



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# **RAISE PLUS-LIMITED SCOPE OF WORK FINAL REPORT**

**FINAL EVALUATION REPORT OF THE RELIEF TO DEVELOPMENT (R2D)  
PILOT PROJECT IN SEKOTA AND GUBALAFTO WOREDAS, ANRS**

**June 2006**

**This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development.  
It was prepared by the Weidemann Consortium.**

# **FINAL EVALUATION REPORT OF THE RELIEF TO DEVELOPMENT (R2D) PILOT PROJECT IN SEKOTA AND GUBALAFTO WOREDAS, ANRS**

**FINAL REPORT**

**Submitted by:**

Weidemann Associates, Inc.

**In cooperation with:**

Winrock International, Inc.

**Submitted to:**

USAID/Ethiopia Mission, Addis Ababa

**Contract No.:**

AEG-I-00-04-00010-00 Task 06

**Period of Performance:**

March-September 2006

**DISCLAIMER**

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	I
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. METHODOLOGY.....	1
III. PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	2
IV. GOAL AND OBJECTIVES OF R2D.....	3
V. TARGET POPULATION.....	4
VI. ANALYSIS OF R2D ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACTS.....	4
A. AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK.....	4
B. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND REHABILITATION.....	8
C. INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT.....	10
D. FOOD AID DISTRIBUTION.....	11
E. NUTRITION, HEALTH & HIV/AIDS.....	14
F. COMMUNITY MICRO-ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT (MED).....	17
G. CAPACITY BUILDING.....	18
VII. PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION.....	19
VIII. IMPACT ON GENDER EMPOWERMENT.....	21
IX. CONSISTENCY WITH USAID STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES.....	21
X. PROJECT FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.....	22
XI. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED.....	22
XII. LESSONS LEARNED.....	24
XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25
ANNEX A: EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE/INTERVIEW CHECKLIST.....	26
ANNEX B: SCOPE OF WORK, METHODOLOGY, WORK PLAN.....	31
ANNEX C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	39
ANNEX D: OFFICES AND FARMER COMMUNITIES VISITED.....	41
ANNEX E: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS.....	43
ANNEX F: ACCOMPLISHMENT OF PLANNED ACTIVITIES IN 2004.....	44
ANNEX G: EGS AND FFW REPORT IN R2D WOREDAS.....	52
ANNEX H (I) PROJECT FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.....	54

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACSI	Amhara Credit and Saving Institute
AMAREW Management	Amhara Micro- Enterprise, Agricultural Research, Extension and Watershed
ANRS	Amhara National Regional State
ARARI	Amhara Regional Agricultural Research Institute
BoARD	Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development
BCC	Behavioral Change Communication
CAHW	Community Animal Health Workers
COLTA	Community Organizing Leadership Training for Action
DPPC	Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission
EGS	Employment Generation Scheme
EPLUA	Environment Protection and Land Use Authority
FAM	Food Administration Monitors
FFP	Food For Peace
FFS	Farmer Field School
FFW	Food For Work
FSPC&DPO	Food Security Program Coordination and Disaster Prevention Office
GR	Gratuitous Relief
GO	Governmental- Organization
Ha	Hectare
HH	House Hold
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunity Virus/ Acquired Immunity Deficiency Syndrome
ICM	Integrated Crop Management
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
ITSH	Internal Transportation, Shipping and Handling
KAPB	Knowledge, Attitude, Practice and Behavior
KDC	Kebele Development Committee
LLPPA	Local Level Participatory Planning Approach
masl	meter above sea level
MED	Micro-Enterprise Development
MT	Metric Ton
NGO	Non-Government Organization
ORDA	Organization for Rehabilitation and Development in Amhara
PA	Peasant Association
PLWHAs	People Living With HIV and AIDS
R2D	Relief to Development
RDIR	Reducing Dependency and Increasing Resiliency
RFA	Request for Application
RIT	Regional Implementation Team
SC-UK	Save the children- United Kingdom
SO	Strategic Objective
SWC	Soil and water conservation
TOT	Training of Trainers
TPTF	Technical Planning Task Forces
USD	United States Dollar
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VCT	Voluntary Counseling and Testing
WSC	Woreda steering Committee

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The external evaluation team would like to express its sincere gratitude for all the logistical and technical support it got from institutions and individuals that facilitated our work. The team is especially grateful to W/o. Mitslal Abraha of USAID/Ethiopia who joined the team for the full duration of the field work. Her contribution in the field was invaluable. We appreciate the USAID Mission letting her join the team, and providing us with transportation during the field evaluation. Our appreciation also goes to Dr. Belay Demissie who provided the overall coordination and guidance to the evaluation.

As Chairperson of the Regional Implementation Team of the Relief to Development Project, Ato Amlaku Asres of FSPP&DP Office was generous to give the team his time, his office, conference facility and essential documents. The team is very grateful for the hours of time he spent with us sharing his insights and providing the team with very good information and advice.

As the lead implementing institution, Save the Children UK was very cooperative and supportive to the evaluation team. Starting from RDIR's Chief of Party to the former employees of R2D (now working in RDIR project), the evaluation team had easy and complete access to the offices, personnel and necessary documents. The team is very grateful for their cooperation.

The team also gives appreciation to the other partners including ORDA, the AMAREW Project, BoARD and District government offices that gave of their time to meet the team and provide invaluable information.

Finally, the evaluation team would like to mention that the evaluation exercise wouldn't have succeeded if it were not for the enthusiastic reception and willingness of the communities of the two pilot woredas. Wherever the team went, beneficiaries came in great numbers to tell their side of the story concerning R2D. The team would like to express its gratefulness to both communities for the frank and genuine discussions and feedback it got from both male and female beneficiaries.

Menwuyellet Moussie, Team Leader

Tesfa Berhanu

Etenesh Bekele

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Northeastern part of the Amhara region is among the regions of Ethiopia that suffered the most from a series of droughts that occurred during the last 3-4 decades. Since most of the drought stricken population became chronically dependent on food aid, the idea of linking relief to development (R2D) became a focus of debate starting the early 90's within the donor community and the Ethiopian Government. In order to get first hand experience on the issue, USAID/Ethiopia initiated and funded R2D as a pilot project to reduce food aid dependency and assist target communities to move in the direction of sustainable development. The evaluation team believes that the R2D project was justifiable and appropriate for achieving the goal of reducing food aid dependency while strengthening the capacity of the local government and the target communities to prevent further destitution through sustainable community and household development activities.

This evaluation was commissioned by USAID and the ANRS to measure the performance and impact of the Relief to Development project, and to gather and document best practices and lessons learned. The evaluation team used both primary and secondary data to collect information during the course of the evaluation. Most of the facts and figures in this report come from documents gathered from key stakeholders including Save the Children U.K., USAID/Ethiopia, and the Food Security Program Coordination and Disaster Prevention Office. The evaluation team used on-site physical observation to assess the overall natural resource and socio-economic environment of the R2D target woredas and well as specific watersheds, household farms, compounds and assets. In each of the two woredas, the team visited 2 of the 5 R2D kebeles and interviewed committee leaders and members, non-committee members, promoters, key informants, household members, traders and group informal gatherings. For each of the groups and individuals interviewed, the team prepared topical questionnaires to guide the interview sessions (see Annex A).

Using their depth of experience in the region, Save the Children UK (SC UK) submitted a thoughtful and relevant proposal and subsequently received the award for implementation. The evaluation team believes that the six proposed interventions components in the two pilot woredas (Sekota and Gubalafto) were appropriate and for the most part, practical. With the exception of the Micro Enterprise Development (MED), the components were designed in such a way that that activities and outputs would achieve the goals and objectives of the project. The MED component, however, lacked technical and strategic depth both at the design and implementation phase. The two main areas (product development and market linkages) that would have generated off-farm income and employment were not tackled by the project.

With regard to partnerships and stakeholder collaboration, the evaluation team found the arrangement very satisfactory. SC UK had entered into a partnership with the Organization for Rehabilitation and Development in Amhara (ORDA) to implement the Food Aid Distribution component and infrastructure development which included safe water supply, construction of feeder roads, and small-scale irrigation schemes.

The other implementing partner of R2D is the Amhara Micro-Enterprise Development, Agricultural Research, Extension and Watershed Management (AMAREW) Project with whom SC UK signed a joint Memorandum of Understanding to implement two pilot watersheds in Yeku (Sokota) and Lenche Dima (Gubalafto). AMAREW assumed responsibility for the

development of the two watersheds with the respective communities in collaboration with the Regional and Woreda level Office of Agriculture and Rural Development. After visiting the two watersheds and talking with the beneficiaries and stakeholder groups, the evaluation team found the integrated watershed development work a good example that the Region can effectively replicate in other woredas, provided adequate resources are mobilized. The AMAREW Project, however, failed to support the MED component of R2D (as was proposed by USAID/Ethiopia), as its own micro- enterprise component did not materialize from the start.

The Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development (BoARD) played a key role both in guiding the implementation and in actual implementation. The woreda-level partners including the Office of Agriculture and Health should be appreciated for their goodwill and leadership.

To implement the six components, the Project used a very effective planning mechanism that allowed the participation of the partners and the community. The Regional Implementation Team (RIT), chaired by the Head of the Food Security Program Coordination and Disaster Prevention Office (FSPC&DPO), acted effectively as the provider of policy and strategic guidance including resolving issues that would have hindered implementation. At the woreda level, the Woreda Steering Committees worked with good team spirit to implement field activities. At the Kebele (PA) level, the performance of the Kebele Development Committees (KDC) was exemplary in terms of ownership, accountability, and decision-making processes. At the beneficiary group level, sub sector/task committees organized a number of beneficiaries (such as crop or watershed committees) that were mobilized and trained to work on projects designed to benefit either the household or the community. The woreda and kebele committee members were provided with adequate training to enhance their administrative and technical capability.

