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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[1.1] This document is an evaluation report for the Building Resilient Pastoralist Communities (BRPC) project co-financed by European Union (90%) under the Food Facility Financing Instrument, Trócaire (7%) and Cordaid (3%), and jointly implemented by Trócaire (lead agency) in consortium with Cordaid; Action for Development (AFD); Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD); Community Initiatives, Facilitation and Assistance (CIFA); Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative (GPDI); SOS Sahel Ethiopia and the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) an associate partner. The project was implemented between December 23, 2009 and December 31, 2011 (including the two month start up phase) in eight pastoral districts of Borana Zone in Oromia Region, with a total budget of €2,495,923.

[1.4.1] Overall objective of the final evaluation was to make an overall independent assessment of project performance, paying particular attention to the impact of the project. [1.4.2] This report is based on firsthand information collected from seven of the project districts and on other pertinent primary and secondary data collected from different sources by employing qualitative approach during the second decade of December 2011.

[1.2] The project districts are characterized, among the others, by chronic food insecurity that is principally instigated by recurring drought, degraded natural resource bases, severe scarcity of water, etc. The project life had coincided with severe drought that claimed lives of more than 300 thousand heads of livestock and necessitated relief intervention (food, water, etc.) for more than 439 thousand people in the Zone.

[1.3.2] The overall objective of BRPC was to enable the pastoralist communities in Borana Zone develop increased productive and income generating capacity which reduces their vulnerability to volatile food prices. It was envisaged to attain this through three specific objectives under which six results were identified.

[2.1] The project had contextualized the global food facility initiative to circumstances of the project area in a way that it could contribute to sustainable solution of the chronic problems of the target community that, among the others, are manifested in high food prices. The project and its different activities were also in line with policies, strategies and priorities of the Government and the UN Millennium Development Goals. The Evaluation Team (ET) has learned that the consortium approach had added value, and also observed a mismatch between duration of the project and the time required for successful accomplishment of some of the project activities, which was due to ambitious planning.

[2.2] On the whole, the project was effective in terms of accomplishing the planned activities. [2.2.1] All of the implementing partners had worked on the first Expected Result, which is increased and better quality community managed sustainable grazing lands, and fully accomplished the planned bush clearing and associated teachings through cash-for-work (CFW) approach while SOS Sahel and CIFA had also worked on rehabilitation of degraded rangeland where SOS Sahel had additionally employed an integrated approach. The visited cleared grazing fields were fenced and responsible groups were also assigned. In general, 9,7032 HHs and their 73,452 livestock benefit from the more than 6000ha cleared rangeland. Members of the target communities had also worked on the task through free labour mobilization though not to the expected level. Cases presented in the corresponding section of the report could provide practical examples in this regard. The project had also conducted a study in relation to rangeland degradation and reclamation options. In spite of the existing need, the study planned on termite control was cancelled.

[2.2.2] Under the second Expected Result (Improved and sustainable access to community-managed water resources for human and livestock consumption), the project had effectively and successfully worked on rehabilitation of 10 ponds, six ellas and a cistern; construction of three ponds, a rock catchment, a spring-fed
gravity scheme, three underground cistern fitted ground catchments, five shallow wells and four slow sand filters, though the work on the Kasso rock catchment was partly successful as it was delayed and eventually substantially damaged by flood and its construction was also stopped due to security reason. The ET believes that revising the design, and timely renovation and completion of the scheme is essential. The intervention has benefited 52,133 (47% female) people and more than 126 thousand livestock.

The project had also worked on the software aspects of the water points by establishing and capacitating water management bodies though gap was observed between the government prescribed water committees and the traditional system of Borana. Even though the project has, among the others, increased the volume of water accessible in the area, still there is need for water related interventions with more intensive work on water sanitation and hygiene.

[2.2.3]The third Expected Result of the project was increased food and income from the production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products. The activities planned under this component were largely related to value chain development and also technical and material support to livestock and milk marketing groups. The vast value chain related works have not yielded practical solution for the immediate problem of the people which is lack of access to fair livestock input-output markets. The project had also supported 29 coops that had 1,036 (50% female) members and involved in upgrading and marketing of livestock and/or livestock by-products. Some of these coops were on good track by virtue of the project before they were considerably affected by the drought. The ET had observed some of them unnecessarily competing with their leaders and members on activities which the members could and should undertake individually like animal upgrading. It is advisable if such interventions promote individual based production and group based input-output marketing or service delivery approach.

[2.2.4]Through the fourth expected result, the project had envisaged to entail increased income from production of high quality non-livestock products to facilitate improved household access to food. To this end, it had provided supports for 22 Saving and Credit Coops (SACCOs), nine coops working on Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) and for up to four pre-coop groups; exposure visits were arranged for leaders of the coops; facilities like buildings, equipments and seed money were provided for these groups; skill trainings were given for ex-pastoralist individuals together with the required materials; and soft and hardware works were accomplished in relation to the Bio-Enterprise Center in Yabello. In all cases, the planned activities were accomplished accordingly though some needed more time. The ET perceived that this intervention would enable the able poor involve in income generation activities and diversify their livelihoods. Particularly, though highly constrained by lack of loanable fund, the SACCOs were found to be instrumental to address women who are the most disadvantaged members of the community. The cases in the report provide examples in this regard.

Duration of the project was not adequate for initiating, organizing, capacitating and registering coops, and ensuring their sustainability. Consequently, in order that they could stand by themselves, the coops deserve further follow up and technical support, especially in the areas of bookkeeping and documentation, auditing their accounts and up keeping integrity of the members. Though its management may not be as simple as foreseen, the Bio Enterprise Centre possesses potential for adding value to and marketing of NTFPs. In general, this seems good initiation that could contribute a lot to efforts of many organizations working on NTFP in Borana. The Skill Training is the other good achievement of the project that deserves broader consideration and replication in the future.

---

1 The JEP Office reported to already secured budget for this and continuity of other coop related activities from Comic Relief (UK).
[2.2.5] The project had planned to work on institutional networking and capacity building through like providing support for linking government authorities and traditional structures. In this regard kebele level monthly meetings were conducted more or less regularly; the district level quarterly review and reflection meetings were conducted as per the plan though not regularly in the case of CIFA; three zonal biannual Steering Committee meetings were carried out; and four zonal multi-stakeholder forums for livestock and dairy product promotions were accomplished. Some of the implementing partners had also worked on building technical and material capacities of the stakeholder government offices through conventional interventions. In general, due to different reasons, these meetings were rarely attended by the pertinent government officials. Nevertheless, especially the kebele and the district level meetings had contributed to effective implementation of the project.

Not only the thought of the multi-stakeholder forum, but also the planned output in general was a bit ambitious since to put in place a strong and functioning partnerships and working groups which address pastoralist issues in food security planning and livestock marketing seem to be beyond capacity of this project and the circumstances it had. Besides, the project did not design a strategy and a structure towards attaining these. On the whole, it is less likely that such practical and sustained partnership and working groups exist after the project. The sixth result was adjusted to exclude CMDRR, and instead to ensure integration of risk reduction measures into components the project.

[2.2.7] The implementing partners had worked on mainstreaming gender, HIV, AIDS and conflict in activities of the project. The latter was adequately gender sensitive as manifested in terms of practically involving women in its different activities, and the implementing partners had encouraged participation of women in and their benefit from the different project activities. Subsequent to the HIV and AIDS mainstreaming training they received from Trocaire, the implementing partners had provided teachings for members of the target community on this issue, though it did not seem adequate in some cases.

[2.3] Given the circumstances prevailed in the course of its implementation like the severe drought that caused migrations, critical water shortage, etc., the project was generally efficient because of, among the others: its relevance; accomplishment of almost all of the planned activities; the effective management it had; the up to standard project inputs and outputs; and the reasonable budget utilization. Better efficiency of the project was limited by some external and internal factors like inadequacy of the available time; the case of the Kasso rock catchment; lack of labour and materials; conflicts; and the fact that some of the activities were not completed.

[2.4] Adequate mutual reinforcement of activities of the project due to their thematic and geographic area integrations could also contribute to this efficiency.

[2.5] The effective, participatory, inclusive and facilitative arrangement of the consortium, specially preparation and use of the Technical Notes and the technical supports, was identified as a learning forum that also enhanced exchange of practices and positive competitions. The management structure of the project had also allowed for participation and contribution of the target community and the stakeholder government offices at different levels. Compared to the final output of the service, reason for involving ILRI at the prevailed status, not any other competent service provider, was not clear. The consortium had also faced few challenges that appear to be mild compared to experiences of other similar consortia.

[2.6] Related to undesirable effect of the drought; since some of the activities were completed lately; and as some of them require sometime for this, impacts of most of activities of the project would be realized at later stage. This is true for most of the activities like the bush clearing, the traditional water structures, and the milk and livestock marketing coops where impacts would be actually seen starting form the next dry season. Nonetheless,
though it is difficult to relate them only to this project, as detailed under Section 2.6 and also provided in cases presented elsewhere, considerable impacts are already manifested the following being the main ones.

- The rangeland improvement intervention has, among the others: shown/taught possibility and alternative approaches for improving the rangeland and already copied and seems to be scaled out in the future; in some cases, the developed fields had saved the livestock during the last drought; and demonstrated the possibility for rehabilitating degraded grazing areas.
- In the case of the water development interventions, of the immense potential impacts, at least the following are already observed: shortened distances travelled by the beneficiaries to reach water points; made water available at where it was not a case; eased challenges and the cumbersome of the people; improved access to better quality water; and increased volume of water available in Borana impact of which is clear.
- The non-livestock interventions have entailed immediate impacts that include the following: inspired the pastoralists to involve in non-pastoralist and non-farm activities and diversify, increase and regularize their incomes which some have already done successfully; the SACCOs have introduced the concepts of saving, trade and profit; the financial profits have helped building assets and access to food and others needs; have potential for women empowerment; etc.
- The project has also demonstrated other unintended impacts like: the job opportunity it created during the critical drought time; and the structures developed by the project were used for purpose of relief distribution.

[2.7] Mixed status was observed in terms of sustainability of achievements of the project. The participatory nature of the project; contribution of the beneficiaries, though limited; and the perceived adequate policy support would enhance sustainability. On the other hand, limited involvement of the rich in rangeland management interventions; limited institutional capacities and institutional incompatibilities; the fact that CFW approach has been used for development interventions; still inadequacy of working capital by SACCOs; absence of tradition for putting aside money for water points though industrial materials were used for some of the schemes; the prevailing inadequate technical capacity by coops; and lack of all rounded capacity by the coop promotion government offices would limit sustainability.

[2.8] This EU sponsored project has added immense values to activities undertaken and also ongoing in the project area. For instance, it has contributed to sustainability of projects implemented in the area like the EU sponsored Pastoralist Food Security Project. It has also added value to interventions of other donors and NGOs in the area like the case of the Bio Enterprise Centre. [2.9] The consortium partners had addressed the issue of visibility at all levels and at least fulfilled their commitments.

[2.11] The project had strengths that include its identification and addressing priority needs of the target community; its participatory approach; and the fact that it accomplished the planned activities despite the challenges. On the other hand, the inadequate and irregular consideration of WASH approach; and inability to revise the MoU in response to demanding circumstances were identified as future learning areas. The supports available from the government and the community, and the consortium approach itself were identified as opportunities the project had while it was challenged by a number of factors that include the drought, tribal conflicts, staff turnover, lengthy EC procedure, and lack of labour, though the first one was unparalleled.

Section 3 of the evaluation report presents lessons drawn from the course of planning, implementation and evaluation of the project while conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation exercise are presented under Section 4. Since the points under these sections are presented concisely, we preferred to ask readers to read them.
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

With an endeavor to contribute to overcoming the impacts of soaring food prices and contribute to sustainable development, the European Union (EU) had supported projects under the Regulation for the Food Facility Financing Instrument. The primary objectives of the assistance were to: encourage a positive supply response from the agricultural sector in the target countries; support activities to respond rapidly and directly to mitigate the negative effects of volatile food prices on local populations; and strengthen the productive capacities and governance of the agricultural sector. The priority measures were: improve access to agricultural inputs and services; safety net measures; other small-scale measures aiming at increasing production based on country needs: micro-credit, investment, equipment, infrastructure and storage; as well as vocational training and support to professional groups in the agricultural sector.

A consortium led by Trócaire had secured funding under this instrument budget line for a project titled "Building Resilient Pastoralist Communities (BRPC)". The project was jointly implemented by Trócaire/CAFOD/SCIAF in consortium with: Action for Development (AFD); Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD); Community Initiatives, Facilitation and Assistance (CIFA); Cordaid; Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative (GPDI); SOS Sahel Ethiopia and the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) which was associate partner. The project has been implemented in eight districts of Borana Zone, Oromia Region, with a total budget of €2,495,923 co-financed by the European Union (90%), Trócaire (7%) and Cordaid (3%). Implementation of the project, as per the EC grant contract, was started on 23 December 2009. However, as Trócaire preferred to have a two month start up phase (Jan-Feb 2010) the actual implementation of activities was started on 1 March 2010. The initially planned 20 month implementation period of the project was extended to two years, i.e., up to 31 December 2011, through three contract riders approved between Trócaire and the EU.

Following completion of BRPC, in line with the initially set plan and the underlying principles, the funding and the implementing partners commissioned TROPICAL CONSULTS, an independent socioeconomic development consultancy firm registered in Ethiopia, to conduct final evaluation of the project. This document, therefore, is an evaluation report produced by the Firm.

1.2 Context of the Project Area

Evidences show that the pastoralist way of life is coming under increasing pressure. A number of global drivers such as climate change, population pressure, increases in conflict, etc. are having particularly marked effects on pastoralist livestock herders. This is also a case in Borana where pastoralist livelihoods are increasingly fragile. The Boranas and the other pastoralist communities in Ethiopia are particularly vulnerable to food insecurity due to a number of reasons that include degradation of the natural resource base, growing imbalance among human population, livestock population, and the available water and pasture; lack of access to fair input output market; missing or poorly developed infrastructure and social service facilities and policy environment that often neglects the specific needs and potential contribution of pastoralist communities. Consequently, the livelihood of the pastoralist communities has become more vulnerable to different natural and manmade shocks.

Recurrent drought, livestock disease outbreak and conflicts are the commonly occurring shocks. Absence of appropriate and fair marketing channel and limited degree of response that resulted in weak market integration is an important impediment which negatively affects the livelihood of these communities. Low production and productivity of livestock which is principally caused by limited and declining availability of pasture and water

---

2 Which included consortium planning activities, project launching workshop with all stakeholders in Yabello, procurement planning, staff recruitment, etc.
is the other important challenge. In the face of decline in performance of the pastoral way of life, lack of diversified economic activities also limits livelihood and coping capacity of the people.

These situations have made the Borana Pastoral Communities chronically food insecure. Consequently, 11 districts in the Zone, including all of the pastoral districts, have been included in the government Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) over the last six years. A total of 124,185 people (49% female and 13% direct support) have been benefiting from the program. As there have not been improvements in circumstances, the figure has not been change, though it should have been increased in response to worsening situations and increase in population size.

As to data obtained from the Borana Zone Water, Mineral and Energy Office, the overall potable water coverage of the zone was 53.47% (49.13% for rural and 77.06% for urban) by end of June 2011. It was said to be 53.3% during the just preceding year and 53% in 2009. The data also provides that 19% of the 662 protected water sources existing in the Zone are not functional. Even though these figures hardly coincide with the reality, even the reported achievement by itself is far below the 65.8%, 91.5% and 68.5% national averages reported by the government for rural, urban and overall, respectively.

The project time had coincided with occurrence of severe drought where the people did not get rains for two consecutive rainy seasons, i.e., for more than a year. The drought had resulted, among the others, in death of more than 300 thousand heads of livestock in the pastoralist Borana; and increased number of relief beneficiaries from 24,500 in 2004 to more than 439 thousand in 2011. The situation had also resulted in distress supply of livestock to market and caused considerable fall in livestock prices. On the other hand, the very poor food grain supply in the market had resulted in high price increase and a corresponding fall in the livestock-grain terms of trade. The drought has also resulted in milk unavailability as a result of which price of milk has increased from the Birr 6 per liter before the drought to the present Birr 15.

After the long drought, the area had received unusually heavy Hagaya (short) rains between mid of September and end of November 2011. Consequently, owing to adequacy of these rains on one hand and the decline in number of livestock on the other, currently (December 2011) there is abundant pasture and water in the area. However, as they did not expect such a rain and also due to lack of oxen for land preparation, the agro-pastoralists did not adequately use this chance.

1.3 The Project
1.3.1 The Food Facility financing instrument
In December 2008, the European Parliament and the Council adopted a Regulation for the Food Facility financing instrument to support supplementary measures that rapidly address the negative effects of the volatile food prices situation in developing countries. An overall plan for the implementation of the Food Facility has been adopted by the European Commission on 30 March 2009. On the basis of the indicative criteria like exceptional crisis situations, appropriateness for Food Facility measures, etc., 50 developing countries including Ethiopia have been identified to receive assistance from the total € 1 billion global allocation. The primary objectives of the assistance under the EU Food Facility are to: encourage a positive supply response from the agricultural sector in the target countries; support activities to respond rapidly and directly to mitigate the negative effects of volatile food prices on local populations; strengthen the productive capacities and governance of the agricultural sector. The priority measures are: improve access to agricultural inputs and services; Safety net measures; other small-scale measures aiming at increasing production based on country needs: micro-credit, investment, equipment, infrastructure and storage; as well as vocational training and support to professional groups in the agricultural sector.

3 The SOS Sahel 2nd year 3rd quarter report cited Zone Taskforce & ZPDO
A call for proposal was launched during May to September 2009 under the EC Food Facility – CfP - EuropeAid/128608/C/ACT/Multi with a global allocation of € 200 million for 35 countries including Ethiopia. For Ethiopia total of 13 proposals have been accepted and grant contract signed with 13 implementing NGOs during November/December 2009 for total budget of €21,972,643 (EC contribution €19,595,390 and €2,377,253 from the 13 NGOs). The Building Resilient Pastoralist Communities (BRPC) was one of these projects.

1.3.2 Project Objectives
The overall objective of BRPC was that pastoralist communities in Borana Zone develop increased productive and income generating capacity which reduces their vulnerability to volatile food prices.

Towards the achievement of this overall objective, the project was envisaged to attain three specific objectives/purposes which were the following.

1) Increased production and marketing of livestock and livestock products. Under this specific objective, it was targeted to increase the income from livestock and livestock by-products by 30%; and to enable 50% of income generation activity (IGA) beneficiaries to access new markets.

2) Asset-poor community members are empowered to diversify their livelihoods and generate increased income. In this regard, it was targeted to increase the income from non-livestock sources by 30%; and enable 40% of target beneficiary households to be food secure all year round.

3) Local institutions, traditional leaders and local government are effectively governing and managing pastoralist food security and livelihoods. Under this specific objective, it was envisaged to enable the local government develop plans to effectively address pastoralist livelihoods issues; and that the local government and customary institutions engage in regular dialogue on pastoralist food security.

The central theme of the project was a viable value chain for the marketing of livestock and non-livestock products.

1.3.3 Project components and activities
In order to achieve its specific objectives, the project had implemented different activities under different components, which are also provided as expected results. They are presented below.

Expected Result 1: Increased and better quality community managed sustainable grazing lands: Through this participatory rangeland management, it was planned to selectively clear unwanted bush on 4,480ha of rangeland and result in reclamation of common reserve pastureland for long term and continuous regeneration of grass. It was also planned to create and manage communal grazing reserves by dairy cooperatives, to provide sufficient grazing land for lactating cows and their calves, thereby boosting milk production. Experimenting appropriate technologies against termite infestation was also planned.

Expected Result 2: Improved and sustainable access to community-managed water resources for human and livestock consumption: Under this result, the project had intended to rehabilitate 10 ponds and eight ellas; construct two new ponds, one rock catchment, one spring-fed gravity water supply, three runoff catchment with underground cistern and five shallow wells; rehabilitate one cistern; and to construct four slow sand filters.

Expected Result 3: Increased food and income from the production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products: The activities planned under this component include description of the value chain actors (role, extent of influence); identification of the constraints in the value chain (individual enterprise performance, vertical linkages, horizontal cooperation and value chain coordination); analysis of supporting actors (commercial support and non-commercial support); analysis of the enabling environment (rules, regulations, policies and strategies); supporting 19 livestock and milk marketing groups through training,
provision of equipment and essential support facilities and establishing market linkages; and dissemination of market information.

**Expected Result 4: Increased income from the production of high quality non-livestock products to facilitate improved household access to food:** In this regard, it was planned to establish comprehensive value chain development approach for non-livestock enterprises with the aim to improve the livelihood of the poor. Conducting value chain analysis and supporting 37 income generation groups by undertaking training and administrative support, market linkages, provision of equipment and essential support facilities and information exchange and exposure visits.

**Expected Result 5: Support for linking government authorities and traditional structures (institutional networking and capacity building):** Under this result, it was planned to put in place a strong and functioning partnership between traditional structures and the local government which addresses pastoralist issues in food security planning. It was also envisaged to build the capacity of local government, community and their customary leadership in the management of food security through discussion and participation process.

**Expected Result 6: Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR):** Capacitating leadership structures and institutions to understand CMDRR approaches to be able to apply them in food security planning in the eight districts was envisaged in this regard.

