the following main reasons: -

* Little rainfall,
* Occurrence of pests,
* Late delivery of seeds,
* Insufficient quantities of seeds distributed

The quantities of seeds were decided based on FAO rates which are much lower than the standard rates. That is because FAO distribute seeds for household consumption and not for commercial production. They calculate the annual food need per household as 146 Kgs times 5 (average family size). This gives 730 Kgs of grain. To know the amount of seeds required to produce 730 Kgs, they divide the outcome (730) by the amount of seeds required to produce one kilogram. Below is ration of seeds used in Kass: -

Sorghum 2.75 kgs

Millet 5 kgs

Okra 0.05

Maize 0.1

Groundnuts 20 kgs

This did not help LEAP to achieve the respective result because the intended results were different. In emergencies FAO aims at maintaining food subsistence while the expected result from LEAP was to improve the rainy-season agricultural productivity.

The delay of delivery was mentioned above as one of the main reasons behind failure of the rain-fed season. FAO has admitted full responsibility of the delay and confirmed that CIS had immediately transported and distributed the seeds after receipt from FAO.

The assumption that “all the required materials are repositioned before the beginning of rain season” hasn’t held to be true. And the corresponding mitigation measures “The project will prepare procurement plan and submit to procurement department for timely procurement and pre-positioning of equipments and materials to project sites on time” haven’t been implemented.

Another obvious assumption is missing in the logframe. That is “adequate amount and good distribution of rainfall”.

The extension services were one of the factors that enhanced the productivity of the beneficiary farmers, albeit the project didn’t implement the Farmers Field School.

The extension sessions were attended by 58.1% of the targeted farmers. Provided the difficulty to bring the farmers together the 58% is a high rate. Those who didn’t attend the sessions were not available at the village. Moreover, those who had received training have shared their knowledge with those who missed it. This brings the percentage of extension service to above 80%. The evaluator has drawn a conclusion from FGD and individual interviews that at least one quarter of the farmers who attended two or more training sessions (49.5%) have shared their knowledge with about 2 others. The breakdown is as follows: -

Table (2)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Attendance | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 39 | 41.9 |
| Once | 8 | 8.6 |
| Twice | 9 | 9.7 |
| Three times | 5 | 5.4 |
| Four times | 32 | 34.4 |
| Total | 93 | 100 |

The low production of the rain-fed cultivation in the second season was offset by the increase of groundnuts prices. The average productivity of grain per Mukhamas was 1 sack and that of groundnuts was 10 sacks. The ground nuts was sold for up to SDG120 per sack.

* 1. **1000 pastoral households enjoy improved access to animal health supplies.**

This component is a multifaceted one. It includes livelihood enhancement, peaceful co-existence, paravets training and awareness-raising. Furthermore, some of the pastorals have been included as direct beneficiaries in other components (IGAs and small scale irrigated schemes) and as indirect beneficiaries in water supply. However, this component could have been better implemented and integrated into the project themes.

The attempt to improve access of pastoralists to animal health supplies started with needs assessment. It was done jointly with the State Ministry of Animal Resources and participation of community leaders. The needs assessment was confirmed by 85% of targeted beneficiaries in Kass and 80% in Gereida.

The major achievements under this component include vaccination of more than 5,000 heads of animals in Kass and more than 4,000 heads in Gereida. It was done in close collaboration with State Ministry of Animal Resources (SMAR). They, also, include provision of veterinary drugs to help establish a revolving supply of drugs. The amount provided was sufficient for 2 to 3 months for each targeted pastoral group. The beneficiaries were supposed to pay nominal fees for the vet services in order to maintain a sustainable provision of services. Nevertheless, this element was not adequately explained to the pastoralists who were not cooperative in paying the nominal fees. This had threatened the continuation of the drugs supply in three centers of Aldanga, Singita and Fadwa. However, the CIS programme officers intervened and managed to convince the beneficiaries to pay the nominal fees, consequently, the services resumed in Aldanga and Singita Vet Centers. The refusal of the beneficiaries in Fadwa has resulted in depletion of the initial stocks and abolished the idea of revolving supply of drugs. Another achievement was training of 15 paravets in each Locality.