Given the nature of the R2D project (piloting an integrated linkage between food aid and long-term development) and considering its short duration, the overall performance of R2D was very good. One of the major accomplishments of the food aid component is the fact that the food gap was significantly narrowed saving many lives and reducing the migration of the rural poor to urban areas. Beneficiaries within the 4 kebeles the evaluation team visited said that their own food production was too small to adequately provide for the entire family. They said that without the food aid, some family members (primarily men) would have been forced to migrate out of the area in search of wage earning farm or non-farm employment. The second major accomplishment is the clear demonstration that food relief can be used as a powerful incentive to initiate and carry out sustainable development projects in addition to protecting and restoring assets both at the household and community level.

In the crop and livestock component, the major accomplishment of the R2D project is the use of in-kind credit to the very poor that would otherwise have not been eligible for loans from micro finance institutions. This innovative transfer modality made the poorest of the poor instant holders of very valuable assets (goats and sheep) – very important capital that increased the social and economic level of the household.

With regard to integrated watershed management, the work done by the AMAREW-led partnership in Yeku (450 ha) and Lenche Dima (1500 ha) watersheds are exemplary, given that the woredas have initiated similar projects in the other kebeles, albeit with limited resources. The intervention resulted in the rehabilitation of upper level watersheds, and a commensurate

positive impact on the lower level watersheds usefulness and productivity. The farmers' committee of Yeku watershed told the evaluation team that the uncontrolled rain water flooding off the hillsides was destroying crops growing in the lower level of the watershed. The interventions which increased vegetation on the hillsides is effectively controlling this rapid runoff by increasing absorption and decreasing runoff volume and speed. As a result, low lying crops are better protected and suffer much fewer losses due to flooding. The R2D's environmental protection and rehabilitation component also accomplished a number of important results including the conservation and rehabilitation of degraded lands in almost all the kebeles of the two pilot woredas.

With regard to health, nutrition and HIV/AIDS, the major project's impact on the community has been the increased level of awareness among the population and the increased freedom and openness among beneficiaries (especially women) to discuss sensitive sexual and reproductive issues. Through well-trained promoters, basic self care and hygiene knowledge has been effectively transferred to the community.

Although R2D's accomplishments were more than satisfactory for five of the six components, there were some weaknesses and constraints. A phase out strategy was not completed before the termination of the project. Another shortcoming was the lack of planning and budgeting for filling (staffing) of possible gaps that would be created at the Woreda government level due to high turnover and shortage of qualified technicians. Although the budget allowed several man-months of short-term consultancy, the effort to bring capable experts was less than satisfactory. Not much effort was made to make use of national experts for the allotted short-term consultancies.<sup>1</sup>

In spite of the constraints mentioned above, there were a number of positive elements stakeholders can learn to inform the design and implementation of future projects. The first lesson to learn is that food aid can be effectively used as a resource and incentive to undertake sustainable development programming including asset creation and protection activities both at the household and community level, if these activities are sufficiently supplemented by financial grants and material support. In addition, by removing the culture of dependency on external aid among beneficiaries, R2D's efforts have materially changed the mentality of many beneficiaries. The formal partnership developed between an international NGO (SC UK) and a donor funded project (USAID's AMAREW) proved very successful. The integrated watershed management done in Yeku and Lenche Dima (among other kebeles) are worth replicating as they demonstrated clear ability to reverse the trend of declining land productivity. Sustainable land rehabilitation, a material change in community assets and improvement in the lives of destitute and very poor households, required considerable resources and coordinated effort among donors, implementers and beneficiaries. The evaluation team believes that hard choices must be made to achieve specific sets of objectives. Faced with limited resources, the focus must be limited to fewer beneficiaries in order to achieve impactful, sustainable results. Otherwise to reach an increased number of beneficiaries, a considerable increase in resources is required.

---

<sup>1</sup> The issue of household surveys was removed from the final report as an existing survey had been conducted. Despite repeated request, the evaluation team was unable to gain access to the report during the course of the evaluation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This end of project evaluation was commissioned by USAID and the ANRS to measure the performance and impact of the Relief to Development project, and to gather and document best practices and lessons learned. The evaluation exercise included all stakeholders in the process of gathering and synthesizing both primary and secondary data, analyzing findings, determining impact, and reviewing and validating the evaluation.

The Scope of Work (SOW) of the Evaluation Team (Annex B.i) was to assess and analyze the overall performance of R2D and document lessons learned and best practices to inform future programming and implementation. Specific SOW objectives for this evaluation included:

- Assess, analyze and document project achievements/performance
- Assess the sustainability and replicability of project achievements
- Assess project design and planning exercise
- Assess project progress towards achieving its goal/objectives including their appropriateness in saving lives and linking relief to development
- Assess relevance of purpose, outputs and activities of project and make recommendations on future programming
- Assess improvements made on initial purpose, outputs and activities made and assess effectiveness
- Evaluate project contribution to USAID's Strategic Objectives initially linked to R2D
- Identify causes/factors that affect implementation positively and negatively
- Identify major problems and issues to be addressed to fine tune future projects
- Assess effectiveness and efficiency of the overall organization and management of the project.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team used both primary and secondary data to collect information for the evaluation. A number of relevant documents (Annex C) were collected by the team from Addis Ababa (USAID, SC UK), Bahrdar (FSPC&DPO, AMAREW Project, SC UK) as well as the Sekota and Gubalafto Woredas (SC UK's RDIR Project, BoARD, Health, Youth, Culture & Sports offices, HIV/AIDS youth clubs, and kebele committees). Most of the facts and figures presented in this report come from documents gathered from key stakeholders including SC UK, USAID/Ethiopia, and FSPC&DPO. As this evaluation is limited by its scope of work and time constraints, the evaluation team did not carried out an impact study of the project. The action plan and schedule of the evaluation team is provided in Annex B.ii.

With regard to collecting primary data, the evaluation team used a combination of survey techniques and interview methods. For each of the groups and individuals interviewed, the team prepared in advance topical questionnaires that would guide the team to systematically and comprehensively interview targeted interviewees. The team used group interview techniques and discussions, as well as one-on-one interviews. Included in the interview assessments were key stakeholders and partners, beneficiaries, implementers, and former R2D employees (Annex D).

In addition, the evaluation team used on-site physical observation to assess the overall natural resource and socio-economic environment of R2D woredas, as well as specific watersheds, household farms, compounds and assets. In each of the two woredas, the team visited 2 out of the 5 R2D kebeles. In each kebele, the team discussed with and interviewed committee leaders and members, non-committee members, promoters, key informants, informal gatherings, household members, and individuals (including traders). Stakeholder workshops were also organized to capture more information on the draft evaluation report (see Annex E).

### III. PROJECT BACKGROUND

Although Ethiopia has suffered from a series of occasional drought in the last few centuries, the last four decades have witnessed unprecedented severe and recurrent drought cycles. The most severe droughts (1971-72 and 1983-85) devastated the country, with north-east Amhara among the most devastated regions. The successive droughts not only degraded the land to the point of barrenness and infertility, but also led to the breakdown of the social and economic fabric of the region both at household and community levels. As a result, most of the drought stricken population became chronically dependent on food aid to the extent of abandoning their traditional livelihood activities and resorting to handouts. It was in response to this combined social and ecological catastrophe that the idea of linking relief to sustainable development became a relevant approach to addressing the recurrent problem of dependency on food aid. Put simply, the “relief to development” concept is to use food relief as a catalyst for development activities leading to increased food security and a self-reliant population.

The Relief to Development (R2D) project for Sekota and Gubalafto Woredas was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and was implemented by a partnership led by the Save the Children UK (SC UK). The project began in September 2002 and ended officially in December 2005. The three key implementing partners were ORDA, AMAREW Project, and the Woredas’ Bureaus including Agriculture and Rural Development, Health, and Youth and Sports. Other partners who made great contributions in coordinating and facilitating the implementation of R2D were ANRS’s FSPC&DPO, and BoARD.

R2D was designed with the aim of combining relief and development resources under two interconnected agreements: The first provides Title II commodities to support targeted poor households in three forms – Gratuitous Relief (GR), Employment Generation Scheme (EGS) and Food for Work. The second agreement is a grant to support livelihood diversification options for local communities including the development of programs in livestock and agriculture, integrated watershed management, micro-enterprise development, health and nutrition, and capacity building. While the food distribution component focused on the development of community assets (watersheds, roads, etc), the non-food intervention targeted changes in the lives of households.

The two woredas selected for the R2D pilot program were Sokota of Wag Hamra Zone, and Gubalafto of North Wollo. These two woredas are located in the northeastern part of the Amhara Region where recurring droughts are common. They fairly represent most of the 52 chronically food insecure woredas of the region.

**Sekota:** Sekota woreda is located in the north-eastern part of the Wag Hamra administrative zone of the Amhara Region. With an altitude of 1500-2200 masl and an annual rainfall averaging 559

mm, Sekota woreda falls into the *woina dega* zone. Farming remains the economic driver, supporting more than 95% of the population. Most farmers remain at a subsistence level, with virtually all production relying on the kremt rains. The total land area of the Woreda is 305,771 ha., of which 35-40% is arable. The land is largely mountainous with deep valleys breaking the vast rugged mountain chains. About 40% of the land is covered with diverse species of bush sparsely covering a highly degraded soil. There is very little grazing land for the approximate 100,000 goats, 50,000 sheep and 105,000 cattle in the woreda. The estimated 2005 population figure for Sekota woreda was 33,000 households and 167,504 individuals. The average household land holding is between 0.75 – 1.0 ha. In a typical year, about 50% of the population relies on food relief to cover nearly 30% of their annual food requirement. The woreda grows a mix of crops including sorghum, teff, barley, and nug although productivity is steadily declining. To supplement the meager food/income generated from subsistence farming, a substantial number of men migrate to other areas to work as laborers and bring back some cash to the household. As Sekota is one of the woredas that suffered the worst of the recurring droughts in the last four decades, the many NGOs present in the woreda fight an uphill struggle.