**Crosscutting issues:** In addition to the six expected results, it was also planned to consider HIV and AIDS, gender and conflict sensitivity in the implementation of all components of the project through training. Establishment/strengthening of documentation centre; follow up and accompaniment; continuous monitoring on conflict, etc. are among the activities planned in this component.

### 1.4 The Evaluation

#### 1.4.1 Objective of the evaluation

The overall objective of the final evaluation is to make an overall independent assessment of the project performance, paying particular attention to the impact of the project actions against its objectives. It is also to identify key lessons and to propose practical recommendations for follow-up and future similar actions.

In particular, the final evaluation is planned to have the following specific objectives:

- Review the Relevance of the project and its approaches in the context of the development need and potential of the intervention areas;
- Verify the Efficiency and Effectiveness of the results achieved and trace the changes observed in the lives of the target beneficiaries, as a result;
- Critically examine the continuing validity of the assumptions on which the project's likely impact was based;
- Analyze Sustainability of the project initiatives from the point of view of local stakeholders including target beneficiaries participation, institutional arrangements, compatibility of project objectives and target community need, etc.
- Assess level of the intended synergies/integration/complementarities as well as the coordination of the project interventions with other on-going similar FS initiatives including the PSNP implemented in the respective project intervention districts by both the government and other actors.
- Draw lessons and give respective recommendations having strategic significance for improvement in future similar actions.

#### 1.4.2 Methodology of the Evaluation

The Consultant assumed the evaluation exercise by holding discussions with the Trocaire/CAFOD/SCIAF JEP Office, Cordaid Ethiopia, the other members of the consortium and the EC Delegation to Ethiopia. Next to this, documents available in relation to the project and the project area were reviewed (Appendix 1). Based on
findings and implications of the discussions and the document review exercise, and also by considering expectations of the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the assignment, evaluation tools and approaches were drafted and submitted to the Client as parts of an Inception Report. The latter was reviewed and approved by the Client before it was put into use. In line with our Technical Proposal, qualitative approach was employed for conducting the evaluation in a participatory, impartial, transparent, professional, and constructive manner. As much as possible, it was accomplished in a participatory manner by involving all the key stakeholders of the project like; the direct and indirect beneficiaries, the non-beneficiaries, the stakeholder government offices and the donors and the implementing partners.

The evaluation was exercised in seven of the eight project districts (only Dillo was not considered). Authorities and experts from the district stakeholder government offices were involved in the evaluation exercise in their respective districts as members of ET – principally for providing information and explanations and also for information triangulation. From each of the evaluation districts, at least two project kebeles that believed to provide adequate and balanced information about the project were selected purposively for the evaluation exercise. In addition to these sample kebeles, the ET had also visited activities in some other project kebeles. As its first evaluation exercise in each district, the ET had received detailed briefing from management and staffs of the project under the five implementing consortium members regarding plans and accomplishments of the project; perceptions regarding relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, lessons, etc.

In each of the sample kebeles and the visited sites, community and focus group discussions and case studies were conducted with informants pooled from different members of the community like men, women, youth, members and leaders of the different cooperatives, committees established to manage the structures developed by the project like water schemes and cleared rangelands, and leaders and managers of the visited kebeles. Structures developed by the project like water points, cleared and reclaimed rangelands, constructions, materials given for the beneficiaries, etc. were directly visited. Cases of the beneficiary individuals, HHs, groups, sites, facilities, etc. were also assessed and documented. Photographs of structures and facilities provided by the project were also taken. Discussions were held with the district level stakeholder government offices. Key informant interviews were also held with appropriate individuals.

In general, information sources of the ET include the stakeholder government offices; local administrations (district and kebele); formal and informal institutions situated at different levels with which the project had worked; the different beneficiaries (individuals, HHs, groups, women, children, youth, institutions, etc.); committees initiated by the project; documents; leaders and bookkeepers of the coop; staffs and managements of the implementing NGOs and the project; the Yaballo Research Center; and direct observations. The details are available in App. 2. Related to the documents, as the final report of the project was not produced and compiled, we have used the second year third quarter physical and financial reports of the project together with the primary data we directly collected from different sources.

The draft report of the evaluation exercise was distributed among and reviewed by the funding and the implementing partners. It was also discussed on a half day reflection meeting of the same implication of which was included in this final report.

The evaluation exercise had faced some challenges which, however, have not brought significant negative impact on it. For instance, some of the intervention areas of the project were inaccessible due to the recent
heavy rains that destroyed access roads\(^4\). In some cases, the government authorities could not be available for the ET due different reasons.

2. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

2.1. Relevance of the Project

As briefly presented under Section 1.2 of this report, the project area in general is chronically food insecure and it is characterized by declining natural environment and weakening traditional structures and institutions. Access to basic service and social protection facilities is far below the minimum. The main reasons are poor performance of the irregular and unpredictable rains; the highly degraded natural resource bases; undiversified income sources; and marginalization. Growing imbalance between herd size, the rangeland and water was the important concern. The project was designed in a way that it contributes to amelioration of these problems, which are felt needs and priority of the target community. This was also confirmed by the different informants of the ET.

The project and its different activities were also in line with policies, strategies and priorities of the Government. Further, the project and its activities were also confirmed to be in line with strategic direction of the back-donor and the co-financing and the implementing members of the consortium. The activities were also coherently integrated and complementary towards attaining the overall goal of the project. Further, they were in line with and also contributed to attainment of at least the following UN Millennium Development Goals: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; Promote gender equality and empower women; Reduce child mortality; ensure environmental sustainability; and develop partnership for development.

The other relevance of the project is manifested through its complementarities to other interventions like the ECHO funded Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) project and the government Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) that are implemented in the area by members of this consortium and/or by some others actors.

The global food facility initiative was contextualized to circumstances of the project area in a way that it could induce development that contribute to sustainable solution of the chronic problems of the people that, among the others, are manifested in high food prices. Though the project was a response to increase in food grain prices, its relation to the latter was indirect like through improving livestock production and productivity, improving the grain-livestock terms of trade, improving access to food, etc.

The consortium approach was relevant because the ET believes that the impact appears to be greater than if each partner had implemented independent projects in the area. Besides, the reported access to each partner’s individual expertise and the opportunity utilized in terms of stakeholder networking, experience sharing and collective problem solving had justified relevance of the consortium approach.

Nevertheless, the ET has observed the following gaps in terms of planning of the project; mismatch between life of the project and the time required for successful accomplishment of some of the activities it identified; the fact that the CMDRR intervention was not relevant as the same or related activities were already implanted in the project areas by the same or other interveners- for instance the ECHO funded DRR; and lack of adequate synergy with other projects implemented by members of the consortium or by other similar organizations.

Perhaps the other limitation of the designing of the project was the fact that it relied much on the local labour in spite of the pastoralist nature of the people and existence of other projects like PSNP that also use the

\(^4\) For instance, attempt of the ET to visit Ella Elwaye in Yaballo was not successful as the road leading to the same was turned impassable by the rains.
available local labour. Combined with the drought, this situation had limited effective and timely accomplishment of some of activities of the project like the Kasso Rock Catchments.

2.2. Effectiveness of the Project

The ET has attempted to assess effectiveness of BRPC in terms of the results it expected (Section 1.3.3) and extents of their achievements. As discussed in the following subsections, in general, the project was effective in terms of accomplishing the planned activities. Quantitative details of the activities planned and accomplished by the project are provided in App. 3, though only up to end of the third quarter. In addition to reports of the project/the implementing members, and observations and understandings of the ET, all of the achievements reported by the implementing consortium members were confirmed and also defended by the stakeholder government offices.

2.2.1 Community managed grazing lands

Clearing unwanted bushes from rangelands is an outcome of the trials made by the ex-Southern Rangeland Development Unit (SORDU) as a possible solution for the problem. It is an innovation for some of the project areas while others like the Bokola area in Moyale had already exercised it before this project.

This activity was picked by all of the implementing consortium members either at the beginning or at the later stage (like the case of SOS Sahel), and it was accomplished more than the plan (more than 6000ha). Rangelands highly encroached by unwanted bushes and/or degraded and turned to bare land were reclaimed. In all cases, fields close to villages were cleared and reclaimed so that they could be reserved for dry season grazing for milking cows, calves, weak animals and those to be sold. In general, 9,7032 HHs and their 73,452 livestock would benefit from the development.

The consortium member NGOs had practiced different bush clearing techniques. This indicates existence of potential for exchange of the different experiences and the possibility for identification of more effective techniques through the process. In most of the cases, the practice was limited to clearing unwanted bushes and fencing the cleared area. However, in the case of SOS Sahel (for instance Harkalo/Fuldowa in Dire), even though it was not part of the plan, a more integrated approach that include physical soil and water conservation measures, enriching the pasture by introducing new and better performing grass species like Rhodes Grass and enclosing the area was practiced. We believe that such approach would enhance rehabilitation of the reclaimed rangeland and also improves its performance. Especially, reseeding and enriching are essential on fields were burning was practiced and for the degraded and bare lands. Lessons from this trial could serve for planning future similar interventions.

The project had also provided teachings on like rangeland management and more effective use of the available feed, which are believed to help transform the traditional practice of the area into like hay making and proper use of the available crop by-products. Maybe as a result of the teachings and facilitation of the project, all of the visited cleared fields were fenced/protected and responsible groups/committees were assigned and working. The cases presented below and pertinent discussions under Sections 2.6 and 2.7 provide additional information in this regard.

---

5 The project did this for instance by all consortium members attending a training given by ACORD and Adami Tullu research centre on appropriate rangeland techniques.
In addition to the project that employed a cash-for-work (CFW) approach, the target communities were also mobilized by the project and the stakeholder government offices and freely involved in the task which was undertaken on one or two days in a week, though it was not up to the expected level. The fact that it has also been included in the local Growth and Transformation Plan of the government was also learnt. For instance, it has been planned by the Miyo District to clear 15,000 ha bush through community mobilization during the current budget year.

**The case of Kalo Jaldess:** Dwellers of the six villages around this vast grazing area (estimated at about 400 ha) had had fenced the area and reserved it before the project only for seasonal grazing for calves, milking cows, shoats and equines. However, the field had been encroached by unwanted bushes that almost turned the it to a forest and decreased its usability. The project had initiated and supported clearing 166ha of this field through CFW.

The CFW participants were paid Birr 300/ha during normal time and this was increased to Birr 500 during the drought time. Twenty people had worked on one ha per day. Most of the beneficiaries were women. In addition to those involved in the CFW, all HHs in the six villages had also freely worked on the task once in a week.

The people had already assigned individuals who would be responsible for managing the Kalo. Participants of the discussion held at the site identified the following as possible impacts of the intervention:

- The nearly forest land that harboured dangerous wild animals like hyena is reclaimed to a productive grassland;
- As it is close to home, the field is suitable for grazing calves, milking cows, animals to be sold, etc.
- This on the other hand means, better milk yield, better productive and reproductive performance of the animals, and increased income of dwellers of the village;
- The money the poor HHs earned through CFW had boosted their access to food, feed and to cover other immediate needs during the drought time;
- The hand tools they were provided by the project would help the community to continuously work on clearing the remaining part of the grazing area;
- Likewise, the knowledge and the technique of bush clearing (tuse manchasu) they gained would remain as an important asset of the community; and
- The dangerous wild animals are pushed back.

In terms of continuity of the activity, the discussants had reported to had already decided to work two days per week on clearing bush from the remaining part of the grazing area through community mobilization.

In addition to reclaiming the rangeland, the project had also worked on restocking through providing animals for HHs who lost their animals due to different reasons. For instance, ACORD had worked on goat restocking and distributed 1000 goats for 200 HHs by involving Livestock Marketing Coops (LMC). Though affected by the drought like any of the other activities of the project, this intervention would contribute to improving livelihood of the beneficiaries. Some of the consortium members had also worked on supplying feed during the drought time and contributed to saving household assets.

Though it was identified correctly and in spite of the existing need, the study planned on termite control was not accomplished. The reason was lack of pertinently trained researcher in the Yaballo Research Centre. On the other hand, though its report was not ready by the time of the evaluation, the project reports to have commissioned a study on ‘Driving Force for Rangeland Degradation and Reclamation Options’ through SOS Sahel.

### 2.2.2 Community-managed water development

Under this, as discussed under Section 1.3.3, the project had worked on rehabilitation of 10 ponds, six **ellas** and a cistern; construction of three ponds, a rock catchment, a spring-fed gravity scheme, three underground
cistern fitted ground catchments, five shallow wells and four slow sand filters. In general, the project has attained remarkable achievement in this regard. The intervention has benefited 52,133 (47% female) people and more than 126 thousand livestock. The details are discussed below and also available in App. 3.

**The Iladu Water Supply Scheme:** This scheme is located in the Qadima Kebele of Dillo District. Before the intervention, people (usually women) were to travel for up to eight hours round trip to fetch water from the spring that is located in rugged, rocky and steep terrain mountain, which was also very difficult for watering livestock. Intervention of the project (through AFD) had involved capping the structure; laying 5km distribution network; construction of 70m$^3$ reservoir and 1.800m$^3$ open overflow storage masonry reservoir; two water distribution points; a wash basin; and four double faced livestock watering trough. The scheme, which is believed to benefit about 2,556 people and 15,000 heads of livestock was identified to entailed at least the following: eased the drudgery of women and children that are responsible for fetching water; availed safe and adequate water for domestic use and contributed to increased safe water coverage of the district, livestock consumption and hygiene; and improved resiliency of the people.

**The Kasso Rock Catchments in Dhas:** The intention of building this structure was to harvest rain water from a small rock hill that has about 1.2km circumference by using an earth wall/embankment covered by geomembrane from the inside and two big size above ground cisterns. Its design also includes five livestock watering troughs. Construction of one of the cisterns was completed timely and it has already harvested relatively clean water during the Hagaya rains and still reserved by the community for future domestic use (the below figure). In general, in spite of the present status of the structure, the target community and the district stakeholder government offices had appreciated and also were in support of the initiation and the to-date achievements.

![Image](image_url)

However, the possible successful accomplishment of the work was affected by the unusually heavy rain that destroyed part of the embankment and substantially damaged the structure, and a security problem that necessitated evacuation of the workers. The latter had hindered completion of construction of the other cistern and the canal taking water into and from the cistern. In addition to inadequacy of the available time for successful completion of such structure, lack of workforce was an important reason that delayed early completion of the work$^6$.

Even though it require considerable budget, it appears that renovation of the earth embankment and finalization of the work is important due to reasons that include: turning effective the immense investment made so far, and to address the community who have already lost the water harvesting structure they had put around the rock before the intervention$^7$.

---

$^6$ The district level discussants identified three reasons for the delay: in adequate mobilization work by AFD, inadequate involvement of the people, and poor follow up and contribution of the district government structure.

$^7$ During the reflection workshop, CST-JEP reported that adequate budget is secured from internal and external sources for completion of the scheme.
Unless action is taken before the coming rains (March-May), the structure could be damaged more. It also appears that future work on renovation of the structure should consider, among the others, design reconsiderations in relation to: the overflow structures, the retention wall built around the rock, partitioning the embankment, and taking into consideration the water logging on the outer side of the embankment.

The underground cistern-fitted run-off harvesting structures: AFD reports that Construction of these structures was accomplished as per the plan. As depicted by the following case, the ET has observed that at least one of them has already been providing service.

The Miyo Tiro Cistern: This structure was built in a way that it could harvest 100m$^3$ water into a hand-pump fitted cistern from a 900m$^2$ lined ground area. It was reported that the reservoir could support 90 HHs for three months. The reservoir had also served the community during the drought for storing the relief water. Though almost all of the costs were covered by the project, the community had also made contributions. For instance, the pit for the underground cistern was dug by the community.

Before the intervention, the women were to travel for three hours to reach the nearest water point and fetch a jerry can of water. Now, the 90 beneficiary HHs get water from the scheme every other day.

The project had trained the water committee in the technicalities of the hand pump, sustainable management of the scheme and its sanitation. Water purification chemicals were also provided though further training is required for its effective use. The water committee has seven members (four women). The committee has already mobilized Birr 1,850 for fencing the scheme. They have also fixed a monthly Birr 2 payment per HH and collected Birr 720 so far. The scheme is also governed by the traditional water management rules of Borana.

Construction and Rehabilitation of Ponds: As reported by the implementing consortium members and also confirmed by the stakeholder government offices, these activities were fully accomplished as per the plan. The ET had also visited some of the newly constructed and rehabilitated/expanded ponds. The development has contributed to spatial and temporal availability of water in the area. Besides, attempts were also made to improve quality of the pond water used for domestic consumption through providing slow sand filter and silt trap structures, though effectiveness of the structures would be seen when the people start using the ponds. The following is case of one of the ponds visited by the ET, and similar situations were observed on the others as well.

Haro Duba in Halona Kebele in Arero: This pond was rehabilitated and expanded by the project through SOS Sahel. Before the intervention, the pond used to support people and livestock from the surrounding 35 neighbourhoods only for one month. Due to intervention of the project, it is perceived to serve the same beneficiaries for more than three months. The pond was protected/fenced and a body responsible for its management was arranged, which were not cases before the intervention.

The Ella rehabilitation works: The project had also successfully worked on rehabilitation and improvement of the planned ellas. The intervention included providing collection chambers and watering trough/naniga that avoided drudgery of the people and increased livestock watering efficiency. The stairs used for uplifting the water by human power were also improved/cemented and eased the task. The intervention is also believed to improve quality of the water. Further, the
In general, the water related interventions have:

- increased volume of the water available for the communities like in the case of ponds and the cisterns and the Kasso rock catchments;
- improved physical access of the community to water points like in the case of the Iladu scheme and the newly built water harvesting scheme;
- improved access of the people to safe water like in the case of the Iladu scheme and the sand filter structures; and
- eased drudgery of the people like the case of the rehabilitations and improvements made on the ellas.

Nevertheless, as discussed under Section 1.2, still there is practical need for further work in the intervention districts on providing water regardless of its quality, and safe water if circumstances so allow.

The water management committees established for the rehabilitated water points by the project were made to include the traditionally responsible persons (Abba Heregas) as chairpersons. For the newly developed water points, the committees were established as per the government guideline existing in this regard. In all cases, the committees consist of seven members including three or four females. However, collective sustainability and effectiveness of such committees that are established to fulfil the government requirement has been a challenge in Borana. The main reason is the fact that they fail to be compatible with the existing traditional system. It is known that Boranas have different regulations that are proved to be effective and sustainable for different water points. One important problem regarding the traditional regulations is the fact that they do not include women. It appears that it is advisable to lobby the Gumi Gayo to allow inclusion of women in the traditional water management bodies at least for some of the water points rather than attempting to put in place unsustainable and in-effective committee just for formality.

The ET has learned that the project had also worked in relation to water sanitation through providing pertinent trainings for the water committees and for members of the target community. Attempts were also made to teach the physical and chemical means of water purification. In same cases, water purifying chemicals like Wuhagar were also provided, though its effective use seems to deserve more intensive follow up and teaching. Related to this, with an attempt to contribute to purity of the water and contribute to performance of the ponds, structures like slow sand filters and silt traps (at least in one case) were considered. Nevertheless, given the undesirable sanitation and hygiene situation existing in Borana, more organized and intensive work is required in relation to water sanitation and hygiene (WASH), and such intervention should be considered for every newly undertaken water development intervention regardless of similar preceding interventions undertaken in the area.

2.2.3 Production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products

The activities planned under this component were largely related to value chain development. It was also planned to support livestock and milk marketing groups through training, provision of equipment and essential support facilities, seed money and establishing market linkages. Dissemination of market information was the other activity envisaged by the project.

As to reports of the project and also the discussions made with the different informants, immense works were accomplished in relation to value chain through the project. A number of studies and analyses and researches were conducted and documentations were finalized; meetings and discussions were made; working groups and committees were formed; etc. It also appears that similar activities were already undertaken for Borana through other projects and organizations before or parallel to BRPC. However, any of the software works
accomplished by either this project or the other actors have not been put into practice and none of the studied value chains has been implemented and helped ameliorating problems of the people which is lack of access to fair market for their livestock and livestock by-products. As to some of the informants, the problem is not the value chain approach but its implementation.

Still in an attempt to create access to fair market for pastoralist, in addition to the value chain, the project had also planned and worked on initiating and supporting 29 coops involved in upgrading and marketing of livestock and/or livestock by-products. These coops had 1,036 (50% female) members. Reports of the project and information obtained from the stakeholder government offices depict that the activities planned in this regard were accomplished accordingly (App. 3). Discussions held by the ET with leaders and members of the visited coops and the observations it made are also in line with these.

The project had provided leaders and members of the coops with capacity building trainings, exposure visits, etc. The coops were also provided with offices, office materials and tools, financial and administrative documents, seed money, equipments, animal holding facilities, technical support (through assigning bookkeepers), etc. The ET had also learned that in some of the cases, provision of some of these materials like office furniture, offices/market outlets and holding facilities were to be finalized. It appeared that some of the coops, especially the milk marketing ones did not start the intended business due to the drought, and it seems that it would not happen before a year.

The cases presented below provide more information regarding performance and the present status of the livestock related coops. More cases are also provided under Section 2.6.