It worth mentioning that paravets training was done in conformity to SMAR strategy that prioritizes refresher training for paravets who received previous training rather than enrolling new trainees. The trainees have been evenly distributed over the targeted pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. 95% of the beneficiaries in Gereida and 90% in Kass reported that the paravets training had improved their access to animal health services through availability of local paravets. On the other hand, testimony of 5% in Gereida and 10% in Kass is the opposite.

The pastoralists have raised three main criticisms against the way the activities of this component were implemented. First, the medicines provided to paravets were for horses, donkeys and goats only, which is another way of saying that the project was not intended to them. Medications provided were for all animals. Second, the location of the vet clinics is in the middle of the residential areas and they can’t reach it without passing through the farms. This may create conflict. They are also not spacious enough to accommodate their herds for vaccination or medical checkup. Third, the majority of paravets are agro-pastorals and only few opportunities were offered to the pastoralists.

Through triangulation the evaluator has found out that two of these criticisms are flimsy. The location is not a problem because the paravets reach the herds where they are for vaccination and for checkup the pastorals take only the sick cow(s) to the clinic which is controllable. The pastoralists had delegated the VDC to select reliable candidates for paravets training. To select those who can perform the job regardless whether they are pastoralists or agro-pastoralists. The paravets have proved to be impartial.

The first criticism about the type of medicines needs more investigation. However, the points raised by pastoralists worth further exploration and discussions.

* 1. **4,000 households have improved year-round access to clean drinking water.**

LEAP’s attempt was to improve access of targeted local communities in Kass and Gereida to sustainable and clean drinking water. The perspective was to improve livelihood and reduce natural resources-based conflict in the two Localities. Water points are one of the most conflict triggering areas.

The evaluation focused on the number of water points rehabilitated or constructed by LEAP, the quality of drinking water, the access to water points and the average consumption per household per day. These elements have been covered by the questionnaire and the FGDs.

Due to lack of baseline indicators, the progress was measured by comparing the situations before and after LEAP interventions. National/WHO standards were also applied for drawing conclusions about access and consumption of water. In accordance with WHO standards a distance of 200 meters from the household to the water point is acceptable. The National standards include certain criteria for water that is suitable for human consumption. Technical labs are available in the capitals of State at the HQ of the State Water Corporation (SWC) for testing conformity of water to respective standards. The target of the project is 500 meters which is within the SWC standards.

Onset the evaluation team observed that the number of water points rehabilitated or constructed is very small. There are two mini-water yards in Kass and three in Gereida in addition to 7 hand pumps. One of the three water yards is in Gereida town. This achievement is far below the target which was improving access of 80% of targeted population in the two Localities.

The project was implemented in areas where the main source of drinking water for the majority of residents is hand dug wells. Before LEAP intervention 74% of the population in Kass and 98% in Gereida entirely rely on hand dug wells.

The second important source of drinking water in Kass is *wadis* where 18% of the population fetches their water supply from them.

LEAP has constructed two mini-water yards in Kass (Aldanga and Dawra villages) and rehabilitated 10 hand pumps. In Gereida two mini-water yards are under construction in Dahab Sharrow and Detto. The component of water supply is of high relevance to the community needs. The implementation of the activities in Kass was successful and the impact of water supply on the livelihood of the communities in Aldanga and Dawra is obvious. The distance to water source has been reduced for the majority of the beneficiary households. The sites were participatory selected as 85% of them within the WHO standards and 100% within National standards. Similarly, the average consumption of water per household has significantly increased after construction of the mini-water yards. This change is illustrated by the table below:

Table (3)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rate of water consumption | Before LEAP | After LEAP |
| Less than 1 barrel | 77.8% | 12.2% |
| 1 barrel | 17.8% | 36.7% |
| More than 1 barrel | 4.4% | 42.2% |

Knowing the low cost of constructing a mini-water yard in the targeted Locality one can argue that: if the number of the mini-water yards was larger the impact on livelihood and peaceful coexistence would have been unprecedented. The cost is low compared to other parts of Darfur.