**Gubalafto:** Gubalafto woreda is located in the central and eastern part of the North Wollo Administrative zone of the Amhara Region. The woreda stretches from the highland belg in the west to the woinadega east plains in the east, and the agro-ecology, climate and socio-economic characteristics of the woreda is not homogeneous as that of Sekota woreda. The highland dega has an altitude ranging from 2500-3700 masl, with an annual rainfall between 900-1050 mm. More than 60% of the land is arable and supports a limited number of crops (mostly barley and potatoes) and small number of livestock (mostly sheep and cattle). Virtually the entire population is dependent on subsistence farming supported by belg rains. The population of the dega highland is about 40,000 with a relatively low population density. Although the land here is fairly flat, the soil is relatively infertile and less productive. The average land holding ranges between 0.75 – 1.0 hectare. Migratory labor (in search of supplementary cash during off seasons) is predominant in this part of the woreda. The woinadega part of the east plains has an altitude of 1300-2200 masl, with rainfall averaging 800-1000 mm annually. Most of the arable land in this region is relatively fertile and supports diverse crops during the meher but also during the belg season. Teff, maize, barley and chick peas are grown during the belg season, while vegetables, pulse oil seeds and other cereals are grown during the meher season. Due to the shortage of grazing land, livestock holdings are very small. The land holding per household is relatively small (0.5 –1.0 ha). Relatively, Gubalafto is in a better position both agro-ecologically and economically than Sekota (particularly in access to markets) and has a better chance for rehabilitation and sustainable development.

#### **IV. GOAL AND OBJECTIVES OF R2D**

The overall goal of R2D is to “*effectively combine relief and development resources to protect and restore household and community assets as a first step to stabilizing food needs in Sekota and Gubalafto Woredas, whilst strengthening the institutional capacity of local government and the target community to prevent further destitution, and lead the population to make improved and sustainable livelihoods*”. This objective is derived from the hypothesis that if food aid is supplemented by cash grants, target beneficiaries will improve their work ethic and use the food aid they get as an incentive to work harder in rebuilding their household and community assets and use the cash grants for creating income generating livelihoods. Food aid alone (such as the traditional FFW) has not worked well, and has instead has made the beneficiaries increasingly dependent on

external aid. During the last 30 years, drought affected regions received several million sacks of direct food aid, yet rural landscapes and villages demonstrate virtually no improvements to the natural resource base, asset development or livelihoods of the intended beneficiaries.

In order to achieve the above goal, the following program objectives were cited in the project document:

- ❖ To strengthen the institutional capacity of the community and local government in both woredas to plan and implement livelihood security initiatives
- ❖ To develop appropriate solutions to production constraints to restore and protect household (HH) assets and diversify agricultural income sources
- ❖ To contribute to improved HH and community land productivity, build community assets and minimize vulnerability o crisis
- ❖ To promote good caring practices for mothers and contribute towards an improvement in the health and nutritional status of the population
- ❖ To develop locally appropriate and innovative strategies for diversification of livelihood systems
- ❖ To facilitate the testing and practical effectiveness and sustainability of a community based Watershed Management approach

## **V. TARGET POPULATION**

Target beneficiaries consist of food insecure people in Sekota and Gubalafto woredas. An original target of 137,000 beneficiaries was downsized by DPPC in 2004. The very poorest beneficiaries were supported by GR and EGS aimed to restore their assets, and was supported with livelihood grants designed to protecting them from further depletion of assets and to stimulate the creation of new assets. Farmers with more resources were benefited by participating in Food For Work schemes.

## **VI. ANALYSIS OF R2D ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACTS**

This following section documents (by program component) the assessment and analysis made on the achievements of R2D during its 27-month duration. Planned activities and accomplishments are detailed in Annex F.

### **A. AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK**

The main objective of the agriculture and livestock component was to promote households access to new and improved agricultural practices and technologies in order to increase agricultural productivity, diversify and increased income. Through the locally established Farmer Field Schools (FFS), farmers participated in training and testing on farmers' fields, and encouraged to take the lead in finding solutions to production constraints. Eleven FFS (9 in Gubalafto and 2 in Sekota) were established during the first year, and 353 farmers were trained on Integrated Crop Management (ICM). Although the initial target was to select and train 72 women (20% of the planned 360), the project ultimately involved only 12 women, far below the target. This trend of low level participation of women persisted throughout the project, with the exception of animal husbandry activities. For example, in 2003 only 5 women (and 65 men) were provided with

vegetable seeds, and only 4 women (and 41 men) received farm tools. In 2004, 3 women out of 70 total participants received vegetable seeds. During the second year of operation, 14 additional FFS were established in Sekota. The project ultimately provided a set of field equipment and improved technology packages to 552 beneficiaries of which 165 were women. As the primary beneficiaries of the sheep/goat livestock program were women, they also received the majority of the training in animal husbandry techniques. The project put less effort toward mobilizing women to register as ICM members. Registrants for this project component were primarily men and as such men received the majority of ICM training.

The provision of sheep and goats to the very poor is one of the few success stories R2D. The program was envisioned to work as a revolving fund where the first beneficiaries would pay back the same number of sheep and goats to the second level beneficiaries once the first offspring were produced. Distribution started in earnest in 2004 where a total of 6684 head were given to 898 beneficiaries of which 551 (>60%) were women. The plan was to distribute approximately 10,000 head to 1,800 target beneficiaries. Although the initial plan was to give livestock exclusively to women, this strategy was later adapted to include men as well.

The following observations illustrate the impact of this project component:

- The credit/repayment scheme designed by R2D was very appropriate as the loan and repayment in kind is less cumbersome and less risky than dealing in cash. Experience in several African countries and Ethiopia tells us that cash credit to the poorest of the poor is generally spent on meeting immediate needs, i.e. food purchases, rather than building assets. The objective of the sheep/goat program is to build long term assets and use them to mitigate another famine.<sup>2</sup>
- The restocking of livestock made people (mainly destitute women) instant owners of useful assets. The result was a gain in social acceptance and respect from the community. Very poor households now have capital that would make them eligible for cash credit from traditional sources such as the ACSI.
- Ownership of small ruminants catalyzed women's participation in numerous project activities including participation and membership in committees designed to foster participatory decision making and problem solving.
- Children also benefited from the family ownership of livestock as the husbandry and herding activities quickly became a peer group activity.
- The sale of small livestock generated sufficient income to meet important needs such as the purchase of school supplies.
- The increase in consumption of animal products had a positive effect on nutritional status. Many beneficiaries reported that they consumed sheep/goat meat from their own herds during the holidays and sometimes sell stock to buy additional food resources.
- The livestock provided an additional value in that their manure was used to improve soil condition and fertility. Women beneficiaries in particular noted to the evaluation team the increased fertility of farmland surrounding their homes had improved significantly following the application of animal manure and manure enriched compost materials.

---

<sup>2</sup> The team believes that while there is always some inherent risk with in-kind credit it in fact carries less risk than cash credit schemes. Even a 20% loss of livestock granted through credit would not completely erode a household's ability to repay in kind following a breeding season.

### *From family shame to respected woman in the community*

Mulu Negussie is a 28 years old single mother with 4 children. She was forcibly married at 15 to a man from a relatively rich family. After having her first child at age 16, she left her first husband and returned to her parents. Her parents called her a “shame for the family” and made her choose between remarriage or leave the family household. She then married her second husband with whom she had two children in four years. At age 22 she left her second husband. For the first 5 years as a single mother, Mulu lived a hard life. She made a living by brewing and selling *tella* (local beer). While in the *tella* business, she had her fourth child. Following the birth and with advice from R2D’s health and nutrition group, she started using birth control injection. Following her participation in the food aid distribution and restocking program, Mulu’s life changed significantly for the better. After she saved some food and money, she built a small tin roof house that she and her children live in happily and proudly. In addition to her new house, Mulu bought household furniture, utensils, and good clothes for her children and herself. Her house and R2D-provided sheep raised her social status to the point where now she is a well-respected community promoter and livestock committee member. Her income and food production have increased significantly, and she sends her children to school.

*Source: Field visit in Gubalafoto woreda (Agegh Tihun PA), 2006*

**Grain and Seed Banks:** For areas that have experienced recurring droughts and famine, the establishment of local grain and seed banks is essential. Grain banks serve as storage facilities for members who volunteer to save a portion of their own grain during the harvest season and use it during the hungry (kremt) season when food shortages become acute. Seed banks, on the other hand, are intended to procure and store ‘improved’ seed for use during the planting season. Although each of the 5 kebeles in each woreda are dotted with grain and seed banks, R2D facilitated the establishment of two additional community-managed grain and seed banks in each woreda. During the evaluation team’s visit to the grain and seed banks, they witnessed the members’ happiness and enthusiasm in having local stores completely under self management. The problem they face now is that stores are becoming too small to accommodate the amount of grain coming from the membership. Although the evaluation team considers the number of grain and seed banks established by R2D too few (only 2 each in each woreda), the community managed grain and seed banks had the following results and impacts:

- The grain banks became important storage facility and encouraged farmers to save more grain during harvest season (when typically virtually all the grain is consumed as part of holiday feasts and weddings).
- Farmers have begun to think cooperatively and strategically regarding the timing of planting, and the quantity, quality, and handling of seed stores.<sup>3</sup>
- Beneficiary farmers have begun to organize and negotiate regarding transactions such as buying stores cheaply during the harvest and consumption season and/or selling at a higher price during times of shortage. Interest income and profits are re-invested to expand storage facility and service.

**Household Fruit Trees and Vegetable Gardens:** To diversify livelihoods and increase sources of food and income, R2D introduced homestead gardening and kitchen gardens where beneficiaries (mostly women) would use increased produce to improve household food security and provide additional income. Although much remains to be done in terms of participation and coverage (only one PA in Gubalafoto and two PAs in Sekota), R2D has accomplished the necessary initial work on

<sup>3</sup> While the team did not have the necessary supporting data to specify the exact number of seed store members and those who use the stores regularly, we can report that approximately 100 farmers attended the meeting that elaborated the by-laws for the establishment of the grain banks. See Annex 6: 2.9).

this activity. It has established 4 fruit garden demonstration sites in Sekota that involved more than 50 beneficiaries. One nursery was established in each woreda. During the life of the project, about 70 beneficiaries were trained and supplied with vegetable seeds and fruit tree seedlings. The Evaluation Team saw a few fruit tree groves in the two watersheds (Yeku and Lenche Dima), but heard that only a few participants were successful in growing fruit trees and vegetables in their homesteads. Whether due to lack of follow up, shortage of expertise, training, resources or water, the team did not feel that R2D performed well as was expected on this activity. Many farmers gave low marks to this activity, but mentioned also the inherent difficulties of growing fruit trees and vegetables in the harsh environment unless an irrigation system is developed. The evaluation team saw a canal (about a kilometer long) built under the RDIR Project in Sekota to distribute irrigation water for small-scale vegetable gardening, but this was not capitalized on during R2D.