**The Dikicha LMC:** This coop exists in Miyo District. It was established in 2009 by 16 members (five women). The members had paid Birr 50 registration fee and bought up to two shares (Birr 250 each) per member. Number of the members has increased to 34 (11 women). The members have mobilized more than Birr 18,000 through sell of shares, savings and registration fee.

The coop was involved in livestock trade before the drought and was profiting. It was also involved in maze trade and obtained Birr 4,474 profit out of it. Half of the cattle they held for upgrading were killed by the drought and the others were sold at far below cost prices, and the coop has not resumed business since the drought. It also seems that things were not good since the drought. Accounts of the coop were not audited by the time of visit of the ET. As to the district coop promotion office, it was due to lack of auditor.

The bookkeeper retained by the project for the coop was said to improved bookkeeping and documentation of the coop. However, the coop complained to lack financial capacity to further retain him after the project and asked for further support. The project gave the coop Birr 60,000 seed money, all the needed financial and administrative documents, safe box and other office materials through AFD though some of them like furniture were to be delivered at a later stage.

In general, though objective of establishment of the coop was to link its members and the community to fair livestock markets, it could not find market for its own cattle.

**The Oda Roba Union** in Moyale that was established by six primary coops (four MPCs and two LMCs) existing in the District (that had 471 individual members-36% female) with a share capital of Birr 270,000. The project had provided the coop Birr 157,533 through CIFA. The project had also provided the Union trainings and exposure visit (in Ethiopia and Kenya) that enabled it to communicate with abattoirs. In spite of the drought, the

---

8 17 of the members have bought 2 shares each.
9 There were also applications from other five coops in Moyale and also from coops in Dhas Di district for membership in the Union
10 The Union was also given grant from Care (Birr 202,950), WB/FSP (Birr 500,000)
Union had earned Birr 120,000 profit within eight months time. It had contracts: to supply 3,000 goats for AFD for restocking; and to supply 300 heifers for unions in East Wollega, West Shewa and East Hararghe. It was also involved in sugar and edible oil supply to the community and played role in terms of market stabilization. The physical facilities provided by the project (office, latrine, furniture, desktop computer and printer, fencing, ----) were confirmed to be of good quality. The Union had intention to extend by its own budget service of the bookkeeper retained for it by the project.

The Roba Anani Milk Processing and Mini Marketing Cooperative: This cooperative was established just last year by support of the project through SOS Sahel by 49 members (24 female). The members paid Birr 20 registration fee and bought one share (value of Birr 100) each.

The coop was given by the project Birr 80,000 seed money; a reasonable building that serve as office and processing center, furniture, milk processing materials, financial documents, and a bookkeeper that also provides service for another coop as well. As there has not been milk due to the drought, the coop has not been involved in the milk business, and it would not be a case before a year. It, however, supplied sugar and edible oil for members of the community and obtained Birr 3,156 profit out of it.

As it could be seen from the cases, the coops exist in mixed statuses. In general, however, it appears that they, especially the newly established ones, seem to require more time and capacity to stand by themselves and to operate effectively and sustainably. They deserve follow up and technical support, especially in the areas of financial bookkeeping and documentation, auditing their accounts and up keeping integrity of the members.

It appears that all or most of the LMCs coops are involved not only in buying the animals from their members and the surrounding community and selling them in large number (by gaining economy of scale) through accessing fair market, but also in livestock upgrading (fattening). This upgrading is not substantially more than keeping the animals under natural grazing environment for up to four months and selling them. Though some of the coops were observed grazing the animals in protected grazing areas (kalos), profit of the coops is principally due to normal natural growth of the animals and temporal price changes, not due to intensive feeding for purpose of enhanced upgrading. That seems a reason for their loss in relation to the drought.

In principle, the main objective of coops is to enable the members accomplish in group what they cannot accomplish individually due to different reasons. In some cases, however, both members of the coops (including the leaders) and the coops were observed involved in same activities like livestock upgrading. The case of the Abdi Gudina Sarite LMC where bulls of the cooperative and those of the chairman of the coop were grazing side by side could be an example in this regard. Such a situation could cause conflict of interest that could put the coops at disadvantage and damage them. It is desirable that coops introduce and demonstrate new practices such as cattle upgrading. However, once the new practice is adopted/copied by its members and the community, instead of competing with them, the coop could work on other activities like introduction of other new practices and methods, and complementary activities like marketing of inputs and outputs of the practice (for instance vet drugs, feeds and marketing the upgraded animals in the case of livestock upgrading).

Likewise, the main objective of initiating the milk marketing coops was, assuming that the pastoralist communities do not get market for their milk, and to link their members and members of the community to fair market. However, at least one of the coops was observed purchasing milk in the market by competing with other individual milk traders (including members of the coop). That is, the milk is not supplied by members of the coops; questioning importance and added value of initiating the coops other than for market stabilization.

---

11 The CST JEP during the Reflection Workshop reported that these and the other coop related capacity and sustainability issues raised in this report are taken care of in its just begun Comic Relief (UK) funded TRADE Project.
Related to these, experiences show that coops involved in group production like group animal upgrading and group milk processing fail to succeed. The main reason is the fact that the members of the coops fail to contribute to the coop equally, but at the end claim to share the benefit equally. Therefore, it is advisable if such interventions promote individual production and group input-output marketing approach, service delivery and the likes.

It was attempted to link the individual coops involved in livestock marketing with potential bulk buyers like abattoirs through exposure visits. It is obvious that the visits could provide the visitors exposure from which they could gain knowledge and information. However, it seems to be more fruitful if the primary coops come together through unions and if such links are made between the union and the terminal bulk buyers. This alternative would enable the coops to gain bargaining power and economy of scale.

2.2.4 Promotion of non-livestock products
The activities planned under this expected result are presented under Section 1.3.3. In this regard, the project reports that supports were given for 22 Saving and Credit Coops (SACCOs), nine coops working on Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) related activities and for up to four pre-coop groups; exposure visits were arranged for leaders of the coops; facilities like buildings, equipments and seed money were provided for these groups; skill trainings were given for ex-pastoralist individuals together with the required materials; and soft and hardware works were accomplished in relation to the Bio-Enterprise Center in Yabello. The report also provides that asset creation works were accomplished through restocking.

The ET had visited some of the coops addressed through this intervention and discussed with their members and leaders, with their bookkeepers and with the concerned government offices. In general, in almost all cases, the planned activities were accomplished accordingly. In few cases, full completion of some of the planned activities, especially the hardware parts, would require sometime.

The intervention is believed to enable the able poor to become involved in income generation activities and diversify their livelihoods. Particularly, the SACCOs were found to be instrumental to address women who are the most disadvantaged members of the community. The ET has also learned that the support given for the groups working on collection and marketing of NTFPs could potentially entail multiple advantages that include increased and diversified income of the able poor members of the community who are the majority; enable tapping the natural endowment of the area like gum, incense, aloe, scent wood and salts; and serve as a lesson for other similar members of the community and the government.

The following are representative cases the coops considered by this intervention of the project and visited by the ET. Section 2.6 also provides more information in this regard.

The Kayo Elwaye SACCO in Yaballo District: This coop was established in 2005 (registered in 2009) by 22 poor women through support of AFD that also provided them Birr 25,000 seed money, the required financial and administrative documents, capacity building training and exposure visit. In addition to the registration fee (Birr10/member) and the two shares each of them bought (Birr 50 per share), the members also make Birr 10 monthly saving. Number of members of the coop has increased to more than 100. The Coop started disbursing loan to its members with a total of Birr 28,000 loanable money. Owing to inadequacy of the available money, the members were to take the loan in turns for six months with 20% interest. Consequently, they managed to grow their capital to Birr 40,000.

Once the AFD project was completed in 2009, the coop grew weak. Number of the members declined to the present 56 due to different reasons like lack of interest and disciplinary measures.
SOS Sahel included the coop in the BRPC project and provided it Birr 60,000 seed money, financial documents, provided them capacity building trainings, employed for them a bookkeeper and also supported literacy program for the coop members. The project resource has enabled them to disburse Birr 2,500 loan per member for one year, but still in turns. The accountant employed by the project (Birr 1,500 monthly salary) has improved the bookkeeping and documentations of the coop. Though it lacks its own office, now the coop is progressing very well. The fear is that it may not be as good as it is now when the project terminates and, among the other, when contract of the bookkeeper is ended.

**The Abdi Gorile SACCO in Dhas District:** This coop is 20 month old and was established by the project through AFD. It had 60 (34 female) members at the beginning, and size of the members grew to 64 before it declined to the present 53 (35 female) due to the drought. The members have mobilized Birr 10,600 through saving (Birr 10 per month per member), and Birr 2,650 from sale of share and registration. They earned Birr 2,000 profit from the loan they disbursed for their members before they shifted to sugar and oil trade which was done also by the other coops. The coop used the Birr 30,000 they were given by the project through AFD as a seed fund. Capital of the coop is estimated at Birr 54,270.00. As the available money was not adequate for the trade and the loan, they dropped the latter as they found the oil and sugar trade more advantageous for members of the coop and also for the community. If they get additional working capital or if they would not be continuing the trade, they will resume the loan disbursement.

The bookkeeper retained for the coop by the project at a Birr 300 monthly salary was instrumental for handling the accounting and documentations. However, his service will stop with the project. Reportedly due to lack of capacity to pay him, the coop does not have intention to retain the bookkeeper. On the other hand, only one of the female and five of the male members of the coop had gained literacy at different levels.

The coop was given by the kebele administration land for office construction and already fenced it. But expect money for office construction from outside. They were also in need of safe box.

Even though it is part of the project, they have not received furniture so far, which was said to be already purchased and on its way.

**The Hargalu Aloe Soap Processing and Mini Marketing Cooperative:** This coop exists in Arero District Fuldowa Kebele. It was established in 2009 by a Food Security Project sponsored by AFD/EU by 15 members (five male). The current members of the coop are 29 (six male).

This project had built a house which the coop use for office and for soap production and storing; provided them with a roof water harvesting structure (notwithstanding the technical limitation); and working capital. The total capital of the coop has reached about Birr 153,000.00, though majority of it is a gift from different sources. The cashier holds more than Birr 28,000 at hand, which is very risky given the prevailing circumstances.

Members of the coop discuss that they have been enabled to turn aloe, which was a useless forest plant, to a usable one which they have already started to cultivate. The intervention has made good quality soap available for the community in the local market and enabled members of the coop earn profit out of it.

It appears that their product (the aloe soap) has gained acceptance in the market. Even though NGOs are the big buyers so far, there is immense potential for marketing the product.

The members are grouped into three workforce team and the groups work on soap production in turns. The members complain that so far, as they have never shared from the profit, they have not got any direct benefit from the coop. It appears that they have interest to share the profit. Besides, given the group production approach of the coop, absence of incentive for individual motivations is a challenge.

The ET has learned that the coops supported by the project, especially the newly established ones, still exist at fledgling stage. This could also be understood from the above cases. One of the causes is that life of the project was not adequate for initiating, organizing, capacitating, registering and ensuring sustainability of coops. This
situation indicates the need for providing continued follow up and technical support at least for the coming two to three years. SACCOs are the most preferred and recommendable types of coops in the area. The reasons are: though limited by lack of loanable capital, they have been successfully and effectively utilizing the available amount; the majorities of their members are women and this situation would have a number of multiplier effects on their respective HHs and on the community at large; the members get immediate benefit through use of the loan money; it helps and enables the pastoralist HHs/members of the community to exercise diversified means of livelihood in addition to (other than) pastoralism; hence it helps transformation of the pastoral way of life; and as the transactions are simple, it is easy for management and follow up.

Absence of micro financing institution (MFI) operating in rural Borana is the other justification for importance of SACCOs in the area. However, they have been constrained by lack of adequate loanable money that compelled them to disburse loan in turns for their members. One remarkable merit of the SACCOs in the area is that different from arrangement of the MFIs that require their clients to repay loans monthly starting from the date of its disbursement, in the cases of the SACCOs, the repayment is effected at the end of the loan term, which is found to be convenient for pastoralists whose life is based on livestock husbandry, not trade.

In the ACORD intervention area, groups identified as “IGA” groups were reported as examples of Saving and Internal Lending Community (SILC). Perhaps these are different from the groups organized and legalized as SACCOs by the other members of the consortium and elsewhere. On the other hand, it seems that there are no legal frameworks supporting either ‘IGA’ or ‘SILC’ under the Ethiopian context. As to ACORD, they are pre-cooperative groups that are striving and building their capacity to register as SACCOs.

**The Bio Enterprise Center:** This project has made a major contribution to the Bio Enterprise Center which is under establishment by SOS Sahel in Yaballo. Objective of the center is to create and develop market outlet for coops involved in NTFPs production and marketing in Borana. It is also intended to add value to these products at this center. In general, this seems good initiation that could contribute a lot to efforts of many organizations working on NTFP in Borana.

The plan is to run the center by an employed staff under auspice of SOS Sahel until a union of NTFP coops that would be responsible for the Center is established. Though this is a good plan, legal status of this transitory body might be a challenge.

**Beekeeping:** In an attempt to improve the traditional beekeeping practiced in the area and diversify livelihood of the people, the project (through ACORD) had worked on promotion of improved beekeeping through providing 105 German type beehives and the associated accessories for traditional beekeepers organized in two coops by the project in Dhokole and Gololcha Kebeles. The coops were also said to be provided office, office materials and pertinent trainings. Successful accomplishment of these activities and their future potential were confirmed by the district stakeholder government offices.

**Skill training:** The project had planned and worked through AFD on training 27 (all male) members of the pastoral communities who could not anymore depend on the pastoralist way of life. The people were given

---

12 The CAFOD/Trócaire/SCIAF JEP commented that as BRPC was a project within its program in Borana, it always had intention to continue working with the partners on these issues. Accordingly, the Joint Programme has secured a grant from Comic Relief (UK) to enable to continue support to cooperatives for three years.
training on construction skills like block laying, plumbing and masonry. As they were deployed to distant places for work, the ET could not meet and discuss with these people. As to the stakeholder line offices, however, the trainees have managed to secure their livelihood through the skills they gained from the training.

2.2.5 Partnership between traditional structures and local government

The results expected out of this intervention are provided under section 1.3.3. To this end, the project reports that: kebele level monthly meetings were conducted regularly though interrupted in some cases; the district level quarterly review and reflection meetings were conducted as per the plan though not regularly in the case of CIFA; the three zonal biannual steering committee meetings were conducted; and the zonal multi-stakeholder forums for livestock and dairy product promotions were conducted. In general, it appears that, owing to overlapping of programmes and as they were busy in relation to planning and implementation of the local growth and transformation plan, these meetings were rarely attended by the pertinent government officials. The devastating drought faced the zone was said to be the other problem.

The kebele level meetings were said to be instrumental for planning the kebele level activities; assess performances and challenges of the project and deliberate on the way forward. Likewise, the district level quarterly reflection and review meetings were also used for follow up of the project activities; enhancing the progress of the implementation through like solving the challenges; etc. The three zonal Steering Committee meetings were facilitated by SOS Sahel, GPDI and AFD in turns. They were said to contributed to effective implementation of the project in the face of the drought.

Two zonal multi-stakeholder forums for livestock and dairy product promotion, aspired to develop networking opportunities among the livestock producers’ business organizations, private sector entrepreneurs, public sector and non-state actors in the integrated market, were conducted as planned and deliberated on the issues. The third meeting was facilitated by SOS-Sahel in order to discuss on the promotional activities accomplished by the working groups on the goat and milk value chains and share best practices. The fourth forum was conducted in Adama by involving the zonal, regional and federal stakeholders. In general, the forum was characterized as weak and it was not attended by the pertinent government officials. Though the practical outcome of these forums and the impact they entail on the outstanding problems of the Borana pastoral communities would be seen in the future, its continuity is unlikely after the project\textsuperscript{13}.

It appears that this output, as it was presented in the logical framework, was a bit ambitious since to put in place a strong and functioning partnership between the traditional structures and the local government which addresses pastoralist issues in food security planning seem to be beyond its capacity and the circumstances it had. Besides, the consortium did not design a strategy and a structure towards attaining and sustaining this. It seems due to this that such a practical partnership does not exist at the end of the project. However, it had and could have value as a methodology.

It was also envisaged to build the capacity of local government, the community and their customary leadership in the management of food security through discussion and participation process. In this regard, SOS Sahel, CIFA and ACORD had conducted organizational capacity need assessment for government offices and provided some conventional material and technical supports accordingly. Some other implementing partners had also attempted to provide capacity building trainings for the customary leaders and the local government structures towards effective rangeland management and enhanced food security. However, it appears that more intensive and better organized intervention is required in this regard.

\textsuperscript{13} Luckily, however, JEP during the reflection workshop reported that the forum will be continued by support from the TRADE project financed by Comic Relief (UK) which has already begun.
2.2.6 Risk integration
In spite of the plan, it appears that there was no serious and practical need for CMDRR related intervention. This was a case because of the fact that: other than GPDI, the other implementing partners were already implementing a CMDRR project led by Cordaid and financed by ECHO in the same area. There were also other related ongoing interventions. Consequently, this result was adjusted to exclude CMDRR, and instead to ensure integration of risk reduction measures into components the project.

In the case of ACORD and CIFA, however, it seems that the kebele level meetings were referred to and reported as CMDRR Committee meetings. ACORD also reported that 50% of the coops it organized and/or supported had integrated risk into their business plans.

2.2.7 Crosscutting issues
In line with the plan set in this regard, though it did not consider any of them as an activity, the project had worked on mainstreaming the identified crosscutting issues (gender, HIV, AIDS and conflict) in all its activities.

The project was adequately gender sensitive. This was manifested in terms of involving women in the different activities of the project like decision making in the course of planning, implementation and monitoring. As to reports of the project and information obtained from the different informants of the ET including women, the implementing partners had encouraged participation of women in and their benefit from the different project activities. The female members of the target community were the principal beneficiaries of the CFW schemes.

Besides, women constitute the biggest proportion of members of SACCOs and also considerable proportion of members of the other forms of coops. Further, women were also adequately considered for the capacity building interventions of the project including exposure and experience exchange visits. Furthermore, women were included in the leadership of the groups (like coops) and structures (like water point management committees) initiated by the project. The project resource transferred through SACCOs has provided opportunity for women. In the long run, it is believed to enhance their economic empowerment which would eventually lead to their genuine political empowerment.

Related to HIV and AIDS, a mainstreaming training was provided for staff members of the implementing partner organizations by Trocaire. Consequently, teachings were cascaded to members of the target community regarding HIV and AIDS, its impact on the different age groups, its social, biological, economic -- dimensions, transmission, prevention, support and care, and about anti retroviral therapy (ART), and possible roles and responsibilities of the different members of the community. The project had also provided (through CIFA Ethiopia) a roll out training for 31 government and community representatives (7 female) on how to mainstream HIV and AIDS in all projects and programs and at all stages of the project cycle.

Nevertheless, even though all of them had reported to mainstreamed HIV and AIDS in all of their activities, in line with perception of the mid-term review, it seems that the work accomplished by some of the implementing partners in this regard was not as substantial as it should have been. Members of the community had hardly mentioned HIV and AIDS as activities of the project. May be one possible reason was existence of confusion regarding the plan existing in this regard. For instance, AFD reported that as this activity was provided only in the Clarification Note and not in the original project plan, its implementation was started only about a year after onset of the project after clarification was obtained from the coordinator of the project.
2.3. Efficiency of the Implementation

Given the circumstances prevailed in the course of its implementation like the severe drought that caused migrations, severe lack of water, etc., the overall assessment of the ET was that the project was generally efficient. This position was fully shared by the stakeholder government offices and members of the target community. The following are some of the justifications for this:

- The project was efficient because it had identified and worked on priority needs of the target community that were also fully in line with strategies and priorities of the government.
- In spite of the challenges, almost all of the project activities were accomplished timely and made ready for use/provided service. The cases the water development works that were ready to harvest the Hagaya rains and the cleared rangelands that were completed before this season and grown grasses could be examples in this regard.
- In almost all cases, management of the project (in terms of planning, implementation, coordination, monitoring, reporting, etc.) was perceived to be efficient.
- The ET had observed that the inputs used by the project and the corresponding results were up to satisfactory standard, and contributed to efficiency of the project.
- Given the fact that most of the activities accomplished by the project were principally related to social services, it is difficult to quantitatively assess cost efficiency of the project. However, as to perception of the ET and comments of the beneficiaries and the stakeholder government offices, the project was cost effective. For instance, the project had paid at lower rate for the CFW beneficiaries compared to the other projects implemented in the area.
- In order to ensure more efficient utilization of the available budget, the consortium had gone up to shifting budget among the NGOs.
- Even though it has to be confirmed by the final budget utilization report of the project together with its explanations, based on the second year third quarter report, as available in the following table, it seems that the project had accomplished the planned activities by a cost which is below the planned.