An important aspect addressed by the project is management of the water points. A subcommittee for water supply was formed in each of the targeted VDCs and supported by training on bookkeeping and operation and maintenance of water points. The performance of water subcommittees is appreciated by the majority of water users. In Kass 84% of the beneficiaries stated that the subcommittee manages the water source successfully. They see the success largely manifested by the uninterrupted supply of water (83%) and separation of animals from human beings (60%) and to some extent by immediate maintenance of water points (44%).

Implementation of water supply activities was done directly by CIS while the partnership with local NGOs focused on capacity building. This is a step forward to gradually shift project implementation to local partners on the long term.

Training on management of water points is documented by training workshop reports and progress reports. However, after training follow up was not strong enough to capacitate the water subcommittees. This is evident by the incompletion of some activities and by the low number of beneficiaries trained by trainers who received TOT.

* 1. **Communities participating in the project demonstrate increased awareness of an improved practice in relation to basic household hygiene.**

Like other rural communities the hygiene situation of targeted groups in Kass and Gereida Localities was poor. This pushed up the awareness-raising on basic household hygiene to be one of the project priorities. The main elements of this component include creation of awareness on sanitation and hygiene practices, construction of institutional latrines, making and distribution of concrete slabs for household latrines and TOT for Women Clubs on good hygiene practices.

The assessment was focused on two elements of this component, the awareness-raising and the construction of pit latrines. Identification of these elements was quite relevant to the community needs and priorities of the communities where 75% and 62% of households in Gereida and Kass respectively don’t have latrines. Through FGD we reached the conclusion that the poor sanitary and hygiene situation is largely attributed to lack of awareness rather that poverty. Another factor that exacerbated the already poor situation in some larger villages is the influx of IDPs.

Launching of hygiene awareness campaigns was more successful in Gereida than in Kass. This has, in turn, resulted in higher rate of construction of latrines using LEAP’s slabs. The comparison below gives a clear idea about how the process went on and the coverage of the campaigns:

Table (4)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Awareness Sessions** | **Rate of Attendance (%)** | |
| **Kass** | **Gereida** |
| None | 34.3% | 00.0% |
| One session | 19.4% | 10.3% |
| Two sessions | 29.9% | 47.4% |
| Three sessions | 0.90% | 16.4% |
| More than three | 00.0% | 33.3% |

100% of the targeted beneficiaries in Gereida communities have been reached by the awareness-raising campaigns as shown by the figures above. In Kass the situation is different where 34% missed the awareness-raising sessions and only 66% were reached. In Kass the technical staff have less experience of hygiene in addition to the partner PCO have not done much trainings compared with Gereida.

Similarly, the construction of pit latrines was more successful in Gereida than in Kass. This has demonstrated a logical relationship between the awareness-raising and adoption of good practices. In Gereida 100% of the beneficiaries have received slabs and constructed their own latrines. This percentage represents 34.6% of the target group. This achievement in Gereida is compared to complete failure in Kass where only 4.5% of the beneficiaries received the slabs and constructed their own pit latrines. This failure is mainly attributed to the type of soil in the targeted villages. It is fragile and collapses in short time. It needs construction of concrete walls inside the well. There is unanimous agreement among beneficiaries that they can’t afford the cost of digging and constructing a wall inside the well. Another reason is the floods during the rainy season that swamp the latrines. However, the awareness of the rural people about sanitary and hygiene issues is so low. A KAP survey is needed for designing a more comprehensive package for changing the attitudes and practices.

WES operates in the area but were not contacted to find out whether they have particular design for the type of soil in the villages situated at the ward of the *wadi.* More technical investigation is needed in order to find an appropriate and radical solution for this problem.

Within CIS the implementation of the activities of this element was properly coordinated with WASH Unit. It was helpful in developing hygiene education materials and using expertise of WASH staff members. Externally, use of CHPs was helpful as well, however, partnership with local NGOs didn’t cover this component.