**Forage Development and Animal Nutrition:** In this activity, over 50,000 forage seedlings were distributed in the two pilot woredas, and over 340 beneficiaries (133 women) were trained in forage development. Approximately 124 hectares of land was the subject of mixed pasture improvement, all of it in Sekota woreda. The improved production and supply of forage species was a worthwhile effort to compliment the restocking component of the project, and many of the beneficiaries appreciated the support. Now, virtually all the local farmers have improved awareness and knowledge on the production of different forage species, and some are actively farming forage crops at the community (watershed) and household level. The main problem identified by farmers was, due to the abbreviated project time frame, no follow-on was conducted on how to intensify and expand forage crops in the pilot woredas.

**Livestock Health and Husbandry:** One of the major constraints for an improved livestock sector is health problems. In both woredas, beneficiaries raised the issue of animal health as a major concern. In the impact assessment done by Acacia Consultants, it was reported that about 20% of the sheep and goats provided by the project died – most from disease. Hence, the incorporation of “Community Animal Health Workers (CAHW)” into the restocking program was a logical and necessary programming decision. This activity trained 15 CAHWs in vet services and animal husbandry, and equipped them with necessary materials and veterinary drugs.

Although there was a initial plan within R2D to identify and recognize traditional healers/herbalists and certify them in ethno-veterinary services, the idea was eventually dropped because of non-viability. The evaluation team concurs with the idea of dropping this activity and focusing resources on the continued development and institutionalization of the CAHW approach.

**Poultry Production:** While the idea of raising chickens both for consumption and sale is sound from a nutrition and income generating perspective, it proved very difficult to implement. As a general rule, poultry production using exotic birds is a high risk business for any type of farmer, be it modern or traditional. From the start, R2D understood the difficulty in transporting both 3-month birds and one-day old chicks to remote areas such as Sekota. Anecdotally, we were told many died during transport. Second, the birds require a lot of feed that the poor beneficiaries cannot readily supply. As a result, the plan was cut short and the project trained only 83 (9%) of the planned 899 beneficiaries, and distributed only 332 (10%) of the planned 3350 birds. The problem was explained clearly in Civilkai Kebele (Gubalafto) when a female beneficiary complained bitterly about how much a chicken can eat – “more than the woman can eat”. She said that “those foreign chickens are no worth introducing at our level and in our area”.

**Beekeeping:** As with the other agricultural activities, beekeeping was planned as an important income generating activity. Because of the severe drought situation, there was no activity in Sekota during the first year. In Gubalafto, approximately 372 farmers were trained and provided with bee colonies. About 345 farmers were also provided with sets of protective clothing. About 20 Das and supervisors were also trained in beekeeping. In 2004, about 448 farmers in both woredas benefited from the activity and were supplied with 2 colonies each, a total of 896 colonies (of 1700 planned colonies). The success of this initiative is mixed. In general, the hives in Sekota and the dry area of Gubalfto did not adapt well as the colonies were short of forage and soon abandoned the hives. On the other hand, there were a few farmers who told the team that they were able to produced 20-40 kg. of honey select hives. While it is important to supply beneficiaries with the correct inputs and equipment, special skills and experience are needed to become a good beekeeper. In addition to the basic skills in bee care, seasonal management, and harvesting, handling and storage of honey, the question of effective marketing needs to be addressed during program design and planning. As is the case in many of the R2D crop and livestock activities, no marketing support has been included in the beekeeping activity.

## **B. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND REHABILITATION**

The overall objective of this component is to contribute to improved household and community land productivity, build community assets and minimize future vulnerability to crisis. This component planned to use an integrated watershed management approach with the local government and beneficiary community taking the lead in the planning and implementation of the activities. Included in this component are the following interrelated activities:

- Soil and water conservation measures
- Afforestation and Biological Conservation
- Water harvesting
- Water Point Development
- Traditional small scale irrigation
- Feeder road construction

### ***Differences between R2D practices and past efforts***

Food for Work has been practiced throughout Ethiopia for the last 30 years. Although several billions dollars of free food and much family labor was used, impacts have been minimal as demonstrated by the degraded lands of the drought affected regions. In essence, FFW promoted a situation akin to day labor with wages paid in food. The main objective of the beneficiaries was the food, what was being done on the land was not of their concern. As a result, whatever structures were rehabilitated or whatever planted on the degraded lands did not have any permanency in their minds and with no sense of ownership or responsibility, results were fleeting and often disappointing. After 30 years of FFW investment, the drought affected landscapes remain degraded and non-productive.

The approach of R2D, on the other hand, is to create concern for the land and use food and supplementary cash as one input to facilitate the protection and rehabilitation of the land. With intensive stakeholder awareness sessions, and trainings coupled with participatory planning and decision making processes, R2D succeeded in transforming the perception among beneficiaries toward a realization that stewardship of the land is their concern and responsibility. As a result, R2D beneficiaries now volunteer to contribute 2 days a week to work in community held lands. Community institutions and cooperative work plans have replaced the old system of waiting to be told what to do or where to work in return for food.

The main accomplishment of this component is the rehabilitation of degraded lands for use in productive livelihood activities. All the activities are implemented by the community through

kebele development committees (KDCs). Detailed accomplishments for this component are summarized below:

**Soil and Water Conservation (SWC):** This activity deals with the construction of physical SWC structures using different techniques including soil and stone bund construction, cut-off drain construction, hillside terrace, trench, and gabion construction. All of these activities have had mixed results. In Sekota, about 494 km of land was constructed in stone bunds (about 90% of the plan) while in Gubalfto, 130 km was constructed in soil bunds (about 20% of the plan). The difference in rates of achievement was due primarily to source building materials. In Sekota, the program relied on stone to construct the bunds (a fairly straightforward process) and benefited from an abundant supply of local material from which to build. Gubalfto has a shortage of stone and relied on soil to construct the bunds, a much more difficult and time consuming process. The evaluation team saw some of these bunds that look very strong, stable and well constructed. These bunds have already formed soil stabilizing terraces.

**Trench Construction:** The construction of trenches on the hillsides to control water run-off, as well as to harvest water to grow forage and shrubs is an important component in the integrated watershed management plan. In all, about 200,000 trenches were constructed (primarily in Sekota where the need is more acute than in Gubalfto). The evaluation team visited the Yeku watershed and witnessed the value of those trenches in minimizing the damage of water run off and soil erosion. Now, farmers are able to effectively cultivate land at the lower end of the watershed.

**Gully Rehabilitation:** One major activity that showed considerable promise for land rehabilitation is the construction of gabions for gully rehabilitation. In Gubalfto, more than 20,000 m<sup>3</sup> were constructed to stop the widening of the gully. Further rehabilitation was accomplished through the planting of different species of vegetation including forage trees and shrubs. The evaluation team was impressed with the work done in Lenche Dima. A once severely degraded gully is now covered with dense vegetation. Although expensive (in terms of getting different types of hand tools, wire mesh etc.) and labor intensive, these activities are essential in order to save the land from further degradation.

**Closures:** Although land closures are not a new concept, R2D capitalized on the willingness and commitment of the community to effectively implement the activity. In both Yeku (460 ha.) and Lenche Dima (1500 ha.) watersheds, more than 200 ha of land was closed to agricultural activities and soon began showing significant improvement in land cover. The difference between the closed and open lands on adjacent hillsides is impressive. The closed ones quickly regenerated grasses, shrubs and trees, while the open land still shows the degraded rocks and soil.

**Afforestation:** This activity promotes the construction of micro basins, establishment of permanent and mobile nurseries, seedling production and planting, and regeneration and rehabilitation of vegetation. During R2D implementation, approximately 4 million seedlings were planted (more than 3 million in Gubalafo woreda alone). About 2 million micro basins were constructed, and more than 50 mobile nurseries have been established. The evaluation team believes that effective afforestation is not a one-off activity. It requires intensive follow up and regular watering for the seedlings establish roots and survive. Although activities can be organized and coordinated by the community, for trees to establish themselves, they need the dedicated care of individuals, who should realize some benefit from the time intensive labor and care they provide to establish the seedlings. A lesson learned from this activity is that individuals should receive some small

incentives, not only to encourage initial plantings but to care for the trees as they establish themselves.

**Small scale irrigation schemes:** This activity included the clearing and improvement of springs and hand dug wells. During the first year of R2D (2003), about 68 springs were cleared and cleaned. In 2004, 11 springs (10 in Sekota) serving 2750 beneficiaries were developed. Four wells serving about 250 beneficiaries were constructed (3 in Sekota). A total of 14 micro ponds were constructed (12 in Gubalafto). About 11 traditional small scale irrigation systems were upgraded (9 in Sekota). The improved water sources were an obvious source of joy and pride for the beneficiaries in Civilkai kebele who have now access to clean water at their doorstep where previously water was a 2-4 hour walk away. The evaluation team would like to note that the number of improved wells and springs were too few to benefit a large proportion of the population. Even the objectives of this activity were too low (for example, no more than 5 wells were planned to be dug in the two woredas) to have an impact for more than a small percentage of the population.

**Feeder road construction:** In 2003, more than 300 km of road were improved and maintained of which 90 km represent new construction. In 2004, about 170 km were constructed and maintained, mostly in Gubalafto. Compared to woredas outside the project zone, these improved feeder roads have begun to attract a few trucks and minibuses. This improved transportation infrastructure is slowly improving beneficiaries' access to markets.