Table 1: Extent of Utilization of the Project Budget (as of September 2011, in Euro$^{14}$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Initial Budget</th>
<th>Ryder Budget July-Dec 2011</th>
<th>Total expenditure as of 31/09/11</th>
<th>Remaining Balance</th>
<th>Utilization (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Human Resources</td>
<td>749,586.0</td>
<td>618,119.00</td>
<td>448,526.55</td>
<td>169,592.45</td>
<td>72.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Travel</td>
<td>47,700.00</td>
<td>41,968.00</td>
<td>16,934.47</td>
<td>25,033.53</td>
<td>40.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Equipment and supplies</td>
<td>526,345.00</td>
<td>566,251.00</td>
<td>565,687.76</td>
<td>563.24</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Local office</td>
<td>103,920.00</td>
<td>163,310.00</td>
<td>118,900.17</td>
<td>44,409.83</td>
<td>72.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Other costs, services</td>
<td>267,700.00</td>
<td>229,009.00</td>
<td>103,003.83</td>
<td>126,005.17</td>
<td>44.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Others</td>
<td>526,309.00</td>
<td>602,906.00</td>
<td>429,582.83</td>
<td>173,323.17</td>
<td>71.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal direct eligible costs of the Action</td>
<td>2,221,560.00</td>
<td>2,221,560.00</td>
<td>1,650,679.40</td>
<td>570,880.60</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct eligible costs of the Action</td>
<td>2332638</td>
<td>2332638</td>
<td>1,722,034.95</td>
<td>610,603.05</td>
<td>73.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total eligible costs</td>
<td>2,495,923.00</td>
<td>2,495,923.00</td>
<td>1,826,927.60</td>
<td>668,995.40</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Second Year 3$^{rd}$ quarter report of the project

$^{14}$ Exchange rate: 1 EURO = Birr 23.2742 (Average for the quarter)
On the other hand, better efficiency of the project was limited by factors that include the following:

- Notwithstanding the three riders allowed by EC, in the face of many unfavourable circumstances of the project area and the country, the time available for the project was not adequate for effective accomplishment of most of the activities planned under the project;
- The case of the Kasso rock catchments that was damaged by flood after it was taken close to completion;
- Due to circumstances of the area like its remoteness, the drought and pastoralist nature of the people, lack of labour and materials (including water) required for construction works;
- Completion of some of the activities would require sometime; and
- Tribal conflict that emerged sporadically in relation to access to the scarce resource.

2.4. **Mutual Reinforcement**

The ET has tried to assess coherence and mutual reinforcement of the different components and activities of the project. Livelihood of the target community is largely based on livestock, pasture and water. The project had principally identified and worked on improvement in availability and performance of these three inseparable pillars. Owing to the continued decline in performance of the pastoral way of life in supporting livelihood of the people, the role of and the need to promote non-pastoral and non-farm activities and sources of income has become vital. Consequently, the project had also identified and worked on activities and institutions that promote non-livestock activities. It is obvious that these four areas mutually reinforce one another towards improving livelihood of the target community and their resiliency to price increases.

In addition to this coherence of the thematic areas, the other important asset for mutual reinforcement is the fact that members of the consortium had worked in the same and closely interdependent geographic areas and with the same community. Given the migratory nature of the people and the possibility for them to access the resources available in Borana, the activities of the project implemented in the eight project districts support one another towards upholding livelihood of the people. The impact would also be maximized.

2.5. **Management and Coordination**

The consortium was identified as a learning forum by staff of the member NGOs who reported to have learned a lot from it, especially from the course of preparation and use of the Technical Notes. Besides, there were opportunities for exchange of best practices, experiences, etc. In addition to creating positive competition, it had also helped the member NGOs to assess themselves in comparative terms. Further, in some cases, it had also enabled to synchronize approaches and activities. For instance, existence of the consortium had enabled the member NGOs to effectively respond to the emergency caused by the drought and also the post drought rehabilitation.

Members of the consortium reflected that a participatory, inclusive, hence helpful governance structure that allowed the consortium members to host and chair the meetings in turn was put in place and practiced. The prevailing perception of members of the consortium was that the JEP had provided effective management. Absence of interference of the co-financers or the other consortium members on management of the project under the independent NGOs was also reported. What existed was said to be only facilitation to develop and stimulate synergy, mutual technical support and experience sharing.

The ET has learned that the Project Management Unit had provided regular technical support and advice for the frontline implementing teams of the project, and this was perceived by members of the consortium as beneficial. Cordaid had also reported to provided supervision and technical support for two of the implementing partners (ACORD and CIFA), though this was questioned by some other members of the consortium.
As discussed under Section 2.2.5, though constrained by inadequate participation of the more pertinent government authorities, the Zonal Steering Committee was also instrumental for supporting management and implementation of the project. Similar situation was true for the district level quarterly review meetings organized by the project that were commended to were helpful in terms of, among the others, ensuring quality, sharing of experiences and lessons and also solving problems. These arrangements had also contributed to the good synergy the project had with the stakeholder government line offices.

A question of the ET and some of the consortium members is the need for and added value of involvement of ILRI at the prevailed status while the service could have been obtained from other sources like pertinently qualifying consultants.

Nevertheless, the consortium was not without challenges though they were not significant enough to affect its performance. The following were identified in this regard:

- Some of the consortium members sometimes gave marginal priority for the consortium issues like poor attendance of meetings by the appropriate staff of the organizations and failure to fulfil once commitments. In few cases, such situations had delayed making decisions and actions;
- In few cases, there was unfair competition on the resources and interest to take more of it regardless of the available implementation capacity was manifested;
- Failure by some of the members to obey provisions of the MoU for their non-BRPC projects which they implemented in the project districts of the other consortium members; and
- Inadequate quality of the reports produced by the consortium member NGOs:

2.6 Effects and Impacts of the Project

The ET has attempted to identify effects and emerging impacts of the different activities accomplished by the project qualitatively based on suggestions of the beneficiaries, the stakeholder government offices, staff of the implementing members of the consortium, and also own observations and understandings. These effects/impacts are provided below. However, it is important to notice that related to undesirable effect of the drought and as some of the activities were completed lately, it is early for most of activities of the project to demonstrate observable impacts. The other point is that it is difficult to relate the effects/impacts only to this specific project. This is a case because some of activities of the present project are continuations of activities of preceding similar projects. Besides, the different activities of the project had coincided with huge relief and rehabilitation interventions that also worked on activities that include maintenance of water schemes; supply of relief food, feed and water; cash transfer; rangeland rehabilitation; slaughter destocking; and CFW employment opportunity.

The Rangeland Improvement: Full effects of this intervention would be realized when the cleared fields grow pasture fully and the grown pasture is grazed by the animals and then result in their improved production and reproduction capacity. Nonetheless, the following were observed so far while more impacts are also discussed under Section 2.2.1.

- In areas where it was implemented for the first time, the intervention has served as a lesson regarding the possibility for intensive and more efficient livestock management and possibility and means existing for intensification. It was also commented to have served as a role model/teaching aid. For instance, the informants in Anole Kebele (Dhas District) had reported to lack experience regarding bush clearing before this project that enabled them to clear 750ha on which they grazed more than 600 animals for two months during the last drought and saved their animals. As the grass has grown fully and densely, they believe that this round, the kalo would support their animals for longer time.
• The intervention has taught the people the possibility to overcome the bush encroachment problem and some of the possible ways and techniques. This was repeatedly reported by the people, especially by those who practiced it for the first time. In Taltale, for instance, the intervention was said to have shown the possibility to reclaim rangeland from encroachment by unwanted bushes.

• In the case of Harkalo/Fuldowa in Arero and Bokola in Moyale, the intervention has rehabilitated a grazing land that was turned to bare land. The case of Harkalo has also shown that the impact would be high if the intervention includes physical conservation measures and enriching/reseeding.

• Though in some cases the intervention has already saved lives of animals from the last drought, all of the cleared and rehabilitated fields will increase amount of good quality pasture available in the future, and contribute to production and productivity of the animals, and consequently increase incomes and access to food.

**Water development interventions:** It is obvious that in Borana where water, regardless of its quality, is very scarce, every intervention made in this area entails considerable impact. In light of these, at least the following effects and early impacts were identified. More impacts would be materialized when the water already harvested by the developed structures would be used during the coming dry season and the years to come.

• In some cases, the interventions have shortened distances travelled by the beneficiaries to reach the water points. The case of the Iladu scheme that reduced the distance travelled from average of 20km to average of 10km could be best example in this regard. Likewise, beneficiaries of the Kate Pond in Dirre that was newly built by the project through ACORD were to travel about 35km to reach Ella Dubluk, the nearest dry season water point. This new pond that also include slow sand filter has harvested 13,000m$^3$ water.

• Related to this, the project has enabled the community to get water at where it was not possible. The surface water harvesting structure successfully built in Miyo and already serving the community could be an example in this regard.

• Some of the interventions have eased challenges and the burden of the people like in terms of collecting water for domestic use and watering the livestock. The rehabilitations and improvements made on the traditional ellas like trough (naniga) and collection chambers, Ella Dhoqola in Dirre and Ella Ijinji in Moyale are examples for this.

• Enabled the people to access/use better quality water through physical interventions like in the case of Iladu scheme and the Kasso rock catchments.

• Overall, the project has increased the volume of water available in the area for dry season use. For instance, SOS Sahel reported that its intervention on rehabilitation of two ponds alone has increased volume the water harvested by the ponds by 13,343m$^3$.

• Some of them like the ground catchments in Miyo had served the community as tankers or container during emergency water rationing

**Production and marketing of livestock and livestock byproducts:**

• The following case could demonstrate the impacts entailed in this regard.

**The Abdi Gudina Sarite Livestock Marketing Cooperative:** This coop was established in 2009 by 25 members who per head paid Birr 10 registration fee and also bought a Birr 500 value shares per head. The cooperative was given Birr 60,000 seed money, a two room office (though not completed) and some furniture by the project through GPDI.

At first, the coop bought and held 15 cattle for four months and obtained a Birr 42,000 profit out of it. Subsequently, they bought 20 cattle and held them for four months. Unfortunately, the drought had happened and the coop had earned a profit of only Birr 5,000. Currently, they have plan to upgrade 30 cattle and they had already bought 13 bulls. Their total capital was grown to Birr 120,000.
Impact of the intervention, as identified by members of the coop and their colleagues include:

- The financial gain/profit that could potentially improve livelihood of the members;
- It has taught members of the coop and the other members of the community about upgrading animals intended for marketing through intensive management for sometime before marketing and its added value. As a result, the approach is already copied by the individual members of the coops and by the other members of the community.
- The exposure visits arranged for leaders of the cooperatives to different places has broadened their information level and thinking. It appears that they have already started replicating or at least thinking about what they observed during the visits.
- As to the stakeholder government line offices (for instance in Taltale), the cattle upgrading practice introduced by the project through coops had served as a demonstration case and changed attitude of the people that for long resisted teachings of the government extension in this regard.

The non-livestock interventions: It appears that these interventions have entailed better and immediate impact compared to the others. The following are some of the reported impacts while more others are available under Section 2.24.

- The SAACOs have inspired members of the community to get involved in non-pastoralist and non-farm activities and diversify, increase and regularize their incomes.
- Members of the pastoral community who were trained in construction skills by the project (through AFD) and managed to earn regular and better income out of pastoral livelihoods has shown the potential and possibility existing in the area in this regard.
- The NTFP cooperatives have provided alternative sources of income that complement livelihood of the members and have shown the possibility existing in the pastoral Borana in this regard.
- The cooperative related interventions have broadly introduced the concepts of money, saving, business, profits, etc. to the pastoralist community and also shown the possibility and encouraged them to diversify their livelihood sources. The women economic empowerment prospect of SAACOs is perceived to be high\(^\text{15}\). The following cases of coops and their members could provide more information regarding the impacts of the project.

- Dadhi Gololcha is member of the Kayo Elwayne SAACO in Yabello. She is 40, married and a mother of 11. She took Birr 1,000 loan and bought two she goats. The goats gave birth to one female kid each. Dadhi repaid the loan through petty trade and from small sources, and the four goats became her net profits.

  Her colleague, Sangabo Mamed is married and a mother of four. Her husband works at a traditional mining spot and mostly he is without any income. She ran petty trade by the Birr 1,000 loan she got from the coop. She joined a weekly iqub with the money and also fed her children, and managed to successfully pay back the loan. Through time, she bought two ewes (though one had died) and now have three sheep as a profit. Now, Sangabo took third round loan from her coop. Her business is going excellent.

- The Jiregna Credit and Saving Cooperative in Saba in Taltale: This coop was established by 65 members who paid Birr 10 each for registration and bought one share (Birr 100 value) per head. The members have also mobilized a total of Birr 3,200 saving so far (Birr 10 per head per month). The overall capital of the coop is Birr 86,140.

  The coop was given Birr 56,000 seed money from the project through GPDI. The coop disbursed the first round loan (10% interest rate) for its members and earned Birr 3,840 profit out of it.

  In addition to this profit of the project, the following are reports of members of the coop who took the loan:

\(^{15}\) The Project has commented that this view was supported by finding of a research conducted by Gerrit Holtland (January 2011), which found that SAACOs are most appropriate for women’s economic empowerment.
**Member 1:** “I took Birr 1,200 loan and bought three goats. One of the goats had died. She also bought tobacco with the loan money. She sold the tobacco and repaid the loan. Now she has two goats which are her profit. She has plan to run a small shop business.”

**Member 2:** “I bought a bull, a goat and food for my family with the loan money. The food helped me to see my family through the bad time. At the end, I sold the bull and repaid the loan, and kept the goat as a profit.”

**Member 3:** “I bought a goat and ate the rest of the loan money during the bad time. At the end, I sold the goat and repaid the loan. My profit is the fact that my family is through the bad time intact.”

**Member 4:** Bake Kala is a single mother sent out by her parents because of her out of marriage pregnancy. Before the loan, she had nothing, but the baby. Bake bought four goats (two she and two male) with the loan money. She sold the males and repaid the loan and ate the remaining money. Now she has two pregnant goats as assets.

**Member 5:** “I bought four goats. At the end I sold two of them and repaid the loan. One of the remaining goats had aborted while the other gave birth to a single kid. Unfortunately the two mothers were killed by wild animals and now I have only one kid which is my profit.”

- In addition to that of the members the SACCOs appear to favourably changed behaviour of the broader members of the community regarding saving and developed culture of saving.

**Other impacts**

- The project had created job opportunity for members of poor households and the youth who worked on bush clearing and construction works through cash payment. The proceeds were used to access food for the people and feed for the animals during the critical food shortage and drought time, and contributed to saving human and livestock life.

- In some cases, the project has also demonstrated multiplier effects. For instance, the cattle upgrading started by the coops supported by the project has been copied by the individual members of the community.

**2.7. Sustainability Issues**

Lack of adequate sustainability of achievements of externally initiated and supported interventions was said to be a general problem in Borana. The ET has attempted to assess sustainability of this project in terms of some variables like extent of local participation and contribution; policy supports; socio-cultural considerations; financial capacity; institutional arrangements; and technical issues which are discussed below.

**Participation and contribution:** The ET has learned that members of the target community and the district and zone level stakeholder government offices were involved in problem identification, design, periodic planning (development site selection), management, implementation, monitoring and evaluations of the project at different extents. These have given them to closely and adequately know the project, which is an asset for its sustainability. In addition to the participation, when circumstances so allowed, the completed activities of the project were also handed over to the pertinent government offices and the beneficiary communities.

In addition to this participation, the direct beneficiaries and members of the target community had also contributed to the project through availing locally available materials like their own labour. In addition to this, some of the activities like bush clearing are already replicated by the community. For instance, in Anole Kebele in Dhas, the people had copied the project and cleared about 500 ha through community mobilization
that was organized by the kebele administration. These are believed to contribute to sustainability of the interventions.

Still on this line, there was direct involvement and participation of the traditional institutions in the different activities of the project. For instance, water related interventions start only if permission/approval is secured from the concerned traditional institution. The same was also true for the rangeland development interventions. These are assets that could also contribute to sustainability.

On the other hand, it appears that only the needy poor who do not have livestock to graze on the cleared/rehabilitated grazing land had worked on the bush clearing through the CFW while the rich who are the immediate users did not have or had limited involvement through the community mobilization. We believe that this situation would have limitation on sustainability of the intervention.

Policy support: As discussed under Section 2.1, all of activities of the project are fully in line with strategies and immediate priorities of the federal and the regional governments. This means, achievements of the project would enjoy adequate policy support. For instance, the local government has already included bush clearing (most likely the traditional approach) in the growth and transformation plan, and it would be accomplished through PSNP and free community labour mobilization. The Pastoral Development Office of the government regularly works on development and management of rangeland and livestock while the water office is responsible for water related matters, which were the principal activities of the project.

Institutional capacity: It seems that achievements of the project exist in mixed status in terms of institutional sustainability. The situation is discussed in the following paragraphs.

In terms of the coops, the project had closely worked with the district cooperative promotion offices. The latter were involved in building capacity of the coops and their registrations. The ET had observed that experts in the offices possess adequate information about the coops. The offices also pledge to take over the coops and support them in the future. Notwithstanding the capacity limitation the offices have, this could be considered as an opportunity that would ensure institutional sustainability.

On the other hand, the project had worked on already existing and newly established coops (SACCOs and the other types). Even though the project had strived a lot to build institutional capacities of these coops, they did not gain a capacity that would enable them stand by themselves. The following case provides an example in this regard. Therefore, the present institutional capacities of both the old and the new coops do not guarantee their effective sustainability.\footnote{JEP comments that this and other coop sustainability related concerns are considered by the Comic Relief (UK) supported TRADE project.}

The Kayo LMC in Dirre was established some six years ago by AFD by 31 members (10 female). The members recall that the coop was strong when it was supported by AFD. Following completion of the project and withdrawal of AFD, performance of the coop and its status declined considerably - most of the money they had was lost, etc. The discussants identified drought and lack of capacity and information as the main reasons. While the coop was about to collapse, the BRPC project rescued it through ACORD. The coop obtained, among the others, training (members and leaders), exposure visit, a bookkeeper and Birr 40,000 seed money from the project. The latter had also supported the coop to supply goats for the restocking intervention. However, in line with fear of members of the coop, it does not seem that the coop will continue as it is at present after completion of this project.
While this is the reality existing from the side of the coops, the government cooperative promotion offices also lack adequate institutional capacity that enable them provide the support required by the coops. For instance accounts of many of the visited coops were not audited due to the same reason. This is the other challenge that would question institutional sustainability of the coops.

Regarding the water points developed by the project, in the case of the already existing ones, the bodies responsible for management of the water points were reinforced/reorganized in a way that they would comply with the government guideline existing for this purpose. For the newly developed water points, new committees were established as per the guideline. The committees include three to four women as members, and the latter were given capacity building trainings.

However, there is clear incompatibility between the government guideline and the tradition of the people which is part of the Gada System. The latter has set different laws for management of the different water points (dip ellas/ella tula, shallow elas/ella adadi, ponds, dambalas (seasonal water points) and the laws have been in effect for centuries and served the purpose effectively and sustainably. Unfortunately, the traditional law does not consider women for water management. On the other hand, the government has prepared blanket guideline which requires establishment of water management committees that include both male and female as members and demands all the actors to apply it. As to experiences (including those from Borana), in almost all cases, such committees fail to be effective and sustainable. Prevalence of this gap has been a challenge in Borana and affected sustainability of water points newly developed by external actors (NGOs and government) as the newly established water committees lack support of the traditional law, hence are not accepted by the community. The ET has observed fear that the water points newly developed by this project might suffer from lack of institutional sustainability.

This implies existence of need for working towards synchronizing this gap by lobbying both sides (the traditional and the government side) and help identification of a structure that effectively and sustainably serve the purpose under the present and future similar circumstances.

Likewise, about the same situation apply for the rangelands cleared and/or rehabilitated by the project. In most cases, the rangelands were managed by individuals elected by the community. In some cases, it also appears that the kebele administrators also have part in it. Such situation might create responsibility gaps.

**Socio-cultural factors**: Perhaps related to socio-cultural setting, it could be argued that the fact that members of the target community had cleared the bush in the rangelands through cash payment would affect its sustainability as it would develop dependency syndrome. Because, the people might expect payments for clearing the rangeland and they will not clear it if there would not be payment. On the other hand, it appears that the people should be supported in this regard due to a number of factors that include the following:

- At present, bush clearing is beyond capacity of the people as the encroachment is far beyond that could be cleared through mobilization of free community labour;
- The recurrent drought that highly damaged resiliency and all rounded capacity of the people;
- Weakening of the traditional system of the community that normally take care of such issues; and
- The fact that some other projects intervening in the area like PCDP and PSNP pay members of the community for such activities.

As a result of all these, it appears that the present approach of the project (involving the people through payment) will continue parallel with free labour mobilization at least in the near future.
**Financial sustainability:** One important problem related to financial sustainability is regarding SACCOS. In spite of their potential for success, the SACCOS initiated and/or supported by the project have been limited by lack of operating capital. This situation might develop worry and affect continuity of the coops.

Almost all of the visited communities were not familiar with the concept of putting aside reserve money for maintenance and repair of the structures developed by the project like water schemes – with the exception of the surface water harvesting structure in Miyo. The reason was said to be the fact that Boranas do not have tradition of saving/putting money (resource) aside for maintenance and rehabilitation of water schemes, and the required resource is mobilized when the need arise. However, this approach does not seem helpful anymore in the present and future market and economic circumstances and the growing use of industrial materials like cement and fittings for the water points. This indicates, in addition to putting in place a strong management system that could call the people in times of need, the need to work on introduction of putting aside adequate amount of money for this purpose and to encourage the people to regularly pay for the same.