Construction of communal pit latrines for schools and markets was successful and improved access to latrines particularly for women. In Gereida 25% of communal pit latrines were allocated for women in contrast to 5% in Kass. The beneficiaries have unanimously agreed that the design of slabs is suitable and safe for children.

* 1. **Participating communities demonstrate increased capacities for mitigating and resolving local conflicts in a non-violent manner.**

The approach pursued by CIS consists of two parts; organization and capacity building. The organization part focused on formation of representative Peace Committees. Part two focused on training community leaders on relevant issues such as conflict resolution, mediation and leadership skills. These efforts aimed at reduction of conflict over natural resources and trust building. A significant progress was achieved in both, within the obvious limits, as we found out from FGDs with VDCs and CBOs. Despite this progress one may argue that the resources and time allocated for this component are not rating with importance and urgency of the assessed need. In a context like the one of Darfur a livelihood programme requires peace building element as a separate component and as crosscutting issue as well.

Development of conflict resolution and peace building training manuals were supposed to be done in collaboration with Peace Building Institute of Nyala University. Contact was initiated by CIS former Programme Officer but not followed up by the successor. Alternatively the project officers customized existing manuals and translated them into Arabic. They used two quite relevant manuals on conflict resolutions and leadership. The targeted number of beneficiary community leaders has been covered. In FGDs at CBOs and VDCs levels participants have confirmed that the training acquainted them with adequate knowledge and good tools for conflict resolution.

The involvement of the Peace Building Institute of Nyala University was discussed in a meeting with them. They stated that they were prepared to develop the training manuals and to conduct TOT for CIS. This didn’t happen due to lack of follow up from CIS side. They had demonstrated a rich experience in working with communities and knowledge of high level of the community mechanisms for resolution and peaceful coexistence.

The CBOs in Kass and Gereida have played a major role in implementation of the peace building activities. They used National events to disseminate messages of peace and to foster culture of peace. They managed to bring the ethnic diversification into homogeneous celebrations. The evaluation team explored opinions and impressions of different people and drew a conclusion that there is a positive impact on peaceful coexistence. Peace building is a long term process and a multifaceted issue that intermingles economic, political and social set ups (and more) of the community. The contribution of this project is a step forward on the right direction. It has proved that the local communities have strong will to live in peace and restore their social fabric.

The delegation and capacitating of CBOs to play a leading role in peace building activities was a good strategy. They have become more confident to carry on with their own initiations. If they find access to stable financial and technical support they can influence the peace process at the National level. Their advantage is that they know the roots causes of conflict and local context better than others.

A close follow up is an essential requirement for capacity building, involvement of CBOs in planning and implementation processes and incorporation of local initiatives into a broader peace building programme.

One very important element is missing from this component is the promotion of customary laws. This includes collection, documentation and endorsement of customary laws by Native Administration (NA), Local Government Administrations (LGAs) and State authorities.

1. **Implementation Strategy**

Central to strategy pursued by CIS to implement LEAP activities is partnership with local NGOs, CBOs and VDCs. This had entailed building capacities of local NGOs and establishment and supporting CBOs and VDCs. Two local NGOs have been selected to receive institutional, technical and financial support from LEAP. These LNGOs were National Organization for Community Development (NOCD) and Peace Corps Organization (PCO).

The objectives of creating partnership with LNGOs and CBOs were to ensure community participation, success of implementation process, cost effectiveness and enhance sustainability. An intermediate objective is to qualify local actors for long term local development interventions.

The two NGO partners were selected through certain criteria. NOCD and PCO have passed the capacity assessment and, consequently, contracted by CIS as implementing partners mid 2011. This was late and they had to squeeze delegated activities into short time. PCO had failed to fulfil their commitments and partnership collapsed because they were not committed. On the other hand, the partnership with NOCD was successful.