### C. INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

The main purpose of the watershed management component is to provide the BoARD and other institutions in the region with land use planning tools and proven techniques for sustainable development and rehabilitation of catchments in food insecure woredas. This activity has been coordinated and led by USAID's AMAREW Project. Among the major accomplishments that are noted by both project implementers and beneficiaries include:

- **Strengthened community level management.** Community water management committees were established in Yeku and Lenche Dima watersheds. Within these, 4 watershed development committees were organized: Natural Resources Management; Agricultural Improvement; Social Development and Business Development. The necessary training (including COLTA) was provided to all committee members and to some additional participants. Farmers were organized into smaller teams of 10 households for carrying out development work (such as compost making and bund planting) on their own.
- **Watershed Planning and Development:** Community-selected and implemented soil and water conservation measures were the main accomplishment for this activity. Community driven area land closures designed to inhibit grazing and shruba db tree harvesting were a success in both Yeku and Lenche Dima watersheds. The evaluation team visited the two watersheds and was quite impressed by the impact of the closures. In both the watersheds, the team witnessed the regeneration and growth of multiple species of grasses, shrubs and trees. Farmers are now benefiting from an improved source of "cut and carry" fodder for their livestock.
- **Yeku and Lenche Dima Watersheds:** The development work in these watersheds was carried out through free labor and food for work and EGS resources. Community members agreed to contribute 2 days of free labor per week in addition to the activity managed by

R2D's food for work resource. Activities demonstrating impact included: hillside terrace construction; water harvesting structures; loose-stone check dam construction; gully rehabilitation; nursery seedling production and small scale irrigation.

#### **D. FOOD AID DISTRIBUTION**

The philosophy driving the move toward the relief to development concept is innovative and highly appreciated by the beneficiary population. All stakeholders within the beneficiary communities are happy with the approach of receiving food aid in return for participating in development initiatives rather than as free handouts. Beneficiaries said that the R2D project has encouraged and sensitized them to bring an attitudinal change towards food aid and sustainable development –one that integrates food security and self-reliance.

The project used traditional participatory approaches by organizing Kebele Development Committee (KDC) in each PA and Technical Planning Task Forces (TPTF), and Woreda Steering Committee (WSC) in each woreda. These committees and task forces were fully responsible for the identification, screening, registering and approval of beneficiary households and categorized them as to which type of food aid they should participate in. In addition, the types and proportions of food aid that goes into different distribution mechanisms, namely Gratuitous Relief (GR) Employment Generating Scheme (EGS) and Food for Work (FFW), were well-studied and relevant to address problems of the beneficiary communities. The evaluation team believes that the planning process and chosen approaches were sound, reasonable, and appropriate to be tested on pilot basis for future replication and scaling-up.

The USAID lump sum contribution to R2D was stated to be “US\$10 million per year in Title II Assistance (including transport and distribution costs) for three years, as well as US\$1,125,760 in development funds over the three-year period”<sup>4</sup> and “according to the RFA, the total food resource available for EGS activities (including gratuitous relief) of 39,480MT of cereal and 6,240MT of oil.”<sup>5</sup>

Although there is no separate and specific goal, objective or purpose depicted for food aid distribution, it is known that it shares in the overall R2D program goal “to effectively combine relief and development resources to protect and restore household and community asset as a first step to stabilizing food need in Sekota and Gubalafto woredas...”<sup>6</sup>

The project started implementation by organizing different committees and task forces. A Regional Implementation Team (RIT) was organized from main stakeholders' governmental and non-governmental representatives initially chaired by the Head of ANRS Bureau of Agriculture but later changed to the head of the Region's Food Security Program Coordinator and Disaster Prevention (FSPC&DP) Office. Within each woreda, Steering Committees (WSC) and Technical Planning Task Forces (TPTF) were organized from among all stakeholders. At the grassroots level, Kebele Development Committees (KDC) were organized from representatives of “*Gotts*” in the PA. Starting from PA level KDCs up to Woreda WCSs, committees and members fully participated in the identification and registration of beneficiary households and distribution of food aid.

---

<sup>4</sup> MoU for the Tripartite Agreement between the USAID/Ethiopia Mission, FDPPC, and the ANRS for the Implementation of the Relief to Development (R2D) pilot Program in Two Woredas (Gubalafto and Sekota) of ANRS. See page 4.

<sup>5</sup> Relief to Development Initiative for Sekota and Gubalafto Woredas, ANRS, Technical Application for RFA # 663-02-A-005, Revised Proposal Submitted By Save the Children UK 20 August, 2002; page 21.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid page 17

Technical handling of food commodities and the administration process was given to ORDA whose main responsibility was to “*deploying warehouse staff and handling the warehouse management in both target Woredas, ensuring that its staff are working closely with SC UK’s Food Aid Monitors (FAMs), distributing the food to targeted beneficiaries and submitting progress reports in collaboration with SC UK FAMs to the regional DPPC and SC UK.*”<sup>7</sup>

The evaluation team was informed that there was an incident where food resources were used for another purpose that created a minor problem among the partners. At the time, the food aid monitors (FAMs) of SC UK were not approving the actual food distribution (mainly in Sokota). From this lesson, SC UK made it mandatory in its RDIR project that the FAMs put their signatures on every distribution sheet. The regional FSPC & DP office has issued a letter to concerned offices stating that no food aid distribution be done without the approval of both SC UK and FSPC & DP signatories. As an implementing partner, ORDA should have taken the necessary precaution and care to avoid any diversion of food aid to non-intended purposes. It should have kept its independence as an NGO.

With the organizational structure and responsibilities of ORDA focused on food aid distribution, the activity was implemented satisfactorily with some minor shortcomings such as delay of delivery (mainly at the commencement of the project in 2003), shortage of warehouses, and distribution centers too distant for some beneficiaries, and the isolated serious case of diverting food to groups outside the project.

According to SC UK organizational structure,<sup>8</sup> sufficient number of staff was allocated to the food distribution component. Apart from overall management of the project, three FAMs were assigned in each Woreda. FAMs were fully responsible for monitoring food distribution in their respective woredas. They also worked in close collaboration with project coordinators and officers for EGS\FFW in each woreda. Furthermore, the Dessie based Regional Relief Coordinator and Addis based Emergency and Food Security Director also provided technical assistance and management support required for food aid distribution. In general, the management and staffing support provided were enough to undertake and manage this activity properly.

During the life of project, forecast distribution targets were: 35,489MT of wheat, 1,658 MT of vegetable oil and 1,439MT of pulses. Out of these, only 28,095MT of wheat, 979MT of vegetable oil and 447 MT of pulses were distributed in all categories (GR, EGS and FFW). The beneficiaries of the food aid from the two woredas were DPPC’s annual appeal (137,000 in 2003 and 85,300 in 2004).

**Table 1: Food aid distribution planned and accomplished**

Years	Wheat (MT)			Oil (MT)			Pulses (MT)			Beneficiaries
	Plan	actual	%	Plan	Actual	%	Plan	Actual	%	
2003	17,105	14,526	85	1,178	698	59	-	-	-	137,000
2004	18,384	13,469	73	480	281	59	1,439	447	31	85,000
Total	35,489	28,095	79	1,658	979	59	1,439	447	31	

<sup>7</sup> Ibid page 42

<sup>8</sup> Ibid page 41

*Source: 2004 annual report page 25-26*

Field visits verified that the beneficiary community has received the nationally fixed rate of 15kg of wheat, 1.5kg of pulse and 0.5kg of vegetable oil by participating in the three categories of food aid distribution.

As to activities implemented, most EGS and all FFW planned activities were fully attained (or exceeded targets) except the following which were not fully accomplished according to the plan (see Annex G for details).

- Soil bund: 36 percent
- Stone fenced soil bund: 11 percent
- Faynaju bund: none
- Check dam construction: 59 percent
- Micro basin construction: 39 percent
- Pond construction: 2.4 percent
- Pond maintenance: 7 percent

All stakeholders agreed that the food ration was not a full-family ration. As a result one can understand that in some of the beneficiary families suffered from lower than expected Calorie intake. Moreover, the objective of protecting and creating assets using some extra food quickly became irrelevant and unattainable as smaller than expected rations precluded such conservation efforts.

### **Impacts of the food aid distribution**

Though 3 years is considered too short to fully qualify projects impacts, it is possible to see some indicators that demonstrate that the approaches applied are headed in the right direction to attain the intended objectives. Certainly the objective to sustain live was largely achieved. The injection of food resources contributed much in terms of food availability and narrowing down the food gap in the woredas.

As to promoting an effective linkage between food aid and development, the R2D approach is well received by all stakeholders, including beneficiary communities. The Employment Generating Scheme (EGS) approach is an innovation that has precipitated a great degree of attitudinal changes in the minds of beneficiary communities. As a result, some have started to visualize the benefits of work done by catalyzing food aid and have even stated that they “will continue with the development projects initiated through this project even if there is no food aid.”<sup>9</sup> Others recognize that the project has demonstrated communities’ ability to participate in effective development work with minimum outside support.

The FFW activities targeting the mid-wealth category of the community have contributed much in terms of protecting their assets. They were able to get additional income and food for their families which saved them from a depletion of assets that may have precipitated a serious drop in living standards.

---

<sup>9</sup> Said by Yeku Integrated Watershed Management participant community members on group discussion conducted for this evaluation.

### ***The FFW beneficiary in Sekota***

One medium income beneficiary in Sekota who participated in R2D's FFW program told the evaluation team that the income he would have used for food was used to buy a cow and an ox. He proudly asserts that his life has dramatically changed for the better. He claims that he got back the dignity he had lost in the last 3 decades when his community was hit by successive bouts of severe drought and famine. His only regret is that such projects that use the same targeted approach encompassing both the poorest of the poor as well the relatively affluent do not last long enough to benefit many more households.

*Source: Field Visit Sekota woreda (Thia PA), 2006*

## **E. NUTRITION, HEALTH & HIV/AIDS**

This component focuses on enhanced health, nutrition as well as environmental protection and sanitation for individual, household and community beneficiaries. The component has also significantly contributed to the increased awareness about HIV/AIDS in the pilot woredas.