**Technical issues:** An important issue related to this is the fact that the cooperatives supported by the project still lack reliable technical capacity that ensures their independence sustainability. Some of the reasons are: the socio-cultural setup of the people which is still traditional; limited knowledge and skill of the people who are predominantly illiterates; and conceptual limitation in relation to cooperative and its management. Consequently, it appears that it would take considerable time for the cooperatives to stand alone and the fact that they deserve external technical support at least in the near future. The following case could provide an example in this regard.

*The Boku Milk Production and Marketing Coop: This coop exists in Miyo District. It was established in 2004 by support of LVIA that also provided it milk processing and handling materials and a building for office and working place. It was established by 33 women who are now 46. It does not seem that the coop progressed much until it was given a Birr 25,000 seed money and safe box by this project through AFD that was also building17 them a shop on the Yaballo-Moyale road for milk marketing as part of the project. Including the amount obtained from this project, the coop reported to had Birr 47,000 cash. The Food Facility project had also funded training and exposure visits of leaders and members of the coop.*

*Lack of market for processed milk (as the community know only whole milk) has been their main problem though it seems getting improved these days. Their objective was to collect whole milk from the community, process it into butter and skimmed milk and make profit out of it. As a solution, they were involved in upgrading bulls, but four of the eight bulls they bought had died due to the drought and ended up in loss. Then they reassumed the milk business. Like the other coops, they were also involved in sugar and edible oil business.*

*The coop appears to be relatively active these days. For instance, in the face of inadequate supply of milk in the market, the members reported to bought and processed 41lt milk on the day of our visit. However, lack of market in the local for the skimmed milk was still a problem.*

*Their account has never been audited. The fact that they were given wrong financial document by the previous project has made the account non-auditable. The bookkeeper retained by the project for the coop was copying entries of the old documents into the ones provided by this project (AFD) which were said to be appropriate. However, if the bookkeeper ceases his service following completion of the project, the coop would be in problem because neither any of the members could replace him, nor the coop could recruit a bookkeeper.*

---

17 Reasons for delay in finalization of the construction were said to include lack of material like cement, workforce and transport.
2.8. EC Value Added

All of the implementing NGOs run long term development interventions in the area. Their thematic areas are related to the activities picked by BRPC project. In most cases, the activities of the project were continuations of the activities the member NGOs had been practicing in the area. In addition to this, most of the activities of this project were initially initiated by the preceding EU sponsored Pastoralist Food Security Projects. The case of cooperatives established by AFD through this EC sponsored project could be an example in this regard. Therefore, this project had ensured continued and more effective functionality and sustainability of the preceding interventions, and made the preceding investments (either by EU or other donors) more effective.

This EC sponsored project has also contributed and added value to interventions of other donors and NGOs. For instance, two of the three buildings of the Bio Enterprise Centre under establishment at Yaballo through SOS Sahel was financed by Oxfam Canada (for gum, incense and aloe marketing) and by the Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) (for honey marketing). However, providing the required hardware for the Centre was completed only when construction of the third building and its furnishing and equipping was sponsored by the EU food facility project.

2.9. Visibility

The European Commission requires that unless the Commission agrees or requests otherwise, the Beneficiary must take all necessary steps to publicize the fact that the European Union has financed or co-financed the Project. In line with this, the ET has learned that signboards bearing names and logos of EU and the co-financing and the implementing members of the consortium were placed at all of the major intervention sites. Besides, the logos and names of these organizations were footnoted in cover or internal pages of documents of the Project, and also in the documentary film and the photo album produced by the project. The project also reports that the funding agencies were acknowledged during meetings, trainings, workshops and other pertinent forums. This was also confirmed by the stakeholder government offices. Further, the project had worked on acknowledging and popularizing the people-to-people resource transfer through leaflets and wearing and distributing caps and T-shirts bearing logos of the donor and members of the consortium. The ET had also observed stickers bearing the EU logo fixed to durable equipment, buildings and major supplies.

2.10. Monitoring and Evaluation

It was planned to undertake monitoring and evaluation of the project at different levels, given the consortium approach and the eight-district coverage. It was also planned to conduct assessment of impact at organisational level with the consortium and government partners measuring performance against agreed objectives and indicators as set out in the logical framework. Perhaps, it appears that this impact assessment was not conducted as planned, or the reports were not available for the consultant.

Close and regular monitoring of the day to day activities of the project had been carried out by the kebele level community development facilitators in participation and technical support from the district level counterpart government offices. This was also confirmed by the district level informants of the ET. For instance, the Dirre District government office discussants reported to had conducted participatory ongoing monitoring, comparing and crosschecking reports of the project, comparing the plans and accomplishments against the planned timetable, etc. They also reported to already had conducted their own final evaluation of the project. Monitoring the project progress and achievements was the principal component of activities of the structures organized by the project (the kebele level monthly meetings, the district level quarterly review and reflections, the biannual zonal steering committee meetings and the governance meetings).
The project had put in place internal monitoring and evaluation mechanism. The regular (monthly) monitoring visits conducted by the Project Coordinator; the governance meetings; the monthly and quarterly meetings, etc. could be counted in this regard. In addition to these internal mechanisms, the project had also benefited from recommendations of a number of monitoring missions it received like: a Joint Results Oriented Monitoring (J-ROM) Mission; an External Results Oriented Monitoring (E-ROM) Mission; and the European Court of Auditors; though timings of these missions put heavy pressure on members of the consortium. Findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of the project conducted by an independent consultant were also helpful for the project. The project appears to had adequately considered findings and recommendations of the monitoring and evaluation exercises.

The implementing consortium member organizations had regularly produced and submitted quarterly physical and financial reports to management of the project and to the pertinent government offices. Nevertheless, in some districts like Dhas, the district Finance and Economic Development Offices complained not to had received such reports.

2.11. SWOT Analysis

Under this topic, internal and external factors identified by the different informants of the ET that contributed to the project and those which worked otherwise are discussed. Under the first group are internal strengths of the project itself and the opportunities it had from the outside. Factors that limited progress of the project include its own weaknesses and the threats it faced from the outside. These are presented in the following paragraphs.

Strength: The project had demonstrated at least the following strengths.

- The project had identified and addressed important and priori problems of the target community.
- The stakeholder government offices had characterized the project as participatory. Management of the project was also said to be transparent.
- In spite of the challenges it faced, the project had managed to accomplish all of the planned activities.

Weakness: Though not overly important, the following were identified as learning areas of the project:

- It did not adequately consider the sanitation and hygiene teachings together with the water related intervention.
- Members of the consortium had failed to synchronize their norms and modality of payment for CFW\textsuperscript{18} activities they accomplished in the same or adjacent kebeles.
- Members of the consortium did not revise/increase the amount paid for CFW which was necessary due to reasons like the fact that the other projects had increased it in response to the drought.

Opportunity: As an opportunity, the project had enjoyed good working relationship and support from the local government structures. Besides, the consortium approach had enabled the implementing organizations to share experiences, and also enhanced sense of positive competition among the members, which had implication on the overall performance of the project.

Threat: The project had faced some external challenges that hindered its performance and critically undermined its efficiency and the possible impacts. The following are the main ones.

\textsuperscript{18} For instance, in Moyale, GPDI had paid Birr 43/M\textsuperscript{3} for pond excavation (non-food facility project) while CIFA could pay only Birr 20/m\textsuperscript{3}. 
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• The drought, that was a case during almost all of life of the project, was unprecedented threat of the project that substantially undermined its activities and achievements. It had, among the others, affected the following:
  ▪ hindered works with the cooperatives as many members were forced to move due to the drought and were not available for training, and other coop related activities;
  ▪ caused death of cows and calves, and affected realization of possible impact of the project in the areas of milk production and marketing;
  ▪ caused shortage of water for construction works;
  ▪ contributed to lack of labour for the different activities of the project;
  ▪ due to lack of water and pasture, the LMCs had incurred losses, forced to stop business, or could not enter business; and
  ▪ the SACCOS were also affected to some extent as the members were compelled to migrate and/or could not make savings;
• Tribal conflict in the project operation areas like in Arero and Dhas Districts.
• Staff turnover that created communication gaps and delays as the new ones needed time to take up.
• Disparity among the remunerations paid by the different agencies that implanted cash based interventions in the area including members of the consortium was a threat for some of the consortium members.
• The substantial devaluation of Birr which affected the project in terms of supply of different inputs.
• Limited flexibility in budget reallocation and the long process taken to get approval of the proposed budget shifting by EC.

3. LESSONS LEARNED

At least the following lessons could be drawn from the course of planning, implementation and evaluation of the project. They were identified by the informants and members of the ET.

• Experience of the project has shown that organizing structures like project review teams and steering committees at different levels enhances participation and contribution of the beneficiaries and the stakeholder government offices; and contribute to effective implementation of projects and sustainability of achievements.

• An important lesson could also be drawn from experience of ACORD that at about the beginning of the project faced shortage of budget due to delayed release from Cordaid Head Office related to regulation of the latter that required monthly report regarding extent of use of the already made monthly disbursement. However, such disbursement and report requirement was found to be inconvenient for local NGOs that operate at remote areas under challenging circumstances like absence of communication facilities, inadequate bank services, etc. This teaches the need for the back-donors to compromise and allow flexibility in line with circumstances of their local partners.

• As discussed under Section 7.5, there has been mismatch and gap between the formal and the traditional institutions, the most important one being in terms of composition of the members by sex. The need to harmonize the institutions initiated by projects/external interventions with the existing traditional structures that are proved to be effective and sustainable could be learned. This reality also teaches that establishment of new institutions like water management committees for the rehabilitated and newly developed water points should be accomplished in a way that it would not negatively affect the existing traditional structures.

• In Sarite Kebele of Taltale District, the Wama Halake Pond that was rehabilitated and expanded by the project has two separate ponds: a small one which was said to be for human consumption and a big one which was for livestock. Perhaps, as it could contribute to safety of water meant for domestic use by avoiding contamination by livestock, this approach could be scaled out.
• Prevalence of risks and uncertainties of adverse externalities in the area that recur frequently indicates the need to allow for and accept flexibilities both during planning and implementation of projects.

• In most cases, the amount paid by the project for CFW, as it was not revised in response to the drought, could not attract people to work on activities of the project. This was also a case because other NGOs and/or members of the consortium through their other projects were paying at higher rates. This situation had contributed to delay in completion of some of the project activities. This teaches the need to revise norms like CFW payment rates in response to demanding circumstances. It also teaches the need to consider this in case of future similar partnership.

• The need to match activities picked for a project with life of the project at the planning stage could be learnt from the three No-Cost-Extensions this project was granted and the fact that some of the activities were not completed by the time of the evaluation, and still need sometime.

• Experiences of some of the coops like Dikicha LMC that strives to upgrade cattle while the area is highly degraded and pasture is in short supply teach that formation of coops and their involvement in business should be based on availability of the resource like grazing area for cattle upgrading and milk for milk marketing coops.

• Existence of need for review and revision of MoUs of consortiums in the face of significant change in circumstances like the last drought in Borana was identified by the grassroots operators of this project.

• There are inherent challenges of consortium approaches. The successful experience of this consortium teaches that there is also possibility for harmonization and overcoming challenges under consortium approach.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of the evaluation report provides conclusions and recommendations of the ET which are based on findings of the evaluation exercise, understandings of members of the ET, observations and understandings of the Consultant and experiences he gained from preceding similar assignments. The recommendations are provided for consideration of the concerned. In addition to these recommendations, in the case of future planning, it is also advisable to consider lessons drawn from the course of its implementation [Section 3].

[2.1] The Evaluation Team has found that the Building Resilient Pastoralist Community Project was relevant and fully in line with the context of the pastoralist Borana, the priority needs of the target people and the strategies and the immediate plans of the government.

In terms of designing of the project, the ET has observed that there was mismatch between life of the project and the time required to effectively implement some of the activities. There was need only to integrate risk reduction measures into project activities, not for implementation of CMDRR among the implementing consortium members.

- Future similar need identification and planning exercises should make sure that: there is compatibility between the life of the project and the time required to fully accomplish the project activities; and whether there is practical need and interest to implant the identified project activities.

[2.2] The overall objective of the BRPC was that pastoralist communities in Borana Zone develop increased productive and income generating capacity which reduces their vulnerability to volatile food prices. The global food facility initiative was contextualized to the circumstances of pastoralist Borana in a way that it stimulates interventions that ultimately contribute to reduced food prices. Accordingly, the project had planned and worked on improvement of the long-term food security status of the target
pastoralist communities and to eventually reduce their vulnerability to volatile food prices, not on immediate and direct food prices reduction. However, the severe drought that, among the others, claimed lives of more than 300,000 livestock had made the effort in vain and also unattainable for the immediate years to come. Appendix 4 provides report of the project in this regard.

- There is ongoing need for relief intervention in the area and immediate need for rehabilitation of the people through like providing productive and reproductive assets for the most affected once and enhance their recovery.

Under its first Specific Objective/purpose, the project had planned to entail increased production and marketing of livestock and livestock by products through three outputs/results [2.2.1 to 2.2.3]. Specifically, among the others, it had planned to increase income from livestock and livestock by-products by 30%; and to enable 50% of the livestock related IGA beneficiaries access new markets. However, in spite of promising starts by some cooperatives and individuals, and though the rangeland and the water related interventions were expected to contribute to this ambitious target, principally related to the severe drought, the targets were not met. On the contrary, it appears that the drought has considerably retarded livelihoods of the people.

[2.2.1] The project had fully accomplished the planned bush clearing and rangeland reclamation works and also initiated the local stakeholders and the community to do the same. Some of the developments have already entailed impacts while those of the other ones would be realized during the coming dry season.
- As it is an important problem of the community, there is need for further promotion and support of rangeland bush clearing and rehabilitation of degraded grazing lands.
- Future range land improvement interventions should consider a more integrated approach that include biological and physical soil and water conservation measures; reseeding and enriching the grass/forage plants; introduction and demonstration of different techniques of bush clearing (destroying, thinning, cutting the stems), fencing/enclosing, water point development, termite control and promotion of cut-and-carry system.
- Synchronized effort should be made to institutionalize bush clearing as part of the regular activity of the community.
- There is need for initiation and supporting participatory research for identification of more effective and compatible bush clearing technique for the different tree species.
- It is recommendable that future similar interventions should work on the problem of termite infestation which is a growing threat in the area on rangelands and on the emerging crop husbandry.
- As need for more quantity was reported by different informants of the ET, future similar interventions should consider provision of hand tools required for bush clearing.
- Though it seems to deserve further assessment, there were suggestions to conduct prescribed and controlled burning of rangelands
- As it could lead to intensification and transformation of the rangeland management through time, promote and support the development and use of the kalo system for small groups of villages/HHs.
- In order to ensure sustainability of the bush clearing practice and its broader adoption and institutionalization in Borana and enhance contribution to the further development of the technique, the rich who are the principal users of the rangeland should be involved in the practice in one way or the other.

[2.2.2] The works planned in relation to improving access to community-managed water resources for human and livestock consumptions were accomplished up to the plans. The ET believes that the developments have considerably added to volume of water available in the area and also to its safety in some cases.
- Since it is a commonly known case, it is needless to recommend for continued water development intervention in the area. Nevertheless, the interventions should consider improving the existing
traditional water points and developing new wisely managed water points at strategic sites, and work towards maintaining sustainable balance between water availability and herd size.

- Besides, such interventions should ensure adequate involvement of the traditional water management structure and should also work in line with the traditional water management system.
- In order to maximize impact of the water related interventions, there is need for continued work on water sanitation and hygiene altogether. There is also need for teaching on effective use of water purification chemicals.
- Application of the WASH approach would be more effective if the government Health Extension Workers are involved.
- Renovation and completion of the damaged Kasso rock water harvesting structure is highly recommended at least due to economic and social reasons. There is also clear need for improving design of the structure including those discussed under Section 2.2.2. Delayed renovations might result in more costs.
- Silt traps could increase life and usability of ponds through reducing siltation. They could also improve purity of the water. Therefore, it is advisable to include this structure as part of pond rehabilitation and building.
- There is possibility to further improve Ella Dhoqola in Dirre District by constructing a canal that collect water from the cluster of ellas situated in the hill down to the bottom the hill where it is more convenient for watering animals.
- Lobby the Gumi Gayo for inclusion of women in the water management structure like what was done for sending girls to school.
- Promote and encourage the people to put aside adequate amount of reserve money for the case of malfunctioning of water points, especially for purchase of industrial materials.

[2.2.3] The project had accomplished the activities planned to increase food and income from the production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products. Some of the LMCs and MPCs initiated and/or supported by the project were involved in livestock marketing and also earned profits before their efforts were undermined by the drought. Few of them are still in business.

- In order to ensure their sustainability and realization of their impacts, most of the activities accomplished under this outcome deserve follow up. Some of the interventions intended to capacitate the newly established or the already existing coops were not completed by the time of visit of the ET and seemed to require some time. Besides, in all cases, the Milk Marketing Cooperatives supported by the project did not start the business and did not receive and use the milk processing equipments meant for them. It seems that milk will not be adequately available in the area before a year, when the animals survived from the last drought could resume reproduction and production. Therefore, these situations indicate a need for follow up and continued interventions in order that the investment made by this project turn effective and profitable19.

- Even though they could not equally compete with the individual traders, livestock related coops can serve at least to regulate prices by serving the pastoralists as alternative market channels in case of lower prices under normal conditions. However, some of the livestock related coops were observed competing with their members. In principle, they should work on activities that support practices of their members instead of competing with them on the same practices, i.e., they should not work on activities which the members could accomplish individually. For instance, the ET had observed that both a coop and its members were involved in cattle upgrading, a move that could potentially damage the coop. Instead, coops could promote individual cattle upgrading by their members and support this effort through group input-output marketing. In general, coops should not be encouraged to get involved in communal production.

---

19 The JEP reported to have taken care of this and the other coop related recommendations in the just started TRADE Project that is financed by Comic Relief (UK).
- It is obvious that genuine and well-managed coops give benefits for their fellow members. However, it is advisable to check whether interest and target of the coop members is the objective they report (solving their common problem like lack of access to fair market in common) or the seed money and the other supports provided by projects.

- It appears that all of the livestock related coops deserve continued capacity building interventions like training for their leaders, staff and members; and technical (like bookkeeping) and regulatory (like auditing) supports.

- Promoting crop farming could, among the others, provide the people with food and the livestock with feed; and also diversify food, feed and income sources of the people both in kind and temporally. It appears to be a time for this because the people have learned use of crop by-products for feed and also considered crop husbandry as an enterprise. Future interventions should consider this in partnership with the local research centre.

- In Borana, in unusually good years, milk would be available for up to six months in a year. However, usually, it is available for a maximum of four months. This puts under question profitability of the milk marketing coops. On the other hand, it indicates the need to consider other possible activities in addition to the milk marketing, which is already considered in some cases.

- The project had planned and worked to contribute to empower and enable asset-poor community members diversify their livelihoods and generate increased income through its fourth output [2.2.4]. The aim was to contribute to mitigating the impact of high food prices on asset-poor households by increasing household income and diversifying livelihoods to reduce risk. Specifically, it was planned to enable the beneficiaries report 30% increase in income from non-livestock sources; and to ensure year round food security for 40% of the beneficiary HHs. The project had adequately accomplished the planned soft and hardware activities in this regard and the SACCOS/IGAs and the skill trainings have successfully shown the potential and possibility existing in this regard. They had also helped the beneficiaries build limited assets and pass through the bad time. Nevertheless, the possible better impact was limited by the drought that, among the others, caused stress migrations and destabilized the local economy. Consequently, this ambitious objective of the project was hardly met during life of the project though it appears that immense potential exists in the future.

- For existence of sustainable pastoralism, a balance between pasture, water, livestock and fair input-out market is needed. It appears that this balance would no more be a case and possible due to internal and external factors. Given this fact, there is practical and increasing need for promotion and support of non-livestock sources of livelihood in the area in order to diversify livelihood of the people who can no longer survive as pure pastoralists.

- SACCOs are more successful and seem to coincide with interest and need of members of the community who can no more live as pastoralists. Especially, they have proved to be instrumental for addressing the poor women. However, some of them were established only after the mid-term review of this project. All of them are constrained by lack of working capital. In general, SACCOs deserve adequate follow up and financial, technical and material support so that they continue serving their members effectively.

- Absence of micro financing institutions operating in the rural Borana justifies the need for channelling adequate working capital for the existing and newly emerging SACCOs to the extent that volume of the money does not affect the local market/local economy.

- The MTR had recommended for ‘strengthening of the coops to the level of union formation’. Even though we also believe that SACCOs should come together through unions, preceding experiences teach that formation of coop unions should be preceded by producing and existence of strong,
sustainable and self standing primary coops that can effectively utilize the union. Once they are proved to be reasonably strong, it is recommendable to bring the SACCOs together under union, which among the others, could help improve their access to working capital.

- The government cooperative promotion offices lack budget and technical capacity to provide the technical and regulatory support required by the cooperatives. In addition to these, high and frequent staff turnover and lack of interest and motivation from the side of the experts are the other challenges. These indicate the need for continued work on building capacity of leaders and members of the coop as a long run solution, and to retain the bookkeepers for the coops (in group when circumstances so allow) for considerable time.

- Some of the non-livestock coops also involve the members in communal production activities like soap production and NTFP collection. However, experiences show that since the members do not make equal contribution, such arrangement does not continuously motivate members for work. As much as possible, coops should not be involved in common production activities, but should provide marketing services for individual production of their members and members of the community. In the case of indivisible production units like soap production, the members should be paid based on quantity and quality of their individual or group production.