Based on their experience and capacity NOCD chose to work on IGAs. They have conducted assessment in Kass and Gereida for selecting IGA beneficiaries and organizing them into groups. They have used own manuals to train beneficiaries on IGAs. They have trained IGA beneficiaries on the following topics:

* Market assessment
* Market Niche
* Bookkeeping and Saving
* Better way of showing
* Organization

NOCD rated the partnership with CIS as effective. They stated that the selection process was fair and within this partnership they have institutional support and technical support in terms of training on Project Cycle Management (PCM). Additionally, they had received administration cost for implementing their activities in addition to some office furniture and equipment to improve operation environment. They, also, view the communication with CIS as good; however, they faced logistical constraints and difficulties to find targeted villages.

Another form of partnership was coordination with Line Ministries, INGOs and UN agencies. Views of the senior managers of SMOA were explored by the evaluator. They had confirmed that there is a technical agreement between the ministry and CIS. They perceived the partnership with CIS as good and well coordinated. Under this partnership CIS had provided support to the Ministry’s campaigns to fight pests, and the Ministry provided local extensionists and updated extension training packages. The Ministry, also, provides technical support for purchasing seeds and tools. They involve in tendering process.

A partnership with FAO was also part of the implementation strategy. CIS received seeds from FAO and distributed them to beneficiary farmers for the rainy season cultivation. In a discussion with the FAO Programme Manager at his office the evaluator conveyed the complaints of the farmers about the insufficiency of the amounts of seeds and the delay. He clarified these two points by saying that they were implementing emergency food security programme. This is quite different from the objective of LEAP that implies increase of production and improvement of livelihood.

The delay was caused by FAO internal procedures and CIS had delivered the seeds to final destinations immediately, he said.

1. **Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability**
   1. **Relevance**

All components of LEAP and their subsequent activities were derived from CIS strategy in Darfur which prioritizes emergency response, protection, and restoration of livelihoods options. It addresses peace building and gender as key cross cutting issue.

Relevance of LEAP results to MDGs is apparent. It aimed at poverty reduction, improving food security and livelihood and improving access to clean drinking water.

The involvement of local communities has ensured relevance to their needs and priorities. Communities participated through CBOs, VDCs and similar committees for IDPs. Relevance also ensured through fair representation of different groups (men, women, youth, farmers and pastorals) in these committees.

**Effectiveness and efficiency**

The following four indicators were used to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of LEAP implementation:

* Clarity of description of goals and activities in the project proposal,
* Bottom-up linkages between the objective hierarchy (activities, results, specific objectives and overall goal),
* Progress and monitoring reports,
* Achievements (delivery of results, achieving specific objectives and contribution to overall goal), meeting or exceeding targets

It was challenging to assess effectiveness because the project document was not thoroughly updated; there are gaps in the bottom-up linkages in the logical framework and absence of monitoring reports. However, the clear description of goals, the comprehensive mid-term progress report and the tangible achievements (and non-completed activities) were helpful in measuring effectiveness. The matrix below may help rating effectiveness (1 is lowest and 5 is the highest):

Table (5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Objectives** | **Linkages** | **Reports** | **Achievement** | **Rate of 20** |
| Partners Capacity Building | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 14 |
| IGAs | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 15 |
| Irrigated Schemes | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 14 |
| Rain-fed agriculture: Seeds and tools | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 11 |
| Livestock Health Services | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| Water Supply | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 12 |
| Hygiene | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| Peace Building | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 |

Note: This is just the evaluator judgment and it is not a standard formula.

The efficiency has been affected by the remoteness of targeted villages, the insecurity situation and the centralization of procurement. Interviews with CIS procurement officers have revealed full adherence to procurement and financial policies of the organization. Nevertheless, they think that authorization limits for field offices are too low vis-à-vis centralization of approvals. Such arrangements favour financial control to efficiency.

Insecurity in the area poses high risk against people and cash movement. For example, vendors in Gereida had to come to Nyala to receive their payments. Despite full adherence to procurement and financial policies the cost of delivering project inputs is high compared to other parts of Sudan.

* 1. **Impact**

Achievements of LEAP and the differences it made to the lives of targeted rural communities are evident by the responses of interviewees and statement in FGDs. IGAs increased incomes of 52% of beneficiary households by up to 20% and 48% by more than 20%. The irrigated schemes have increased vegetables production by a rate ranging between 25% and more than 50%.