The original component design was based on findings of SC UK studies including *Nutritional Surveillance, Household Food Economy Analysis, Destitution in the Northeastern Highlands and Wealth, Health and Knowledge: Determinants of Malnutrition in North Wollo*. The component also benefited during implementation from additional study findings (KAPB HIV/AIDS survey), which helped to shape its direction. The evaluation team found the component activities to be culturally appropriate, friendly in nature and community focused. Information and communication (IEC and BCC) materials designed for the promotion of sanitation, nutrition and better health were simple, illustrative, easy to understand and accurately reflected the culture of the society. The component has also effectively addressed the practical gender needs of women related to clean water, food, nutrition and childcare.

### ***Baseline findings used to design the nutrition, health and HIV/AIDS component***

***Nutrition:*** The most important determinants of malnutrition in North wollo are household income, level of maternal education and childrens' health status. There has been a decline in nutritional status in Sekota woreda leading to acute malnutrition, and ultimately increased risk of morbidity and mortality. Sekota has consistently reported acute malnutrition below the cutoff point for intervention (90%) for consecutive years since the 1970s. Nutritional status has declined in Gubalafto since 1996 reaching its lowest level in 1999, with some recovery since 2000.

***Health and Sanitation:*** It is common for animals and humans to share a house and very few households have separate latrines. Most commonly used water sources are unprotected springs, boreholes, rivers and lakes, which are shared by animals and humans. Use of unclean water for washing and drinking has been highlighted as leading causes of diarrhea and intestinal infection. A perpetual and mutual reinforcing cycle of malnutrition and infection results and is readily apparent in Sekota and Gubalafto.

***HIV/AIDS:*** Rates of HIV in 1999 were 6.7, 7.9 and 20.8% for Desse, Gonder and Bahir Dar respectively, showing the likelihood of elevated prevalence in the woredas surrounding Bahir Dar, including Sekota and Gubalafto.

*Source: R2D Proposal, 2002*

The overall objective of the component was to promote improved care giving practices for mothers and contribute toward an improvement in the health and nutritional status of the population. The evaluation team observed that objectives of the component were largely met through on the ground activities. Specific objectives of the component included:

- Improve the knowledge and daily practices of community promoters about maternal/child health issues;
- Provide a source of income/food for health promoters in the form of FFW;
- Improve community knowledge and practices about care giving, disease prevention, improved hygiene, neo-natal and child health (including vaccination), family planning through the use of health promoters;
- Mainstream HIV/AIDS concerns across all interventions in the community; and
- Support local health services through training and provision of supplies and equipment.

In terms of staffing, a nutrition officer was in place at Woldiya SC UK office to manage the over all operation for both Sekota and Gubalafto woredas. The officer was responsible for facilitation and coordination, and follow-up of all day-to-day activities in the entire 10 pilot PAs target region. The officer was also responsible for the design and development of the education materials used in the trainings of target groups.

Major component activities consisted of training, awareness raising and strengthening woreda sector capacity. Activities were carried out through partnerships with woreda health, women's affairs, HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control (HAPCO), and Youth, Culture and Sports (YCS) offices. Discussions the evaluation team held with Woreda Health office staff at both Sekota and Gubalafto indicate good working relationships and effective institutionalization of the component within the government structure. The team found that the component benefited from participatory planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting among the stakeholder offices at woreda and PA levels. The R2D project office played an effective role of facilitation and gap-filling role.

At the community level, activities were carried out by community promoters (all mothers) (11 per PA). A total of 5 supervisors per woreda (all men - one for each PA) were responsible for linking community promoters with stakeholder offices (e.g. taking messages to promoters and reporting back to the nutrition officer the activities and challenges of the promoters).

### ***A Community Promoter in Gubalafto***

Yeshe Ashenafi is a 30 years old mother of four children. She has 7<sup>th</sup> grade education. Yeshe was selected by her village/“Gotte” leaders as a health promoter to train pregnant and lactating women.

Yeshe received 8 days of training with other colleagues, before she started her work as a community promoter. She received training on vaccinations, food and water hygiene, basic personal and child hygiene, child care, breastfeeding, family planning, diet and nutrition, home management, environmental hygiene and importance of pit latrines. She also received an umbrella, t-shirt and training materials (flip chart with pictures). She gathered together groups of women Sundays after church and gave collective training 4 times a month. 6 days/month she visited pregnant and lactating mothers in their home and taught basic hygiene practices, child care, nutrition and home management.

Yeshe enjoyed her work as a promoter; she claims that she is respected by her community and feels she is contributing to the betterment of maternal/child health child in her community. She has observed changes in her community; an increased acceptance of advice on improved nutrition and sanitation practices, people wash their clothes and themselves periodically, an increased use of pit latrines, and people have begun to dispose of garbage in a designated pit.

As a reward for her community work, Yeshe was to receive payments in the form of Food for Work, (50-30 kg wheat per month), following reports to her supervisor. However, Yeshe expressed her current unhappiness as she is no longer receiving payments in the safety net program and she has stopped her work as a community promoter.

*Source: field visit, Ahun Tegegn PA, 2006*

Most component activities were implemented on schedule with the exception of HIV/AIDS activities (which were further delayed in Gubalafto woreda). Major outputs and impacts of the component are:

- A total of 150 community promoters and supervisors were selected by KDC (based on their ability to raise well-nourished, healthy children). All received 8 days training (TOT) on food hygiene, maternal/child health, hygiene, family planning and HIV/AIDS. The target audience for health promoters were pregnant women and lactating mothers
- Posters (150), flipcharts (200), booklets (100), billboards and t-shirts were produced in local language targeting nutrition, health and HIV/AIDS. This IEC and BCC materials served to increase awareness about family planning, sanitation and HIV/AIDS prevention among the community. The evaluation team observed that activities have also contributed to an increased level of community openness to sensitive sexual and reproductive issues.
- Knowledge, Attitude, Practice and Behavior (KAPB) study was undertaken, documenting the nutrition, health and HIV/AIDS status of the pilot woredas. Such studies have enabled location specific understanding of the cause and impact of HIV/AIDS and appropriate mechanisms to mitigate its impact.
- Carrot, beetroot, tomatoes and cabbage seeds were distributed to promoters to establish kitchen gardens. This activity promoted diet diversification and additional income generation

to the promoters and to the larger community through demonstrations to neighboring farm households.

- Technical and material support was provided to woreda stakeholder offices, community based organizations and local school and anti-HIV/AIDS clubs (two computers with accessories and 2 motor bicycles were given out for both Sekota and Gubalafto health office, musical instruments, clothing and stationery for clubs). 34 Government health workers were trained on sexually transmitted disease including HIV/AIDS, 88 in home based care, and 31 on universal precautions. In addition, 158 religious leaders, 64 local alcohol sellers, and 69 women's association members were trained on HIV/AIDS prevention. This technical and material support increased the capacity of both government offices and clubs to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS.
- 100,000 condoms were distributed through the health office in both woredas. This represents a marked improvement to condom access in the rural community. Money was also transferred through the government HAPCO office for support of People Living with HIV/AIDS in Sekota woreda (27,348 birr) and Gubalafto (20,000 birr).

#### ***Support to local HIV/AIDS clubs***

##### ***Case 1: A PA anti- AIDS youth Club in Sekota Woreda ( Sirel Libanos PA)***

The club has 35 volunteer members (18 women and 17 men) between the ages of 18 and 35. The club has benefited from the R2D led trainings on HIV/AIDS awareness, support for PLWHAs, as well as financial support for overhead costs and audio-visual materials. Club activities include community education, coffee drinking ceremonies, candle evenings, peer discussions, and experience sharing with other clubs.

##### ***Case 2: Youth, Culture and Sport office ( Gubalafto woreda)***

The office gets support from SC UK for its HIV/AIDS activities. Office head Demisse Abebe (through informal analysis of changes in the woreda) has witnessed a change in behavior and openness with regards to HIV/AIDS, an increase in Voluntary Counseling and Testing (VCT), especially when couples decide to get married, and a decrease in traditional practices like 'kimit' and 'warsa' which increase risk of contracting HIV.

*Source: field visit, 2006*

## **F. COMMUNITY MICRO-ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT (MED)**

Though the intended goal of the MED component to diversify income and livelihood was relevant and useful for the project area, the component was poorly designed and implemented. Activity achievements were not clearly observed through the evaluation team's field visits and discussions with communities. The MED was designed to be implemented with the AMAREW Project providing technical assistance in conjunction with its own micro-enterprise activity. This never happened, as the AMAREW project itself failed on implementing this important component of the project.

The component was based on the assumption that micro-enterprise development is an important element to the overall project objectives, but faces serious constraints within the target zones. The component was designed to develop locally appropriate and innovative strategies for diversification of livelihood systems. The intent was to manage the component within each woreda through agricultural officers, who would also assume responsibility for the micro-enterprise development

feasibility study and subsequent piloting of interventions. The need for staff with specialized qualification in product development, micro enterprise development, market development and organization of beneficiaries was overlooked. This has contributed to the poor implementation of the component. No studies on potentially feasible enterprises for the pilot PAs were conducted, rather activities under the component and directional recommendations were left to be determined through an external consultant study. This lack of clear problem analysis and pre-planning contributed to the poor implementation of the component.

It was also originally envisioned that staff from the regional micro- and small-scale business enterprise development agency and the Amhara Credit and Saving Institute (ACSI) would be integrated within the component. Unfortunately, this never came to pass as regional community micro-enterprise development was in fact at an immature stage in the region. An external consultant studied the component development and presented findings at the end of 2004. Original activity plans for a participatory assessment of market information, and recommendations for establishing cooperatives and community linkages to skill training institutes were adequately achieved. With the exception of the establishment of a tannery cooperative around Sekota town, potential and feasible micro enterprises have not been identified.

## **G. CAPACITY BUILDING**

In general, the capacity building component of the project is well organized and executed. It is divided into two broad sections: 1) capacity building for local government and 2) capacity building for the community. Capacity building targeting local government was aimed at strengthening the newly decentralized structures of the woreda through the provision of technical, material, training, mentoring and implementation support. At the community level, interventions were designed to train community members on different sector specific technical subjects and on general community mobilization and planning approaches (using Local Level Planning and Participatory Approach (LLPPA)).