- Most of the coops hold a huge amount of money at hand. Absence of bank in the vicinity was reported as a reason. As the risk of total loss of the money is costly than depositing in the nearby bank (Yaballo or Moyale), the coops should be encouraged to learn using banks.

- Auditing accounts of the coops would enhance transparency and cultivate mutual trust among the members. However, principally related to limited capacity from the side of the responsible government office, it has not been a case, if any, it was not as regular as required. Therefore, future interventions should lobby for and support regular auditing of accounts of the coops.

- In some cases, members of the coops are made to pay income tax from the dividend they get from profit of the coop even when they decide to capitalize their share of the dividend. Perhaps, this does not seem to be in line with provision of the commercial code in this regard. The concerned government offices and also NGOs working with coops should check this.

- Some of members of the consortium had organized groups running saving and credit activities in a modality different from SACCO that does not seem to be based on any supporting legal framework. It is advisable to organize such groups within the context of the existing legal framework in a way that would ensure legality, sustainability and acceptance from the concerned government offices.

- Some of the SACCOs were observed charging interest rate which is higher than what is provided in their bylaws. Even though it seems that this was done to improve financial capacity of the coops, this situation, among the others, might discourage the members. This deserves follow up and technical support of the government coop promotion offices.

The third Specific Objective of the project had triggered enabling local institutions, traditional leaders and local government effectively govern and manage pastoralist food security and livelihoods. As indicators, it was expected to see plans developed by the local government to effectively address pastoralist livelihoods issues; and to see the local government and customary institutions in regular dialogue on pastoralist food security. Even though the first indicator was not met, meetings sponsored and facilitated by the project were held at kebele, district and zone levels almost as planned though participation of the local authorities and leaders of the customary institutions was not as good as expected. In addition to the fact that the intended objective was not met, it seems that the meetings will not continue after the project.

The central theme of the project was a viable value chain for the marketing of livestock and non-livestock
products. Though there were studies, analyses, meetings, discussions, visits, etc. sponsored and implemented as part of the project, a practical solution that enhances access of the pastoral community to fair livestock and livestock by-product input-output markets has not been put in place.

- Such final outcome of this project in relation the value chain approach and observations from other similar preceding interventions hint existence of needs for contextually re-examining the concept and applicability of value chain approach and its usability. Working on building capacity of cooperatives (unions and primaries) to enable them look for and get linked to potential and alternative markets and building their capacity in this regard, and to open them to markets by working on accessibilities seem more feasible and fruitful, hence advisable.

It appears that huge resources (for relief, rehabilitation, project based development, regular government development program, PSNP, etc.) have been channelled to the pastoralist Borana with attempt to improve livelihoods of the people. However, situations have been growing worse than better over time. This has happened due to factors that include the following that resulted in inefficient utilization of the available resource: absence of coordination and integration; existence of duplication of efforts; failure to build on preceding achievements and experiences; absence of interest for networking and information exchange; concentrating on small works rather than pulling resources and work on intervention that could entail basic change; etc. Of course this is our general observation which is not necessarily related to BRPC.

- This situation indicates the need for developing synergy for optimum and more effective utilization of the available resources and entail practical and continuing improvement on life of the people and their lasting resilience. Perhaps donors funding projects implemented in the area could play important role in this regard. As to observations, since EU and USAID are the bigger donors funding intervention in Borana, they can put in place this desirable improvement. Possibly, EC can also take the initiation.
- Such synchronized approach could enable to finance bigger programs that could work on basic problems of the people and result in fundamental and sustainable changes in their life. SORDU, which was wrongly terminated, could be type intervention that should be envisaged.

Our discussion with the Yaballo Research Centre has revealed that there are on shelf technologies in the areas of crop and livestock husbandry, rangeland management, agricultural processing, and moisture management that could be introduced to the people in the target area.

- Future intervention could consider dissemination of these technologies. Specifically, NGOs should also work on promotion of husbandry of pertinent corps in partnership with the research centre with a bid to diversify livelihood of the people and increase their chance for resiliency.

No-Cost-Extensions are common for the EU sponsored projects. Of course it has been instrumental for fully accomplishing planned activities and ensures effectiveness and efficiency of projects. On the other hand, it is obvious that such mismatch between life of projects and the time required for full and effective execution of the planned activities affect qualities by creating frustrations and hasty situations. It appears that the principal reason is ambitious planning that fail to limit itself by considering the prevailing circumstances and challenges. It also seems that NGOs are forced to fit into a predetermined project duration regardless of the actual time required to fully accomplish the activities they identify based on assessment of local needs. Is some cases, good proportion of the planned time elapses for non-project activities like waiting for signing project agreements. Etc.

- It seems that this situation deserves further investigation and subsequent corrective measures by all parties (EC, the co-financers and the implementing partners).
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### 3. Detailed Physical Accomplishment of the Project (up to second year third quarter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Activities (Project period)</th>
<th>Achievements during the reporting period</th>
<th>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</th>
<th>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</th>
<th>cumulati ve progress</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1. Increased Production and Marketing of livestock and livestock products</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Rangeland management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Selective bush clearing and area closure</td>
<td>2011 hectares of land cleared during this reporting period by all partners with both cash for work and community participation</td>
<td>Direct beneficiary: 1945 households (1109 male &amp; 845 female)</td>
<td>6411.45 hectares of land cleared since the start of the project, of which 5212 hectares with cash for work and 1199.45 hectares with community participation</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>As per the MoU signed, the achievement of bush clearing with community participation is only 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Reclamation of common rangeland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71 hectares reclaimed and 58 hectares sown with 700 kg improved fodder seed (Rodus grass)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>revised with final contract rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Termite Control pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Purchase of hand tools</td>
<td>Two set of hand tools (axes &amp; big knives) were purchased and distributed</td>
<td>Male: 113 &amp; Female: 75</td>
<td>The purchased hand tools distributed for rangeland managers for sustainability through chopping &amp; cutting off the regenerated branches of cleaned bushes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>All partners completes tools purchase in the first year before starting range land work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Water supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Rock catchment scheme</td>
<td>10% construction progress during this reporting period by AFD which include;</td>
<td>1750 households and 19,000 livestock benefited from this water scheme.</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Increase in construction materials together with raise in labour cost contribute for delay in rate of this activity implementation and increase in over all cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 Water points construction 100% completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 100% of the earth embankment structure completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The levelling of the embankment for covering geo-membrane 50% completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 double face cattle trough completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Of the two water canals which harvest water from the rock to reservoirs, one fully completed while the other 50% completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1 double face shoats trough completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction of two 100 M3 capacity water reservoirs completed 95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Two water points construction completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Of the two water canal, one fully completed and the other 50% completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Activities (Project period)</td>
<td>Achievements during the reporting period</td>
<td>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</td>
<td>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</td>
<td>cumulative progress</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Spring-fed gravity System (Iladu)</td>
<td>8% Construction progress during this reporting period by AFD which includes;</td>
<td>2556 households (1291 female) and 24,480 livestock benefited from this water scheme</td>
<td>To date 93% Construction progress, which includes;</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Remaining work; Geo-membrane for basement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 shoats double face completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• One reservoir with a capacity of 70M3 fully completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pipe laying from spring to reservoir 3.2km completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 double face cattle trough work completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 water point construction completed,</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 shoats double face completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• laying of 1258 meters pipe laying,</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pipe laying from spring to reservoir 3.2km completed( Out of 5km)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• painting the wall of over flow night storage and 1 reservoir completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pipe laying of 1258 meter from reservoir to village completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Over flow storage pond excavation labour work completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 water point construction completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Three Ground Catchment Systems (Cistern Construction)</td>
<td>Out of the planned 3 ground catchment work in Miyo woreda, during this reporting period, there was 20% construction progress on two ground catchment works which includes all the foundation work, masonry of underground wall with slab preparation</td>
<td>The planned beneficiary, when this work completed; Male: 381 &amp; Female: 369 Total = 750</td>
<td>To date 70% construction progress, which includes;</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Implemented by AFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 fully completed ground catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 ground catchment with progress of 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Slow Sand Filters construction</td>
<td>25% construction progress during this quarter which includes finishing work of the three slow sand filter</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiary: 1950 population (936 male &amp; 1014 female)</td>
<td>• 4 fully completed slow sand filter in Dokole, Gololcha and Fulo-Romso Pas</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Implemented by ACORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Rehabilitate of one cistern</td>
<td>Planned beneficiary: 100 HHs, 500 population (260 female) But not yet started serving the community because of absence of rain</td>
<td>One cistern rehabilitation fully completed in Follo Romso PA</td>
<td>One cistern rehabilitation fully completed in Follo Romso PA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Other Traditional Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1 Rehabilitate 8 Ponds</td>
<td>5 % construction progress and completion work of pond</td>
<td>Direct beneficiary: 578 households (259 female &amp; 319</td>
<td>• To date 10 pond rehabilitated( 4 by ACORD, 2 by SoS &amp; 4 by GPDI)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Activities (Project period)</td>
<td>Achievements during the reporting period</td>
<td>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</td>
<td>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</td>
<td>cumulative progress</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehabilitation in Bule-Korma PA by GPDI</td>
<td></td>
<td>male)</td>
<td>• The rehabilitated pond started serving both human and livestock population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.6.2 Construct 2 Ponds | • During this reporting period 9% progress achieved with;  
• One pond construction completed by ACORD  
• CIFA new pond construction reaches 70% | People benefited from cash for work are 637(262 female) | So far, two pond construction completed by ACORD and starts serving both community members and livestock and the other pond with CIFA progressed 70%. | 90% | |
| 2.6.3 Rehabilitate 5 shallow wells | • Rehabilitations of two shallow wells at Dambi and Tille Mado PA’s by CIFA scored 20% progress during this reporting period. | 1500 people benefited( 938 male and 612 female) | • 4 shallow wells rehabilitation completed by CIFA and all wells start serving both community and livestock | 100% | |
| 2.6.4 Maintenance of 5 traditional ellas | • Maintenance of two traditional ella found at Dhokole and Gololcha was completed in this quarter by ACORD which constitute 50% progress during this period | Direct beneficiary: 340 HHs( 156 female) and 1700 family members as indirect beneficiary benefited from cash for work and 43,200 livestock population access this water scheme | • SoS shael rehabilitated 3 traditional ellas while its original plan was 2 by increasing community participation.  
• ACORD rehabilitated all three as per the plan  
• All rehabilitated ellas continue serving both human and livestock population | 125% | The extra achievement comes because of SOS additional ellas rehabilitation. |
| 2.6.5 Training and Accompaniment for Water Committees | • 14 water committee members trained in water management, hygiene and sanitation by three partners( ACORD/5/, AFD/5/ and CIFA/4/  
• Scored 5% progress | Direct beneficiary of this reporting period: 98 members (56 female) | To date 29 water committees were trained and have a functional community based management system. Each water committees has got 7 community members ( 4 female and 3 male) | 97% | Only one water committee training for new pond by CIFA remains |
<p>| 3. Livestock and milk marketing | | | | | |
| 3.1 Support to 19 (8 new and 11 existing) livestock/milk marketing groups | 18 LMCs supported and business plan prepared( the support includes the following; | Direct beneficiary: 155 households ( 114 male and 41 female) | • 29 LMC/MMC/fattening/ co-op/union received training and technical support | 95% | |
| 3.2 Exposure Visits | During this period two visit conducted by two partner with a progress of 30% | 55 people take part in this visit (47 members of cooperatives (15 | • SoS Sahel conducted a visit to Bushoftu &amp; Chancho milk primary cooperatives and union | 60% | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Activities (Project period)</th>
<th>Achievements during the reporting period</th>
<th>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</th>
<th>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</th>
<th>cumulati ve progress</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • CIFA: Staff exposure visit to Kenya (2 project staff) and 31 cooperative members visit  
• GPDI: 22 cooperative members from 3 LMC visited livestock fattening in Hararga and Mojo  
• AFD and ACORD completed the arrangement to conduct the visit | female), 5 government and three project staffs. | • CIFA: Staff exposure visit to Kenya (2 project staff) and 31 cooperative members visit  
• GPDI: 22 cooperative members from 3 LMC visited livestock fattening in Hararga and Mojo  
• Other partners completed their specific site selection and ToR development | | | |
| 3.3 Provision of Support Facilities (building equipment, seed money) | During this period,  
• seed money support, cooperative/union office construction completed by two partner  
• Cooperatives/union office furniture supported for 3 cooperatives and one union | Direct beneficiary: 325 households (279 female and 46 male) | • 18 LMC/fattening/milk co-op/union receiving support including seed money and So far seed money of 602,532 ET. Birr transferred to cooperatives  
• 60% office/store/sales unit completed  
• T60% coops supported with furniture | 90% | Seed money transfer for two LMC (ACORD)  
Livestock holding facility 50 and 30% (AFD)  
Office construction and furniture support |
| 3.4 Livestock Fattening | • Purchase of 12 bulls and crop residue for 2 cattle fattening group established in earlier period (By ACORD0 | • The two cattle fattening groups has got 49 members (10 female)  
• Three LMC has got a member of 84 (3 female) | • To date; 5 cattle fattening group organized, supported with different inputs like seed money for the purchase of bulls, feed, water equipment and donkey cart and three of them has sold out their first well fatten animals and get reasonable profit. | 95% | |
| 3.5 Awareness Raising on Commercial destocking | Awareness rising continue using different forums like community meeting and other traditional gatherings. During this period only;  
• Leadership training for cooperative leaders (26 member/11 female)  
• Business development training (70 member/32 female) | Direct beneficiary: 231 households who received training on leadership and business development | This is on-going activity done with all livestock cooperatives and fattening groups either through formal training and/or informal accompaniment and information sharing | 100% | |
<p>| 3.6 Animal Feed | During this reporting period, GPDI | 285 members of milk marketing | • 509.25 qt of feed and 109 qt of concentrated | 100% | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Activities (Project period)</th>
<th>Achievements during the reporting period</th>
<th>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</th>
<th>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</th>
<th>cumulative progress</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has purchased crop residue and concentrate for cattle fattening groups</td>
<td>cooperatives</td>
<td>feed distributed for 285 members of milk marketing cooperatives during the peak dry season. 109qt of concentrated feed and 3 truck of crop residue purchased and distributed by GPDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The value chain reports of the bulls, goats and camels are completed</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Value chain accompaniment planned for November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2. Asset Poor Community members are empowered to diversify their livelihoods and generate increased income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Income generation and diversification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Support 37 (18 new and 19 existing) natural resource producer and Income generating groups</td>
<td>15 SACCOs, 1 scented wood and 1 gum and Incense were supported during this reporting period by four implementing partner Vouchers &amp; working documents for SACCOs &amp; 1 scent wood group have been printed, purchased &amp; disseminated.</td>
<td>Direct beneficiary: 337 household( 346 female and 293 male)</td>
<td>To date 22 SACCOs, 2 new NRC and 4 existing NRC and 1 salt producing cooperatives were supported</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Exposure Visits</td>
<td>AFD: 41 SACCOs member( 21 female) visited successful groups in Moyale Woreda</td>
<td>Direct Beneficiary: 41 SACCOs member (21 female)</td>
<td>AFD facilitated exposure visit for 41 members to Moyale area ToR and sites are selected by each of the implementing NGOs</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>ACORD Visit remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Provision of Support Facilities (building equipment, seed money)</td>
<td>During this reporting period; seed money of 120,000 Et Birr by ACORD for 4 IGAs, construction of office and furniture support given for NTFP cooperatives and SACCOs 9 SACCOs received seed money of Birr 360, 000.00 by SOS Sahel 105 modern beehives of Germany Model including its accessories were purchased and distributed</td>
<td>Direct beneficiary: 700 household( 466 female and 129 male)</td>
<td>22 SACCOs &amp; 5 Natural Product Cooperatives supported &amp; So far seed money transferred NTFP = 230,000 Et Birr SACCOs = 596,000 Et Birr IGAs = 210,000 Et Birr 105 modern beehives of Germany Model including its accessories were purchased and distributed for the two beekeeping cooperatives</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3 Gum &amp; Incense, 2 scented wood, 1 soap making, 1 salt making, 2 beekeeping and 22 SACCOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| g |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Activities (Project period)</th>
<th>Achievements during the reporting period</th>
<th>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</th>
<th>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</th>
<th>cumulative progress</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Bio-Enterprise Centre (Yabello Depot) Construction and Equipment</td>
<td>for the two beekeeping cooperatives and Technical training was also given for 35 cooperative members.</td>
<td>Not yet started serving the community</td>
<td>The centre is completed and furniture is being purchased.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>only furniture purchase remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Bio-Enterprise centre business development &amp; feasibility studies</td>
<td>During this reporting period, the bio enterprise management study conducted jointly by two consultant and the report is presented and submitted for partners</td>
<td>Not yet started serving the community</td>
<td>The study completed, and report presented and submitted to SOS Sahel and Trócaire.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Only distribution for all partner remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Skills Development for ex-pastoralists youth/women</td>
<td>27 ex-pastoralists (all male</td>
<td>• 27 male ex-pastoralists are engaged as skilled labour on different construction and getting their livelihood from this acquired skill. • Different equipment purchased as a start up tool given to the trained ex-pastoralist.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Ex-pastoralist trained on block laying, plumbing, masonry etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Asset Creation</td>
<td>• Restocking of 595 goats was conducted for 119 HHs. (260 goats were provided for 52 HHs found at Golocha PA and 335 goats for 67 HHs found at Dhokole PAs.) • The vendors of the goats are those LMCs that the project supported based on the agreement reached • 5 goat per household</td>
<td>Direct beneficiary: 119</td>
<td>• To date, 595 goats purchased and distributed to 119 households in two Pas with five goats for one HH</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>All the arrangement for the purchase were made with LMC, the remaining balance will be handle in November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Studies</td>
<td>Bio enterprise centre management study completed in this period</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The value chain reports of the aloe Vera/incense &amp; gums completed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 3 Local Institutions, traditional leaders and local government are effectively governing and managing pastoralist food security and livelihoods.