In Kass water consumption increased to match WHO and National standards and the distances from households to water points are all within the National standards. The impact of water supply on the livelihood of the beneficiary communities is tangible.

Impact of peaceful coexistence is manifested by the normal operation of weekly markets and interaction between different groups. This has supported settlement of returnees in the targeted areas.

The impact on livelihood is so positive but didn’t exceed quantitative and qualitative improvement of daily meals, stability of children at schools and better clothing to furniture and equipment.

* 1. **Sustainability**

The main factors of sustainability are implied in all of the components of LEAP at different rates. Building capacities of VDCs, CBOs and LNGOs is a sustainability factors for community initiatives and participation. It depends on the level of technical and institutional support. For sustainability of LEAP’s contribution additional support is needed to achieve sense of ownership.

An effective sustainability factor is the in-built strategy which is available in IGAs, small scale irrigated schemes, livestock health services (training of paravets) and water supply. This factor is weak in peace building, rain-fed agriculture and hygiene interventions.

Follow up is an important factor of sustainability but it is not clear in LEAP design how it is going be done. Follow up during the LEAP life cycle was not strong and this can be attributed to limited number of project officers and high staff turnover at field level.

1. **Conclusions**

Having an overview to the situation in South Darfur during project cycle one can describe it as emergency. The surrounding environment was so volatile that witnessed tribal conflicts simultaneously with the political armed conflict. The project implementation process has, also, been facing several difficulties and logistical constraints.

The project is a good manifestation of inter-relationship between peace and development. It has broken the vicious circle of the dilemma which is first peace or development by an intervention that addresses recovery and long term needs. It has coincided with a voluntary return of IDPs to the targeted areas and played a role in attracting more returnees.

The project has enhanced livelihood and supported settlement of the returnees through recovery of water points, irrigated agriculture, household income and contribution to restoring peaceful coexistence.

The organization of the targeted communities through formation of VDCs and CBOs and the associated capacity building was the platform for the demonstrated achievements. With more technical and institutional support they can lead local community development.

The livelihood activities were successful and supplemented each other as the beneficiaries of each component are different to a chance for wider coverage. The irrigated small schemes, IGAs and water supply are the most successful components followed by hygiene, capacity building, peace building and livestock health services.

Speculations for rise in general price level should be considered at planning stage. The rise in whole sale prices have swept the marginal profits of IGAs beneficiaries. On the other hand, those who invested their grants in agriculture, particularly groundnuts, have benefited from the increase of prices.

The small-scale irrigated schemes were very successful and have an apparent impact on the beneficiary farmers’ livelihood. If the number of members of each group is less than 10 the difference made could have been outstanding.

The rain-fed cultivation had failed due to natural factors and man-made reasons. The rainfall was too low combined with pests. The delivery and distribution of seeds and tools were late and the quantities were too small. Collaboration with FAO was not successful because the two partners had different objectives.

Pastoral households have been selected as beneficiaries for all components, however, the component of animal health services focused on vaccination only. Pastorals, also, complained about VDC formation of not being representative.

The water component was so essential and not expensive; however, the number of water points is so small. Nomads didn’t get direct water support while water supply is the top priority for pastorals. It proved to be effective in conflict resolution and peaceful coexistence.

Training methods and manuals of conflict resolution and peace building could have been more effective if the experts of the Peace Institute of Nyala University were involved. This point is related to the follow up throughout the project life cycle which was not regular.

Similarly, the way that awareness-raising activities implemented was not appropriate for the targeted communities. Their seasonal schedule is so busy; hence, reaching them requires careful planning and consultation.

Updating the design of the project document was not thorough. The old themes and figures are still there in the narrative proposal. Changes were made to the logical framework but not to the other documents.

In short, the project was relevant and made a tangible difference to the livelihood of the targeted rural communities. It can be expanded for same communities and replicated in similar contexts.

Argument about project success or failure is not a straight forward statement. It is complicated and always controversial.