The capacity building component of the project was well integrated at the project design level. The component was designed to attain the following objective: *“to strengthen the institutional capacity of community based intuitions and local government authorities in both woredas to plan and implement livelihood security initiatives in the woreda.”* Thus the set objective is wider and more comprehensive than might be realistically attainable in the three year project timeframe, especially given the marginalized and inadequate human and financial resource situations of Sekata and Gubalafto woredas.

The newly decentralized structures that enable local decision making have helped the project deal more effectively with local authorities especially in terms of provision of necessary supports as well as maximizing the use of human resources, such as government DAs already assigned at local PA levels. To promote local capacity building, the project created new institutions including the Kebele Development Committees (KDC), specialized Water User Committees (WUC) and Farmer Field School (FFS). The project also made use of existing community institutes such as ‘Q’ires’, Burial Societies, PA and *Gott* structures and included them as part of the integrated community mobilization strategy.

According to the organizational structure of SC UK, implementing responsibilities for the capacity building component were left to be carried out either by other sector officers or by government professionals assigned in the woredas. As a result, some of the trainings and experience sharing visits did not occur on schedule. Furthermore, the regional line office authorities (FSPC&DP) have

complained that the region didn't use many of the short-term trainings and consultancy services that were planned by the project. Relying on government staff for training left the project vulnerable to frequent staff turnover and open the risk of conflicting priorities. This negatively impacted project results.

Eight areas of capacity building support were identified in the project technical proposal. With the exception of a few trainings and experience sharing visits, most of the capacity building activities were accomplished per the envisioned plan. The project provided inputs such as vehicles (motor bikes), computers, stationery materials, fuel and per-diem necessary for the monitoring and supervision at woreda level. Some manuals and training material were developed and distributed for use in community trainings. The allocation of a directed budget line item ("partners monitoring cost") and its effective use is one of the best practices applied by R2D project. This has filled the resource gaps of local government bodies and smoothed relationships with implementing partners.

Locally facilitated on-the-job training, field trips and trainings outside of the region (as far as Kenya) were also organized for government staff by the project. Thus, despite many complaints raised questioning the lack of capacity building resources designated for the community level, the evaluation team believes that many efforts were made by the project to attain its planned objective of strengthening capacities of local government authorities and beneficiary communities of both woredas (see Annex F for details).

### **Impact of the Capacity Building Component**

Steering Committees and Task Forces were organized, trained, equipped and strengthened in both woredas and became functionally active. In all PAs of both woredas, Kebele Development Committees were organized, trained, equipped and strengthened to be active participants in planning and implementing development works in their respective PAs. Furthermore KDC's ability to mobilize their community members for development objectives and protection of communal asset such as enclosed areas, conservation projects, water harvesting and utilization structures have been enhanced.

As a result of the capacity building activities, strong relationships and enhanced mutual understandings were created between the project and woreda level government authorities and professionals. Furthermore, an increased sense of ownership and attitudinal changes has been instilled in local government authorities and beneficiary communities. As a result, some communities have decided to volunteer two days of free public works in their PAs. Similarly, though not *en masse*, a sense of reduced dependency on relief aid is growing in some communities as beneficiaries are going back to their fields to rehabilitate their lands and resume cultivation. Undoubtedly, these are crucial steps to guarantee sustainability of project outputs. Thus, the evaluation team is confident in saying that this is a good start (if not entirely sufficient) toward enhancing the social capital potential of the communities of both woredas.

## **VII. PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION**

With regard to partnership and coordination, the project was designed to assemble key partners that would bring a complete package of mobilization and leveraging resources including food, funding, expertise, facilitation, coordination and field implementation expertise. The overall performance of the project partners exceeded expectations.

USAID/Ethiopia initiated and funded the R2D project, taking the relief to development approach as the path from continued food aid dependency toward sustainable livelihood, and incorporating it into its long-term assistance portfolio. While USAID contributed the financial and food resources, SC UK, along with other partners used their administrative, technical and area experience to implement the project.

SC UK had entered into a partnership with the Organization for Rehabilitation and Development in Amhara (ORDA) to implement the Food Aid Distribution and infrastructure development component including safe water and small-scale irrigation schemes. The other implementing partner of R2D is the Amhara Micro-Enterprise Development, Agriculture Research, Extension and Watershed Management (AMAREW) Project with whom SC UK signed a joint Memorandum of Understanding. AMAREW took the responsibility of developing two watersheds with their respective communities in collaboration with the Regional and Woreda level Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development. After visiting the two watersheds and talking with the beneficiaries and stakeholder groups, the evaluation team found the integrated watershed development work exemplary. The Region can look to this model to effectively replicate in other woredas provided adequate resources are mobilized.

The Regional Food Security Program Coordination and Disaster Prevention (FSPC&DP) office provided policy guidance and interpretation to the project. The RIT acted effectively as the provider of policy and strategic guidance including resolving issues that would have potentially derailed implementation. The Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development (BoARD) played a key role both an oversight capacity and actual implementation. Other partners included the various woreda administration and offices including agriculture, health, culture, youth and sports.

The evaluation team was satisfied regarding the level of partnership and collaborative work at the woreda level, noting a high degree of dedication, enthusiasm and a spirit of teamwork. The woredas level partners, including the Bureaus of Agriculture and Health, should be appreciated for their goodwill and leadership. The woreda Steering Committees worked with good team spirit to implement field activities.

At the Kebele (PA) level, the performance of the Kebele Development Committees (KDC) was exemplary in terms of ownership, accountability, and transparent decision making processes. At the beneficiary group level, there were sub-sector/task committees that organized a number of beneficiaries (such as crop or watershed committees) that were mobilized and trained to work on projects that benefited either the household or the community. In addition to these committees, R2D had promoters that provided awareness and day-to-day hands-on training on issues such as health and nutrition, sanitation and hygiene, HIV/AIDS, etc. The woreda and kebele committee members were provided with adequate training and support to enhance their administrative and technical capability. Annual plans, quarterly meetings and reports, and mid-year reviews supplemented all committee activities.

Except for misunderstanding between ORDA and SC UK caused by lack of communication and clarity at the initial stage of R2D, partnership between the project and other implementing partners was smooth. In particular, the partnerships at the woreda level were exemplary. The evaluation team heard from every partner without exception that the woreda partners worked in unison as one team in both pilot woredas regardless of the different agencies they represented. The partnership worked as a result of good policy guidance and effective coordination by the RIT and its chair

person, close monitoring and follow-up on the part of R2D's Chief of Party and Project Manager, Woreda R2D Project Coordinators and the enthusiastic willingness and resourcefulness of woreda government including the agriculture and health and HAPCO bureaus.

## VIII. IMPACT ON GENDER EMPOWERMENT

The evaluation team appreciated the R2D's recognition of both the practical and strategic gender needs inherent in this project and for placing a high value on the economic and social empowerment of women.

The team has observed equal and in some cases a higher rate of representation among women beneficiaries in all the project components. Women were also involved in community decision-making processes through the KDC and subject matter/task force committees. Beneficiary women testified that their lives have changed positively thanks to their participation in the project components (especially under the ICM and restocking initiatives). Women community promoters (13 mothers in each PA) have also generated significant economic and social benefits for women in the community. Health Promoters are still seen as models for other women in the community.

## IX. CONSISTENCY WITH USAID STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

As a result of this project, significant progress toward two designated Strategic Objectives and applicable Intermediate Results were achieved.

**SO 11: Mitigate the effect of disaster (MED).** The food aid distribution component was well targeted, timely and contained appropriate disaster response actions which have saved many lives. The most vulnerable populations were effectively targeted and supported. As a result, these vulnerable groups have begun to participate in development work within their PAs. They have started to accumulate some tangible assets through participation in the EGS works and restocking scheme. The integrated watershed management and other natural resource conservation activities were also other major initiatives designed to mitigate the impact of future disasters. Furthermore, many households have benefited in terms of asset building through participation in EGS/FFW programs, which represent the only employment creation activities in the target areas.

**SO 7: Rural household production and productivity increased (RHPP).** This SO was also addressed in an encouraging and effective way. The restocking of small ruminants was a successful intervention designed to increase and stabilize household cash income. Those families that participated (though small in number compared to existing need) became full-time herders and were able to pay back their loans by transferring stock to the next beneficiary after the first breeding cycle. Of special note is the undeniable impact his component had on the lives of women. Through its partner AMAREW, the project has been working indirectly with the regional research institute, ARARI. Enormous collaborative benefits were attained in the area of watershed management and conservation of natural resources. Furthermore, the project worked with ARARI's Sirinka Research Center to disseminate research outputs (such as the provision of striga resistant sorghum varieties and high yield triticale). Through its training programs and establishment of Farmers Field Schools (FFS), the project introduced livestock health services, improved crop and pest management practices, and other new technologies to rural farmers.

Though their numbers are still quite low, many rural households have begun to benefit from water harvesting systems and small scale irrigation schemes implemented by the project.

In general, though many activities must still be considered to be in their start-up stages, appropriate and encouraging measures that are consistent with USAID/Ethiopia's long-term strategic objectives were successfully undertaken by the project during its implementation period.

## X. PROJECT FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

The project was financed by two grants:

- Food for Peace grant no. FFP-A-00-02-00111-00; and
- R2D Development Assistance grant no. 663-A-00-02-00381.

The project has received an obligated amount of USD 1,509,961 from FFP and USD 2,275,527 from R2D Development Assistance, totaling USD 3,785,488 for three years (September 2002-December 2005). According to an SC UK financial report for the same period, total expenditures were USD 1,504,047 from FFP grant and USD 1,810,403 from Development Assistance (USD 3,314,450 in total). The balance of USD 465,123 from FFP grant and USD 5,914 from Development Assistance were not used.