1. Stakeholder Networking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Activities (Project period)</th>
<th>Achievements during the reporting period</th>
<th>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</th>
<th>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</th>
<th>cumulative progress</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 PA Level Meetings</td>
<td>23 PA level meetings were conducted by four partners during this reporting period</td>
<td>Direct beneficiary: 2016 members (944 female)</td>
<td>99 meetings conducted at PA level</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Woreda Level Meetings</td>
<td>7 meetings were conducted at woreda level by four partners</td>
<td>Direct beneficiary: 147 members (99 female and 48 male)</td>
<td>26 woreda level meetings were conducted so far since inception</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Zonal Level (review and reflection/steering Committee) Meetings</td>
<td>Final zonal stakeholders meeting conducted in is reporting period in Yabello in the presence of government, community and project staffs</td>
<td>42 people attended meeting (10 female) community members, Geda leaders, government staffs and project staffs</td>
<td>Three zonal level steering committee meetings facilitated by SOS Sahel, GPDI and AFD</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.4 Zonal Multi-Stakeholder forum for Livestock and dairy products promotion | 10 pastoral woreda forum members were attended, 86 people (11 female) | • Two zonal multi-stakeholder forum for livestock and dairy products promotion  
• The 3rd meeting of LiDS Forum WAS conducted by SoS-Sahel so as discuss on promotional activity done by working groups on goat and milk value chain and to share best practise | 80% |        |

### 2. Institutional capacity building

#### 2.1 Organisational capacity assessment and implementation of recommendations

- SOS Sahel and ACORD complete implementation of recommendation as per the report like 2 computers, 3 cabinets, 1 printer were purchased & distributed while 4 GPS, 1 computer & 2 printers are on purchasing process. 1 training on Environmental conservation & protection was provided
- CIFA and GPDI started the implantation based on the study report
- It vary with the type of selected partner  
  - SOS Sahel: pastoral development office and cooperative office for office supplies but 33 participant from GO for trainings  
  - GPDI select customer institutions and 22 people attended the capacity building  
- Two partners complete the assessment and implementation of the recommendation while other two’s are on the process of completing the recommendation based on the study report.  
  - 70% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Activities (Project period)</th>
<th>Achievements during the reporting period</th>
<th>Actual Number of Beneficiaries (Male/Female)</th>
<th>Cumulative achievements since the start of the project</th>
<th>cumulative progress</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Revitalising customary institutions for effective rangeland management (linked to community dialogue activity in 1.1)</td>
<td>People attended the meeting 240(95 female)</td>
<td>GPDI used the findings of the assessment and integrated the activities into their normal monthly meetings.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOS Sahel supported meetings in four PA in Yabello where traditional leaders, government and community discussed key issues including inappropriate land use, management etc resulting in key decisions being made and currently being implemented including voluntary resettlement and re-zoning of land according to traditional practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACORD provided leadership training to key persons to enable them to better understand their responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Technical training on natural resource management</td>
<td>Number of people trained by two partner organization so far 65 people(42 female)</td>
<td>GPDI trained 20 and SoS trained 45 on natural resources management( range land management)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Support regular dissemination of livestock market information to community</td>
<td>This activity is not done in isolation but as part of the wider process of strengthening the livestock cooperatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Capacity building on development partnership</td>
<td>This is an on-going cross-cutting issue for all partners that follows a accompaniment model</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 HIV and Aids Training</td>
<td>CIFA conducted HIV and AIDS training for 31 participant from government office(7 female)</td>
<td>HIV and AIDS mainstreaming training was provided by Trocaire’s Senior HIV and Gender Programme Officer to staff members of the implementing partner organisations.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DRR Approach</td>
<td>A total of 6 CMDRR committee meetings were conducted during this reporting period by ACORD(32 people attended)</td>
<td>All partners are integrating DRR into their on-going project activities including with rangeland, water and cooperatives. To date 32 CMDRR committee meetings were</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Progress in achieving objectives/ results achieved/
This is taken from the third quarter report of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.N</th>
<th>Purpose/Specific objective:</th>
<th>Project purpose indicators</th>
<th>Progress of indicators to date</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased production and marketing of livestock and livestock products.</td>
<td>1. 30% increase in income from livestock and livestock by-products reported by beneficiaries; 2. 50% of IGA beneficiaries accessing new markets</td>
<td>Even though it is difficult to measure those indicators, here are few proxy indicators; 1. Few Livestock marketing and cattle fattening groups sell their livestock, get profit and made dividend distribution for their members. 1.1 SACCOs mobilize their own capital through saving and share capital and they start small business. 1.2 Milk cooperatives were engaged in alternative market access like sugar and vegetable oil selling.</td>
<td>The drought means that it is highly unlikely that we will fully achieve these objectives within the time frame of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asset-poor community members are empowered to diversify their livelihoods and generate increased income.</td>
<td>1. 30% increase in income from non-livestock sources reported by beneficiaries; 2. 40% of target beneficiary households food secure all year round</td>
<td>Even though it is difficult to measure those indicators, here are few proxy indicators; 1. As per the monitoring report from field, increase in income is reported from non-livestock cooperatives. 2. As per the report from AFD, from the total number of cooperatives, 255 who get the first round loan are accessing food better than the previous year.</td>
<td>The drought means that it is highly unlikely that we will fully achieve these objectives within the time frame of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local institutions, traditional leaders and local government are effectively governing and managing pastoralist food security and livelihoods.</td>
<td>1. Plans developed by local government effectively address pastoralist livelihoods issues 2. At least 99 PA level, 26 Woreda level and 3 Zonal Level Meetings organised by</td>
<td>1. Not yet available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Project output (I): Increased and better quality community-managed sustainable grazing land.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output indicators</th>
<th>Output indicators</th>
<th>Project output (II) Improved and sustainable access to community-managed water resources for human and livestock consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 25% increase in hectares of rangeland available; 2. functioning traditional structure playing regulatory role; 3. conflicts over natural resources are reduced</td>
<td>1. There is 25% increase of rangeland from the base line since the inception of this project. (a net increase of 4399.95 hectares) 2. Functional traditional structures are playing regulatory roles to ensure suitability by conducting regular meetings 3. During this reporting period, conflict has decreased in the area because of relative small rains and decrease in migration of large number of livestock from Kenya and other woreda to Yabelo and Arero Woreda.</td>
<td>1. To date 29 water schemes were completed and all are functional. 2. So far no clean water provisions but 10,300 households and at least 80,600 cattle’s get access to water rehabilitated or constructed by this project. 3. All water sites have a functional community based management system in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Project output (II): Increased food and income from the production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output indicators</th>
<th>Output indicators</th>
<th>Project output (IV): Increased income from the production of high quality non-livestock products to facilitate improved household access to food.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. targeted livestock producers have a 30% increase in income from livestock and livestock products; 2. 20% increase in milk supplied to the market by targeted households 3. decreasing trend in beneficiary households needing relief assistance</td>
<td>Due to prolonged period of drought this is not yet materialized. Due to severe drought, no milk supplied to the market during this reporting period.</td>
<td>1. 26 community groups/cooperatives are engaged in the production of non-livestock products. 2. Not yet available 3. there is an increasing trend due to the drought 4. Not yet available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Project output (III): Increased food and income from the production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output indicators</th>
<th>Output indicators</th>
<th>Project output (IV): Increased income from the production of high quality non-livestock products to facilitate improved household access to food.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 30 water schemes operational; 2. 9608 households accessing clean water; 3. sustainable community-based water management system in place for each water point</td>
<td>1. 26 community groups/cooperatives are engaged in the production of non-livestock products. 2. Not yet available 3. there is an increasing trend due to the drought 4. Not yet available</td>
<td>1. 26 community groups/cooperatives are engaged in the production of non-livestock products. 2. Not yet available 3. there is an increasing trend due to the drought 4. Not yet available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rangeland is defined as the amount of Kallo per target PA.  
- The consortium defined functionality as meeting on a regular basis; traditional leaders are members of the committee and decisions of committee being respected.

- The occurrence of drought affects the achievement of this output.

- The indicators need to be assessed over the period of the project as they require comparisons to be made to previous years at various points in the year.
**Project output (III):** A strong functioning partnership between traditional structures and local government which addresses pastoralist issues in food security planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regular Meetings with government, leaders of the traditional institutions and community at PA, woreda and Zone level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At least one pastoral issue is raised by community at Zonal Level Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. To date 99 Meetings were held at PA level and 26 meetings at woreda level and five at zone level meetings were conducted which is 3 project steering committees meeting & two Zonal multi-sectoral meetings |
| 2. Continue dialogue at community and woreda level on sustainability issues or on how the ownership of the project ensured by the community. The main agenda of the meeting were natural resources management and the roles of customary institution on natural resources management. |

It is highly unlikely that the project will influence policy which is largely done at regional and federal level but it may be able to influence how it is implemented and the ability of the community to engage with the policies.

---

**Project output (II):** Risk is integrated into the project components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At least 50% of cooperatives will integrate risk into their business plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At least 70% of rangeland committees have by-laws that consider drought risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At least 70% of water committees have by-laws that consider drought risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. 46% of the cooperatives established have integrated risk in to their business plan. |
| 2. 90% of rangeland committees have by-laws that consider drought risk. |
| 3. 90% of water committees have by-laws that consider risk. |

- Community decided communal enclosures to be used only during the time of feed shortage, decided kallo to be used by lactating caws and calves and have strong management committee
- The community decided pond water only used during the dry period, limit the number and type of livestock should access it so as it would serve for at least 3 months
5. TOR of the Assignment

TERMS OF REFERENCE for Final Evaluation
(tentative schedule for the evaluation exercise: November 18-December 20, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Building Resilient Pastoralist Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Funded by the EU under the Food Facility – Call for Proposals ref: DCI-FOOD/128608/2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location Regions/zones/woredas</td>
<td>Oromia Region, Borana Zone, eight low land woredas of Borena namely; Arero, Yabello, Dire, Dhas, Miyo, Dillo, Moyale and Teltele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing NGO</td>
<td>The Joint Ethiopia Programme of Trócaire, CAFOD and SCIAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Partners</td>
<td>Action for Development (AFD); Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD); Community Initiatives, Facilitation and Assistance (CIFA); Cordaid; Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative (GPDI); SOS Sahel Ethiopia and in association with the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERMS OF REFERENCE for Final Evaluation

Title: Building Resilient Pastoralist Communities

1. Background

1.1 The EU Food Facility Instrument

In December 2008, the European Parliament and the Council has adopted a Regulation for the Food Facility financing instrument to support supplementary measures that address rapidly the negative effects of the volatile food prices situation in developing countries. An overall plan for the implementation of the Food Facility has been adopted by the European Commission on 30 March 2009. On the basis of the indicative criteria: exceptional crisis situations, appropriateness for Food Facility measures, etc., 50 developing countries including Ethiopia have been identified to receive assistance from the total € 1 billion global allocation. The primary objectives of the assistance under the EU Food Facility are to: encourage a positive supply response from the agricultural sector in the target countries; support activities to respond rapidly and directly to mitigate the negative effects of volatile food prices on local populations; strengthen the productive capacities and governance of the agricultural sector. The priority measures are: improve access to agricultural inputs and services; Safety net measures; other small-scale measures aiming at increasing production based on country needs: micro-credit, investment, equipment, infrastructure and storage; as well as vocational training and support to
professional groups in the agricultural sector. A call for proposal was launched during May to September 2009 under the EC Food Facility – CfP - EuropeAid/128608/C/ACT/Multi with a global allocation of € 200 million for 35 countries including Ethiopia. For Ethiopia total of 13 proposals has been accepted and grant contract signed with 13 implementing NGOs during November/December 2009 for total budget of €21,972,643 (EC contribution €19,595,390 and €2,377,253 from the 13 NGOs).

1.2 Background on the project

The Joint Ethiopia Programme of Trócaire, CAFOD and SCIAF is implementing a three-year Sustainable Livelihoods Programme with an overall goal to contribute to the attainment of food security and well being of all Ethiopians in a manner that enables the sustainable management of natural resources for the benefit of all men and women.

As part of the Sustainable Livelihoods Programme, Trócaire secured funding from the EC Food Facility budget line for a project entitled "Building Resilient Pastoralist Communities (BRPC)". The BRPC project is being jointly implemented by Trócaire/CAFOD/SCIAF in consortium with: Action for Development (AFD); Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development (ACORD); Community Initiatives, Facilitation and Assistance (CIFA); Cordaid; Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative (GPDI); SOS Sahel Ethiopia and in association with the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI).

The project is being implemented in eight woredas namely; Arero, Yabello, Dire, Dhas, Miyo, Dillo, Moyale and Teltele (of Borana Zone, Oromia Region, with a total budget of €2,495,923 co-financed by the European Union (90%), Trócaire (7%) and Cordaid (3%). Trócaire, as a lead agency in the consortium, has signed the grant contract with the European Commission, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with all consortium members from February 23 - 24, 2010, and the implementation agreement with the Regional Government authorities in May 16, 2010. Project implementation duration is for 22 months from 1st March 2010 to December 31, 2011. The project is expected to directly benefit 102,694 people, including livestock producers, asset-poor households with productive potential, and decision makers on food security planning. The overall objective of the project is that pastoralist communities in Borana Zone develop increased productive and income generating capacity which reduces their vulnerability to volatile food prices.

The specific objectives of the project are:

1. Increased production and marketing of livestock and livestock products.
2. Asset-poor community members are empowered to diversify their livelihoods and generate increased income.
3. Local institutions, traditional leaders and local government are effectively governing and managing pastoralist food security and livelihoods.

The project has six expected results:

4. Increased and better quality community managed sustainable grazing lands
5. Improved and sustainable access to community-managed water resources for human and livestock consumption.
6. Increased food and income from the production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products.
7. Increased income from the production of high quality non-livestock products to facilitate improved household access to food.
8. A strong and functioning partnership between traditional structures and local government which addresses pastoralist issues in food security planning.
9. Risk is integrated into the project components.

Implementation of the project began on 1 January 2010 following the signing of the project contract between the EU and Trócaire in December 2009. A contract rider (#1) was agreed with the EC in March 2011, which allowed a budget amendment, some minor revisions to the project log frame and an extension of the project until 22 October 2011. A second contract rider (#2) was agreed with the EC in October 2011, which allowed a budget amendment and a further extension of the project until 22 December 2011.

Planning workshop with stakeholders held on for two days from February 23 – 24, 2010.
The project has received a number of monitoring missions as follows: a Joint Results Oriented Monitoring (J-ROM) Mission in July 2010; an External Results Oriented Monitoring (E-ROM) Mission in September 2010; the European Court of Auditors in November 2010. In January 2011, Trócaire, on behalf of the consortium, commissioned an independent mid-term evaluation of the project. The recommendations of the evaluation were incorporated into the first contract rider. A summary of the recommendations of the J-ROM, E-ROM and mid-term evaluation is annexed to this document.

As the project is due to end on 22 December 2011, Trócaire and the consortium would like to conduct a final evaluation of the project by an independent consultant.

2. Evaluation Objectives

The overall objective of the final evaluation is to make an overall independent assessment of the project performance, paying particular attention to the impact of the project actions against its objectives. It is also to identify key lessons and to propose practical recommendations for follow-up and future similar actions.

Specifically, the final evaluation will have the following specific objectives:

- Review the Relevance of the project and its approaches in the context of the development need and potential of the intervention areas;
- Verify the Efficiency and Effectiveness of the results achieved and trace the changes observed in the lives of the target beneficiaries, as a result;
- Critically examine the continuing validity of the assumptions on which the project’s likely Impact was based
- Analyse Sustainability of the project initiatives from the point of view of local stakeholders including target beneficiaries participation, institutional arrangements, compatibility of project objectives and target community need, etc
- Assess level of the intended synergies/integration/complementarities as well as the coordination of the project interventions with other on-going similar FS initiatives including the PSNP implemented in the respective project intervention woredas by both the government and other actors.
- Draw lessons and give respective recommendations having strategic significance for improvement in future similar actions.

3. Issues to be Analyzed/ Studied

The evaluation study shall verify, analyse and assess in detail the issues and questions outlined below (3.1-3.8) referring to the five evaluation criteria endorsed by the OECD-DAC (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact), and to the EC-specific evaluation criteria (EC added value and coherence). It is also required to verify, analyse and assess the integration, complementarities and impact of cross cutting issue within the project interventions. The consultants are required to use their professional judgement and experiences to review all relevant factors including the realization of the recommendations forwarded by the MTE, and to bring these to the attention of the management of the implementing NGO and the Delegation of the European Union to Ethiopia.

3.1 Relevance

The analysis of relevance will focus on issues related to the design of the project:

The extent to which the project has been consistent with, and supportive of, the policy and programme framework within which the project is placed, the EC and partners strategic plans, the relevant GoE - Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) and/or regional short and long-term strategic plans;

- The extent to which the objectives of the project are consistent with the target beneficiaries’ needs/priorities. To what extent is the project design consistent with the local situation and coherence with on going initiatives?
- The quality of the problem analysis and the project’s intervention logic and logical framework matrix, appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators; analysis of assumptions and risks;
- The degree of flexibility/adaptability to facilitate responses to changes in circumstances;
• The stakeholder participation in the design and in the planning, management/implementation/monitoring of the project, the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity;
• Clarity and appropriateness of project implementation arrangements and structures;
• The realism in the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and admin resources)
• The appropriateness of the recommended monitoring and evaluation arrangements ;
• The extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed;

3.2 Efficiency

The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results/outputs, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned.

The assessment of Efficiency will therefore focus on such issues as:

• Availability and of means/inputs provided or available on time and at planned cost to implement activities as well as monitored regularly to allow cost-effective implementation of activities.
• To what extents are activities implemented as scheduled, and to what extent they are implemented at planned or below planned cost?
• How regularly and well are activities monitored by the project and corrective measures applied as necessary? Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
• Are the inter-institutional structures adequate to allow for efficient project monitoring and implementation, and are all partners been able to provide their contributions to the project, and are there good relations between the project management and with existing partner institutions?
• Extent to which the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions.
• The quality of day-to-day management, for example in: operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs), budget management (cost control); management of personnel, information, property, etc,
• Relations/coordination with local authorities, target beneficiary community institutions, other relevant actors such as NGOs operating in the respective intervention woredas, etc;
• The quality of information management and reporting, and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project implementation progress (including target beneficiaries/target groups); respect for deadlines as per the action plans for implementation;

3.3 Effectiveness

The effectiveness criterion, concerns how far the project’s results were attained, and the project’s specific objective(s) achieved, or are expected to be achieved. The analysis of Effectiveness will therefore focus on such issues as:

• The extent that the project achieved results in terms of defined project OVIs and/or aggregated key Food Facility interventions result indicators including: Crop production yield increase per unit area (Qt/ha); Percentage reduction in staple food crop price volatility; Percentage increase in livestock production & productivity (livestock access to water, vet service, livestock feed/pasture availability, and livestock Terms of Trade);
• Increase in average HH income of targeted beneficiaries; % reduction in number of food aid beneficiaries in targeted areas and/or contribution to PSNP beneficiaries graduation process;
• Level of capacity improvement of local governments and farmers’ cooperatives/unions and community based institutions.
• Whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received, as perceived by all key stakeholders (including women and men and specific vulnerable groups);
• Satisfaction of the beneficiaries and local government stakeholders in terms of timely availability and quality of project inputs (materials, finance, and human resources); quality of results (respect for standards);
• The extent that project results/outputs used by beneficiaries;
• If the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the results would achieve the purpose; etc.;
• Whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate,
• How unintended results have affected the benefits received positively or negatively and could have been foreseen and managed;
• Whether any shortcomings were observed due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation;

3.4 Impacts

At impact level the final evaluation will make an analysis of the following aspects:

• Extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved as intended in particular the project planned overall objective.
• What significant changes can be observed and attributed to the project?
• Whether the effects of the project have contributed to the food security situation and in general poverty reduction in the respective intervention woredas/zones/region and also made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, etc;
• The likelihood of the assumptions at project purpose level realised, and the extent that project impact jeopardised by external factors?
• Evidences of innovative ideas, behaviour or action amongst the target beneficiary group, and examples of government replicating and/or scaling up project initiatives?
• The extent that the project enhanced the role of the communities in local socio-economic development?
• Any unexpected result arising from this project, and any ways of reducing the impact of any undesirable results?

3.5 Sustainability

The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after the project. The final evaluation will make an assessment of the prospects for the sustainability of benefits on basis of the following issues:

a) Policy support - how far the national, regional strategies and priorities are affecting project results positively or adversely; and level of support expected from local government and other actors;

b) Institutional capacity - the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures; if it involved creating a new institution (cooperatives, etc), how far good relations with existing institutions have been established; whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?); whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;

c) Socio-cultural factors - whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits; whether it respects local power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others; how well it is based on an analysis of such factors; and the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities.

d) Financial sustainability - whether the products or services being provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and are likely to remain so after funding will end; and economic sustainability, i.e. how well do the benefits (returns) compare to those on similar undertakings once market distortions are eliminated. The adequacy of the project budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;

e) Technical (technology) issues - whether (i) the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge; (ii) alternative technologies are being considered, where possible; and (iii) the degree in which the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance.

3.6 Mutual reinforcement (coherence)
• To what extent is the project complementary to the country’s policies and other actors/donors’ similar interventions?
• Considering other related activities undertaken by Government or other donors/actors, the likelihood that results and impacts will mutually reinforce or duplicate or conflict one another; and contribute to (or contradict) the regional/national policies, approaches and strategies;

9.7 Cross-cutting issues and innovation
• What measures have been taken to ‘mainstream’ gender and HIV/AIDS in the project and to what extent have women and vulnerable groups been involved in decision making and control over resources?
• What measures have been taken to ensure environmental considerations are central to the project and to what extent have they been successful?
• To what extent have the innovative aspects of the project been fulfilled?

3.8 EU value added

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

3.9 Visibility

The consultants will make an assessment of the project’s strategy planning and on-going activities in the field of visibility, information and communication, the results obtained and the impact achieved with these actions. For details refer to the EU visibility standard guideline http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.htm. Further guidance on evaluation questions is available on the EU website: http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/europeaid/activities/evaluation/sec_en.htm

4. Methodology

Once the external evaluation team has been recruited and contractually engaged, the evaluation process will be carried out through three phases: a Desk Phase, a Field Phase and a Synthesis Phase.

a) Desk Phase – Inception

In the inception stage, the relevant programming documents (Special condition, General conditions, description of activities and all annexes — LFM, Budget of the action.), the implementation agreement with regional authorities, MoU with the respective intervention woredas/zones, the MoU for partnership agreement between the leading and implementing partner NGOs, etc should be reviewed, as well as documents shaping the wider strategy/policy framework such as the GoE/GTP, etc.

The evaluation team will then analyse the logical framework [as set up at the beginning of the project/programme cycle] or [as reconstructed by the project/programme manager retrospectively]. It should also cover implementation progress reports (quarterly and annual interim and final implementation), and other reports including internal monitoring reports and external EU JROM/ROM, Mid Term Evaluation, etc.

On the basis of the information collected the consultant should:

• Comment on the issues/evaluation questions suggested (see section3) or, when relevant, propose an alternative or complementary set of evaluation questions justifying their relevance. Develop the evaluation into sub-questions identify provisional indicators and their verification means, and describe the analysis strategy.
• Present an indicative methodology to the overall assessment of the project/programme Identify and present the list of tools to be applied in the Field phase exercise;
• List all preparatory steps already taken for the Field phase exercise
• Propose the work plan for the finalisation of the first - inception phase.
• At the end of the desk assessment an inception report shall be prepared and discussed with the implementing NGO management and the EU Delegation/RDFS section.

b) Field exercise phase
The Field exercise phase should start upon approval of the inception Phase report by the project/the contracting authority – the implementing NGO management. The consultant should:

- Submit its detailed work plan with indicative checklists/surveys to be undertaken, dates of visit, and itinerary. This plan has to be applied in a way that is flexible enough to accommodate for any last-minute difficulties in the field. If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation exercise, these should be immediately discussed with the management of the contracting NGO/the implementing NGO.
- Hold a briefing meeting with the project/contracting authority management, and the EU Delegation - Rural Development and Food Security Section before travelling to the project intervention areas/the field phase exercise;
- Hold briefing/debriefing meetings with all project stakeholders (the project field team, partner implementing NGOs; local government partners at regional/zonal/woreda levels, other implementing partners and the beneficiary communities institutions as well as other actors: NGOs, etc implementing similar actions in the respective intervention woredas;
- Field visits (direct observations) to project activity kebeles/sites including focus group discussions and participatory assessment with the targeted beneficiaries, project field staff, Regional/zonal/woreda government partner bureaus/sector offices,
- The evaluation expected to cover 75% of this project operational woreda and 75% of this project major intervention areas like range land improvement, water supply, livestock and non-livestock cooperative ,stakeholders networking and partner capacity building etc. in different ways possible
- Collection of quantitative data using structured questionnaires designed on the basis of key result indicators defined in section 3.2
- Summarise the findings of the field exercise, discuss the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present and verify preliminary findings in a debriefing meeting with the project field management, the concerned local partners, etc and the contracting authority – the implementing NGO country office and the EU Delegation to Ethiopia/RDFS section.

  c) **Synthesis phase**
This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the draft final report. The consultant will make sure that the assessments are objective and balanced, affirmations accurate and verifiable, and recommendations realistic. If the project management considers the draft report of sufficient quality base on the assessment grid annexed to this ToR, it will circulate the draft report for comments to the EU Delegation and others concerned, and if necessary convene a meeting in the presence of the consultant.