1. **Challenges:**

* Insecurity and high tense in the targeted areas pose limitations against movement of project staff members,
* Logistical constraints in the two targeted Localities is a major difficulty,
* Lack of banking and other facilities,
* The two areas are not attractive for experts to work and stay for long periods and this has resulted in high turnover of staff,
* Slow recruitment process through HAC kept the project under-staffed for quite sometimes,
* Bureaucracy of local security authorities who were not cooperative with the implementing organizations,
* Inadequate response of targeted communities, particularly, in Gereida. This was attributed to their prolonged dependency on emergency relief and the concepts of livelihoods and IGAs are new to them.
* Centralization of decision-making in particular regards to procurement,
* Local vendors don’t understand or adhere to CIS procedures,
* Reaching targeted communities for participation in tasks such as selection of beneficiaries, meetings … etc is very difficult.

1. **Recommendations and Lessons learned**

* Good project design is a necessary condition for planning, implementation of project activities and assessment of outcomes. Updating of project design is equally important.

*It is strongly advisable to devote adequate time, efforts and expertise for project design and updating.*

* TOT is cost effective and is an important factor for sustainability. LEAP experience revealed that TOT for potential community members requires close follow up In order to achieve its objectives.

*Establishment of follow up mechanism for effective TOT is highly recommended.*

* One of the most important lessons learnt from LEAP is that without activated internal monitoring function we can’t make sure that the project is on the right track. We can’t, also, identify the gaps and changes for update.

*The recommendation is setting up of monitoring and evaluation system before implementation process starts and activating existing M&E plan.*

* It was learned from peace building component that such a complex issue needs systematic and continuous interventions and real capacity building of community leaders.

*Recommend broadening the scope of peace building component to include more leadership training, expanding the coverage of culture of peace campaigns and documenting the customary laws (Capacitate Dimlij).*

* Construction of mini-water yards in Kass and Gereida is a low cost investment. Despite this fact the main source of water supply for the targeted communities is hand dug wells. The more the project invests in water supply the higher will be the impact on livelihood and peaceful coexistence.

*It advisable to invest more in construction of mini-water yards for both sedentary and nomadic populations.*

* LEAP management team knew from the SMOA that there are many varieties of horticulture trees that suit the climate in Kass and Gereida. They made successful experiments but don’t have the capacity to establish nurseries at community level.

*It is recommendable to establish at least one horticulture nursery in each Locality for provision of fruit tree seedlings.*

* It is learned from distribution of seeds for the rainy season that the earlier is better in order to avoid fluctuations of the rainfall.

*Timely distribution of seeds is strongly recommended and should be in May up to mid June.*

* The lesson learned from IGAs is that small grant doesn’t protect beneficiaries from the rise of wholesale prices. They may maintain the financial capital but it is still subject to depreciation and depletion over time.

*The recommendation is to increase the amount of small grants from SDG350 to SDG500.*

* The small scale irrigation schemes are very successful in terms of production; however, distribution of dividends over 10 shareholders reduces the impact per household.

*It is recommendable for mass improvement of livelihood of rural households to provide more pumps for irrigation and reduce the number of partners from 10 to 5.*

* It is learnt that the awareness-raising campaigns have changed the attitudes of local communities and encouraged them to construct their own latrines in Gereida. In Kass where the coverage of the campaigns was less the response was respectively less.

*More systematic campaigns on hygiene and sanitary issues are recommended.*

* A good lesson learnt from making slabs for pit latrines is that technical feasibility is very important at the formulation phase.

*It is advisable to make special design of pit latrines for Kass area in consultation with WES.*

* The line ministries have proved to be cooperative and willing to share their technical expertise. They feel undermined and become bureaucratic when not consulted.

*It is necessary to strengthen coordination mechanism with line ministries and other partners.*

* A lesson that is related to donors and beneficiaries is the importance of finishing the activities within the allotted timeframe. There are some activities that still going on and need more time to finish.

*It is recommended to request no-cost extension for completion of pending activities (mini-water yards, digging of wells and installation of pumps for small scale irrigation schemes and distribution of slabs for pit latrines).*

* *A general recommendation is to train CIS programme staff members and local partners on PCM and report writing.*
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