On the basis of comments received by the project management/the contracting authority – the implementing NGO, and the EU Delegation, the consultant has to amend and revise the draft report accordingly. Comments requesting methodological quality improvements as per the agreed inception report should be taken into account, except where there is a demonstrated impossibility, in which case full justification should be provided by the consultant. Comments on the substance of the report may be either accepted or rejected based on the assessment grid (annexed) to be completed by the project management and the EU Delegation/RDFS/Task Manager of the project.

  d) **Stakeholders' workshop**
The consultant has to present the findings and recommendations of the evaluation exercise at a one-day workshop for all stakeholders (the NGO country office team, the project management team, the implementing partners, the representative government partners at both woreda, zonal and regional levels, representatives of the target beneficiary communities, the EU Delegation to Ethiopia and other actors: NGOs, etc implementing similar initiatives in the intervention areas). The purpose of the workshop is to jointly review and analyze and reach to consensus on the factual basis of the findings and recommendations of the evaluation exercise and agree on the way forward in case of necessary follow-up actions.

On the basis of comments and suggestions made by participants of the workshop, the consultant has to write the final version of the evaluation report. The consultant should submit the Final evaluation report as per standard presentation
with complete statements for the findings and relevant recommendations with the way forward for action with respect to the implementing NGO and its partners, the concerned government partner sector offices at woreda/zonal and regional levels, etc.

5. Evaluation Team Composition

The Final Evaluation will be participatory, involving as much as possible the relevant experts from the concerned regional government partner bureaus (BoFED, BoARD, Pastoral Commission, etc) to participate mainly during the field exercise, and also the relevant experts from the project field team and the respective woreda sector office to join the project activity site visits. Such joint exercise would help to clarify/provide explanation on the spot by the project team and from the side of the key implementing partners particularly in case of critical issues arise during the project activity site visits.

- The composition of the team of experts should be balanced to enable complete coverage of the different aspects of project evaluation including for cross-cutting issues. The local consultant (team leader – (if necessary include/add specialist as member):
  - Should have a University Degree in Agricultural/Development Economist and related discipline with minimum 10 years experience – with good consultancy reputation in similar areas of interest.
  - S/he is expected to have an experience in planning, implementation and review/evaluation community based integrated Agricultural/rural development projects/programs.
  - S/he should be well acquainted with cross cutting issues such as gender, environment;
  - S/he should be analytical and also need to have outstanding skill of writing reports.

6. Assignment Duration

The final evaluation consultancy assignment will take from November 18, 2011 to December 20, 2011 for 32 days including for preparation and submission of the final report, and scheduled to begin on November 18, 2011 with the following indicative breakdown

1.1 Inception phase
Documents review and briefing in A.A with implementing NGO and the EU Delegation; and submission of inception report November 18-20, 2011 for 3 days.

1.2 Field phase
Project sites visits, briefing/debriefing – evaluation workshop November 21, 2011 to December 14, 2011 for 23 days (There is a possibility of extending this with 2-3 days based on the coverage of intervention kebeles in respective woreda)

6.3 Synthesis Phase
Debriefing with implementing NGO and EU Delegation, preparation, and submission of the first draft and final draft evaluation report December 14, 2011 to December 20 for 6 days Total maximum days 32 days (This should be adjusted as per the above amendments)

7. Expected Outputs

Assessment and report of the project implementation in terms of meeting its purpose (building on the existing quarterly/annual progress and monitoring reports) and an understanding of constraints and opportunities faced during implementation.

Report on how the projects inputs (financial, human, management) have been utilised.

Project implementation effectiveness in terms of co-ordination, integration and complementarities of the project interventions with the respective intervention woreda on-going similar initiatives including PSNP, the Gov/other donors/NGOs, etc FS/agricultural development programs.

The final product/the evaluation draft report is expected to be delivered within 10 to 15 days of the conclusion of the field work and the workshop with all stakeholders.
8. Reporting Requirements

The Final Evaluation reports must match quality standards. The text of the report should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables, photos, etc. The consultant will submit the following reports in English language:

8.1 Inception report of maximum 12 pages to be produced after [indicate days] from the start of the consultant services. In the report the consultant shall describe the first finding of the study, the foreseen degree of difficulties in collecting data, others encountered and/or foreseen difficulties in addition to his programme of work and staff mobilization.

8.2 Draft final report (of maximum 50 pages – 3 hardcopies with electronic copy) using the structure set out under 8.4 below and taking due account of comments received from the reference group members. Besides answering the evaluation questions, the draft final report should also synthesise all findings and conclusions into an overall assessment of the project/programme. Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

8.3 Final report with the same specifications as mentioned under 8.2 above, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report, to be presented within [number] days of the receipt of these comments. Comments by the implementing NGO and EU Delegation shall be forwarded to the consultant within 8 days of submission of the draft report.

8.4 Structure of the presentation of Final Report:

8.4.1 Cover page:
- The name/logo of the implementing NGO/NGOs and the EU;
- The title of the evaluation, project Title/reference nr/ co-funded by the EU.
- Cover page of the report shall carry the following text: “this evaluation is supported and guided by (the ….name of NGO) and funded by the EU; presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the (name of the NGO) or EU”

8.4.2 Main sections of the evaluation report:

Executive Summary

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus mainly on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points related to Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows.

Introduction

A brief description of the relevant situations in the intervention locations, the project design, the funding sources, partners, etc, and about the evaluation providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

Overall assessment

A chapter synthesising all answers to evaluation questions into an overall assessment of the project/programme. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading.

Conclusions and Recommendations
This chapter introduces the conclusions relative to each question. The conclusions should be organised in clusters in the chapter in order to provide an overview of the assessed subject. It should features references to the findings (responses to the evaluation questions) or to annexes showing how the conclusions derive from data, interpretations, and analysis and judgement criteria.

A self-assessment of the methodological limits that may restrain the range or use of certain conclusions.

The conclusion chapter features not only the successes observed but also the issues requiring further thought on modifications or a different course of action.

A paragraph or sub-chapter should pick up the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive. This practice allows better communicating the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission. If possible, the evaluation report identifies one or more transferable lessons, which are highlighted in the executive summary.

The recommendations must be related to the conclusions without replicating them. A recommendation derives directly from one or more conclusions. It should be in line with the findings (listed in order of importance) and who is responsible for the proposed action. The recommendations should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible;

They could concern policy, organisational and operational aspects for both the national implementing partners and for the EU; and general issues arising from the evaluation in relation to, for example, policies, technologies, instruments, institutional development, and regional, national or sectoral strategies.

**Annexes to the report**

The report should include the following annexes:

- ToR of the evaluation, detailed evaluation method including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations.
- Tools/formats/questionnaire/checklists used for data collection and analyses;
- The names of the evaluators and their companies (very brief CV's – max 1 page);
- List of persons/organisations consulted;
- Literature and documentation consulted;
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures; case studies);
- Annex to this ToR: Quality assessment grid for evaluation of the quality of the submitted evaluation report by the Consultant.
- Annex I - Quality assessment grid for evaluation of the quality of the submitted evaluation report by the Consultant.
- *This grid is annexed to the ToRs for information to the consultants*

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the management of the implementing NGO and the EU Delegation using the following quality assessment grid where the rates have the following meaning:

1 = unacceptable = criteria mostly not fulfilled or totally absent
2 = weak = criteria partially fulfilled
3 = good = criteria mostly fulfilled
4 = very good = criteria entirely fulfilled
5 = excellent = criteria entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way
Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meeting needs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the report precisely describe what is evaluated, including the intervention logic in the form of a logical framework?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the report clearly cover the requested period of time, as well as the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests. If not, are justifications given?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes stock of the rationale of the project / programme, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reliable data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have the collected data been cross-checked?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sound analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Is the analysis based on the collected data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Is the analysis clearly focused on the most relevant cause-effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Is the context adequately taken into account in the analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Credible findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are the findings derived from the data and analyses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Is the generalisability of findings discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Valid conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the report reach overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Useful recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are recommendations coherent with conclusions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidance for taking action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do the recommendations cater for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Where necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clear report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Is the report well structured and adapted to its various audiences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the 8 previous criteria, what is the overall quality of the report?
6. General Discussion Guideline used for the Evaluation

GENERAL DISCUSSION GUIDELINE

This general discussion guideline will be used for conducting discussions with all informants through contextualizing it at a spot.

2.1 The context (project area, the people, -----)
Collect general information in these regards

3.1 Relevance of the project

- The extent to which the objectives of the project are consistent with the target beneficiaries' needs/priorities.
- Extent of responding to the basic needs and priorities of the target community
- Extent of correctly identification of the target direct and indirect beneficiaries
- To what extent is the project design consistent with the local situation and coherence with ongoing initiatives?
- The extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified have changed;
- The extent to which the project has been consistent with, and supportive of:
  - the policy and programme framework within which the project is placed,
  - the EC and partners strategic plans,
  - the relevant GoE - Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) and/or regional short and long-term strategic plans;
- The quality of the problem analysis and the project's intervention logic and logical framework matrix, appropriateness of the objectively verifiable indicators; analysis of assumptions and risks;
- Clarity and appropriateness of project implementation arrangements and structures;

3.2 Effectiveness of the project

3.2.1 In terms of activities/components of the project

- Extent of accomplishment of the planned activities and the results achieved according to the project contract
  - Increased and better quality community managed sustainable grazing lands
  - Improved and sustainable access to community-managed water resources for human and livestock consumption.
  - Increased food and income from the production and marketing of livestock and livestock by-products.
    The intended value chain analysis –its translation into intervention strategy
  - Increased income from the production of high quality non-livestock products to facilitate improved household access to food.
  - A strong and functioning partnership between traditional structures and local government which addresses pastoralist issues in food security planning.
  - Integration of risk is into the project components.
  - Crosscutting issues

3.2.2 In terms of other variables/issues

- The extent that the project achieved results in terms of defined project OVIs and/or aggregated key Food Facility interventions result indicators including:
  - Extent of reduction in staple food crop price volatility;
  - Extent of increase in livestock production & productivity (livestock access to water, vet service, livestock feed/pasture availability, and livestock Terms of Trade);
  - Increase in HH income of targeted beneficiaries; % reduction in number of food aid beneficiaries in targeted areas and/or contribution to PSNP beneficiaries graduation process;
  - Level of capacity improvement of:
    - local governments
    - farmers' cooperatives/unions
    - community based institutions.
  - The extent that project results/outputs used by beneficiaries;
• If the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly management has adapted to ensure that the results would achieve the purpose; etc.;
• How unintended results have affected the benefits received positively or negatively and could have been foreseen and managed;
• Whether any shortcomings were observed due to a failure to take account of cross-cutting or overarching issues such as gender, environment and poverty during implementation;
• What measures have been taken to ‘mainstream’ gender and HIV/AIDS in the project
• To what extent have women and vulnerable groups been involved in decision making and control over resources?
• What measures have been taken to ensure that environmental considerations are central to the project and to what extent have they been successful?
• the success of the project in achieving the objectives set out in the project contract and logical framework matrix

3.3 Efficiency of the Implementation

3.3.1 Time

• Whether means/inputs were provided or made available on time
• Timeliness of accomplishment of the planned activities and their timely readiness for the intended purposes
• Extent of timeliness and regularity of monitoring
• To what extents were activities implemented as scheduled?
• Satisfaction of the beneficiaries and local government stakeholders in terms of timely availability
• Its impact on effectiveness of the project

3.3.2 Quality

• The quality of day-to-day management, for example in: operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs), budget management (cost control); management of personnel, information, property, etc,
• Satisfaction of the beneficiaries and local government stakeholders in terms of:
  o quality of project inputs (materials, finance, and human resources);
  o quality of results (respect for standards);
• Its impact on effectiveness of the project

3.3.3 Cost effectiveness

• Judgment of cost-effectiveness of implementation of activities
• To what extents were activities implemented at or below planned cost
• the overall achievement of the project against implementing the activities foreseen in the contract by the available/planned cost
  o reason if there is deviation
• Analyzing the cost of the project and assessing whether this is reasonable in the context and whether the resources have been used as efficiently as possible
• Extent to which the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits whether or not expressed in monetary terms in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking account of contextual differences and eliminating market distortions.
• The realism in the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and admin resources)
• The degree of flexibility/adaptability to facilitate responses to changes in circumstances;

3.3.4 Budget utilization

• Extent of utilization of the planned budget, reasons if there are differences reference to the approved budget and agreed proposal.
• In the account of the two contract riders agreed with the EC

3.4 Mutual reinforcement (coherence)

• To what extent is the project complementary to the country's policies and other actors/donors' similar interventions?
  o Country level, region level, zone and the beneficiary districts
• Considering other related activities undertaken by Government or other donors/actors, the likelihood that results and impacts will mutually reinforce or duplicate or conflict one another; and contribute to (or contradict) the regional/national policies, approaches and strategies;
  o By thematic area (activities and sub activities)
  o By geographic areas of the interventions
• Similar or related activities undertaken in the area by other actors before or during the project, and relation (coherence, complementarities, etc.) with this specific project

3.5 Management and coordination

3.5.1 Of the consortium
• Extent of implementation of the MoU signed between Trócaire and four partners to check the effectiveness of the modality and draw lesson for future learning.
• Key lessons from the implementation and management processes of the project including an analysis of the roles of each partner, Trócaire/CAFOD/SCIAF and the European Union;
• Were the inter-institutional structures adequate to allow for efficient project monitoring and implementation,
  o Were all partners been able to provide their contributions to the project?
  o Were there good relations between the project management and with existing partner institutions?
• How well had the management of the project worked with reference to the structure of:
  o the Project Governance Team
  o the Project Steering Committee
  o the Project Coordination Team
• Extent of effectiveness of the management structure of the project i.e. having a coordination team based in the lead agency office.
• How well did the consortium arrangement worked?
• The coordination structures in place in Borana,
  o the woreda and Zonal meetings, extent of their efficient and effectiveness
  o towards attainment of results.
• technical support provided to the implementing partners by Trócaire and Cordaid

3.5.2 Of the project activities
• Whether the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders was appropriate,
• Relations/coordination with local authorities, target beneficiary community institutions, other relevant actors such as NGOs operating in the respective intervention woredas, etc; ---- and its impact on efficiency
• The quality of information management and reporting,
• the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of project implementation progress (including target beneficiaries/target groups);
• respect for deadlines as per the action plans for implementation- and its impact on efficiency
• Flexibility of the management

3.6 Impacts
• impact of the project on different target groups and how the situation of these groups has changed;
  o institutions
  o groups
  o communities
  o households
  o government offices
  o others
• Assessing the extent to which the impact, if there is one, is due to the project intervention or due to other factors
• What significant changes can be observed and attributed to the project?
• Extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved as intended in particular the project planned overall objective.
• Whether the effects of the project have contributed to the food security situation and in general poverty reduction in the respective intervention woredas
  o Where, how, -----to what extent
If it has made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, etc; how?
Evidences of innovative ideas, behaviour or action amongst the target beneficiary group, and examples of government replicating and/or scaling up project initiatives?
The extent that the project enhanced the role of the communities in local socio-economic development?
Any unexpected result arising from this project, and any ways of reducing the impact of any undesirable results?
The extent that project impact jeopardised by external factors

3.7 Sustainability
- Participation and contribution --- in the design, planning, management/ implementation/monitoring of the project:
  - The community (including women/men, youth/adults)
  - The individual households
  - the beneficiaries (unions, coops, ----)
  - the stakeholder government offices
- Policy support - how far the national, regional strategies and priorities are affecting results of the project positively or adversely;
- Level of support expected, obtained and will be available from local government and other actors;
- Institutional capacity –
  - the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures;
  - if it involved creating a new institution (cooperatives, etc), how far good relations with existing institutions have been established;
  - whether the institution appears likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits after the project ends (is it well-led, with adequate and trained staff, sufficient budget and equipment?);
  - whether counterparts have been properly prepared for taking over, technically, financially and managerially;
  - the level of local ownership, absorption and implementation capacity;
- Socio-cultural factors –
  - whether the project is in tune with local perceptions of needs and of ways of producing and sharing benefits;
  - whether it respects local power-structures, status systems and beliefs, and if it sought to change any of those, how well-accepted are the changes both by the target group and by others;
  - how well it is based on an analysis of such factors;
  - the quality of relations between the external project staff and local communities.
- Financial sustainability –
  - whether the products or services being provided are affordable for the intended beneficiaries and are likely to remain so after funding will end;
  - economic sustainability, i.e. how well do the benefits (returns) compare to those on similar undertakings once market distortions are eliminated.
  - The adequacy of the project budget for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects;
- Technical (technology) issues –
  - Does the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge;
  - Whether alternative technologies were considered, where possible;
  - the degree in which the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology acquired without further assistance.

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

3.9 Visibility
- strategy planning and on-going activities in the field of visibility, information and communication,
- the results obtained and the impact achieved with these actions.

3.10 Monitoring and Evaluation
- How regularly and well are activities monitored by the project
• corrective measures applied as necessary?
• Quality of monitoring: its existence (or not), accuracy and flexibility, and the use made of it; adequacy of baseline information;
  • The appropriateness of the recommended monitoring and evaluation arrangements;
6. SWOT Analysis
  • Internal factors (strengths and weaknesses) of the project
  • External factors (opportunities and threats)
7. Lessons Learned
8. Conclusions and Recommendations

Project Activity Related Discussion Points

2.1 Livestock and livestock products production and marketing
  • major constrains of livestock production and marketing in the area
  • What did the project do to solve water problem?
    • What did the project do to solve feed problem?
    • What did the project do to solve the livestock and livestock byproduct marketing problem?
      • How satisfied are you with the implementation of the project in these regards?
      • Who benefited? Male, female, children?
    • Did the tasks accomplished by the project change performance of the animals
    • Did it improve the return from the animals?
    • What other advantages it provided like in terms of:
      • Easing drudgery
      • Avoiding conflict
      • Resource utilization

2.2 Empowering asset-poor community members to diversify their livelihood and generation of increased income
  • What are the sources of income of the community?
  • How is performance of each and what is the trend?
  • What did the project do in this regard?
  • Who benefited? Male, female, youth----?
  • Were training given on income generation and asset creation? For how long? How the community benefit from it?
  • What are the impacts of the intervention? (Increased income-get example/cases-, increased asset, knowledge, etc)
  • Do you think the results/impacts will be sustainable? Why?

2.3 Local institutions’, traditional leaders’ and local government’s capacity building
  • What type of capacity building supports were given by the project?
  • For what purpose was the knowledge gained used?
  • Was the training relevant? Why?
  • What changes were observed due to the intervention?

2.4 Overall performance and achievements of the project in terms of food security
  • On availability of and access to food
  • On food prices
  • On the means of livelihood of the people, income and income sources
  • changes in terms of assets of the beneficiaries
  • on participation in PANP--- if it has resulted in/contributed to graduations

Discussion areas/topics for Project Office

• Briefing about the components and activities of the project implemented in the woreda
• Relevance of the project and its activities:
  • in terms of responding to local needs and priorities,
  • ==== capacity building,
  • Integration and complementarities
  • synergy & complementarities with others/GOs programmes/policies,
• Extent of accomplishment of the planned activities, evidences
• Extent of achievement of the planned goals, evidences, examples, ---
• Organization and management of the project?
  • Relation among the field offices of the implementing partners
  • Structure of the consortium at the field level
  • Extent of accountability responsive, transparency ---
  • Extent of practicality of the steering committee,
  • The intended district and zone level meetings, frequency of meetings, follow ups
  • Extent of technical support from the consortium leaders
  • Monitoring and evaluation
  • Timeliness of budget release
  • Placement of the required staff (time, number, quality
• Impacts
  • Observed impacts
  • Impacts that could emerge in the future
  • Evidences
  • Need for follow up
• Likelihood of sustainability of achievements
  • Activities planned and accomplished to ensure sustainability
  • Evidences of achievements in this regard
    • In terms of the different project activities
    • In terms of sustainability variables
    • Need for follow up
• SWOT
• Lessons
• Conclusions/positions in terms of achievements of the project
• Recommendations