Concerning the financial report (H), the evaluation team has the following observations:

- Since it is beyond the scope of the technical evaluation, the financial report should not be considered for any kind of auditing by the evaluation team. Rather, a financial examination by a qualified auditor is required.
- The project was not able to use the entire obligated amount, due primarily to the number of beneficiaries being reduced in 2004. As a result the FFP grant was underused since it was directly attached to the amount of food distributed.
- Important discrepancies exist between accomplishment of physical activities (September 2002 - December 2004) and financial report (September 2002- December 2005).
- Approved budget line items are not self explanatory or sufficiently detailed for partners (other than USAID and SC UK) to readily understand how the money was spent.
- Is not clear when or how the budget line "expanded integration of HIV/AIDS awareness" (USD 369,201) was spent.

## XI. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

Apart from this the following minor problems cited below, all partners reported no major problems with food commodity supply.

1. **Inadequate matching financial resources for volume of food aid.** All partners including ORDA, SC UK, and government line offices complained about the low level of cash resource allocation, which was required to cover some critical costs such as the purchase of hand tools and others support items.
2. **Temporary shortage of warehouse spaces.** Due to the seasonality of the interventions and to the fact that the administration of food aid warehouses falls to one organization (ORDA), all food commodities intended for the WFP, Rural and Agricultural Development office and other

NGOs, arrive in the region at once or within a very short time frame. As a result, short-term storage space is at a premium and distribution efficiency suffers due to inadequate space, poor logistics and inefficient record keeping.

3. **Protracted process of food payment approval.** Registration of beneficiaries begins at the PA level with names submitted to the Woreda R&A Development Office conservation expert for verification, before going to the Extension Team Leader, then passes for approval to the head of the R&A Development Office. The list is then sent on to the SC UK agricultural officer for verification, onto SC UK Woreda Coordinators and finally to ORDA to effect the payment. Regional ORDA store keepers then give appointments to community members for a time to come and collect their food. This bureaucratic chain of is time consuming and tedious at best, but grinds to a halt when the responsible in charge is away for any reason.
4. **Location of distribution centers.** Some distribution centers are located as far as two days journey by foot from the PAs they serve (for example, recipients from the Bora PA must travel to Abergale center in Sekota). With the exception of a few centers located around woreda capitals, a full day's journey to the nearest distribution center is not uncommon. There are only four centers in Sekota and five in Gubalafto to supply to entire woreda.
5. **Exclusion of eligible beneficiaries.** It was a common occurrence that some poor and disabled members of the household and in some cases more than half of household members were excluded from all food aid distributions due to the limited number of households or individuals included in the national annual appeal. It was reported by Ahun Tegegn PA of Gubalafto Woreda during a group discussion that the problem was very common during implementation of R2D, and that the problem is even more pronounced in the current Safety Net Program.
6. **Late start of HIV/AIDS activities.** Activities started under a cost extension at the end of 2004. As a result most of planned activities for this sub-component were implemented after the transfer of R2D to RDIR.
7. **Unsustainable FFW payment arrangement for community promoters' work.** As a result of the re-targeting process in the safety-net criteria of RDIR, this compensation arrangement could no longer work. Lack of compensation for the local community promoters will negatively affect their continued effectiveness, undermines the training and capacity building accomplished during the project and demonstrates the unsustainability of the remuneration arrangement.
8. **Poor design and implementation of the MED component.** Government micro- and small-scale enterprise agencies at woreda levels do not have the expertise and experience to provide effective assistance in the intended study and implementation of the MED component. Moreover, the project-recruited consultant was not sufficiently competent to develop innovative activities. Delay in the consultancy led to further delays in actual implementation of activities. Inadequate follow-up for the component at all levels was also a reason for the poor performance of the component.
9. **High government staff turn-over.** This perennial problem seriously impacted the R2D work. Staff turnover means not only that project funded training is effectively "lost" to a region where there are no active interventions, but new resources must be dedicated to train the replacement staff. In addition, lack of trained staff translated to a shortage of qualified individuals to lead community and DA trainings.

10. **Shortage of refresher training.** Several communities stated that while the project was strong in providing initial high quality training, it was weak in providing periodic follow-up. It was felt follow-up would have provided an opportunity to reinforced and further develop training, particularly given that many stakeholders rely on memory only to retain information.
11. **Some planned short term trainings not accomplished.** The regional FSPC&DP office head noted that they missed many short-term trainings and consultancy services included in the project. This not only affected the project implementation but also reduced the opportunity to enhance overall capacity in the region.

## **XII. LESSONS LEARNED**

1. The pilot project effectively demonstrated that it is possible to link relief resources to development activities and attain both objectives at the same time. The effectiveness of the EGS approach is the best lesson that could be applied when ever relief food aid distribution is sought. Linking the receipt of food aid with some degree of active participation in development initiatives is an innovative and effective way of reducing dependency on continual relief resources.
2. Facilitating the active participation among community members at every decision making level is another strong lesson that could be drawn from R2D project implementation process. By encouraging transparency among local government partners and beneficiary communities, the project gain full local and regional support, ensuring the smoothest possible implementation of planned activities. Creation of local RIT and WSC groups and empowering them in decision making and implementation contributed greatly to the successes of the project.
3. FFW is an effective way of encouraging middle wealth households to create more diversified assets and generate more livelihood income, provided the ration size is sufficient.
4. Fostering clear linkages between nutrition, health and agricultural development activities leads to a larger food security impact at household levels.
5. Enthusiasm and a willingness to share and teach others are more important selection criteria than education level when choosing community promoters for training.
6. HIV/AIDS education materials could benefit by being more targeted to the specific circumstances of each target location.
7. Home visits by health promoters were often a more effective method to transfer nutrition and health information than mass group meetings, as promoters were able to meet one on one, evaluate conditions within the home and tailor their messages accordingly. Private meetings also allowed for information exchange on sensitive topics, which might not be discussed in an open forum. An integrated approach using both home visits and group meetings should be included as part of future health education efforts.
8. Using FFW as payment incentive for community promoters is an innovative way of adding value to food aid, although it does not guarantee sustainability of the activity should such payments stop.

9. Community structures organized at regional (RIT) and woreda (WSC and Technical Task Force) level are new, innovative approaches that have greatly enhanced collaboration, communication and decision making capacity on many difficult and contentious issues.
10. Community-level organization of KDCs, coupled with different community mobilizations and leadership trainings greatly contributed to the successful implementation of project objectives.
11. Allocation of dedicated budget allowances for implementing partners solved problems that could have arisen from scarcity of financial resources in government offices.

### **XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1) Donors should heed the lessons learned from the effective blending of food and financial resources and make an effort to support similar projects targeting the poorest of the poor.
- 2) In order to effectively monitor project performance, donors such as USAID need to organize and sponsor training on performance planning management, determination of performance indicators, grants management, household survey techniques and preparation of strategic plans.
- 3) Given the successful partnership between R2D and the AMAREW Project, other donors and the Government need to take foster this collaborative approach within its sustainable development programming and relief and recovery assistance programs.
- 4) The partnerships with local organizations and Government offices were a valuable aspect of R2D (both in terms of implementation and capacity building). This approach should be encouraged in other projects throughout the region.
- 5) Early termination of projects should be avoided as much as possible in order to achieve intended objectives and impacts.
- 6) Providing loans and “in-kind” or revolving repayment systems worked very effectively in R2D. This approach should be promoted to serve the very poor target populations who are not eligible for MFI loans.
- 7) The integrated approach to watershed management that demonstrated significant improvements in rehabilitation of denuded lands should be promoted in other similar landscapes.
- 8) The shortage of qualified professionals and the high rate of staff turnover at Woreda level should be considered during project design. Implementing agencies should plan appropriate mitigating measures to fill the inevitable staffing gaps during implementation.
- 9) Implementing agencies should take full advantage of local and expat expertise when designing complex programs such as Micro-Enterprise Development, and should use qualified professional during implementation.

- 10) Accomplishments and lessons learned should be disseminated to stakeholders including the regional and local government, NGOs and communities.
- 11) The use local experts for short-term consultancies (STTA) should be encourages by the donors as much as possible.
- 12) Using Community Promoters proved to be successful approach to reach large numbers of beneficiaries within remote communities. However, periodic follow-up visits by project staff and refresher trainings should be part of the project plan. A sustainable form of compensation for Promoters needs to be developed.
- 13) Micro-enterprise development could be an important tool for local income generation, especially in areas where traditional agriculture is not viable. However, more research is needed in order to develop innovative ideas for enterprise development that are viable and sustainable in the Ethiopian context.

## Annex A: Evaluation Questionnaire/Interview Checklist

### I. Food Aid Distribution

- a. What were the types and rates of food aid distributions? Who decided on their applications? Were they appropriate and accepted by beneficiary communities?
- b. How the beneficiaries were identified and selected for each type of food aid distributions? What were the criteria applied?
- c. What were the plans and their accomplishments?

S/N	Type Of Food Aid	Planned (In Tons)			Accomplished (In Tons)			Beneficiary Hhs.			Remarks
		Wheat	Oil	CSB	Wheat	Oil	CSB	MH	FH	T	

- d. Organization & management
  - i. Who were directly in charge of beneficiary identifications, registration, distribution and monitoring?
  - ii. How many food distribution centers were established and used effectively?
  - iii. What are the feed backs from beneficiaries? Are they satisfied with the approaches and methods applied?
- e. SWOT analysis of the food aid distribution process:
  - i. What were the main strengths observed?
  - ii. What were the main weaknesses observed?
  - iii. What were the main opportunities encountered that were used or not used?
  - iv. What were the main challenges encountered and solutions sought to solve them?

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a random check on registration books;</li> <li>• Conduct beneficiary interview;</li> <li>• Make overview observations.</li> </ul> |
|--|

### II. Use of Improved Technologies

- a. What was the development themes identified?
- b. List which sub sectors were planned to be covered and accomplished?
- c. What technologies were initially identified? Were they appropriate?
- d. From those identified which ones were introduced to the beneficiary communities and properly defused?
- e. Which ones were successfully adopted? (Percentage of beneficiaries showed improvements in productivity and production due to the use of the new technologies.)
- f. Are the adopted technologies sustainable?
- g. How can one prove that for a long term?
- h. What are overall improvements and changes came in terms of:
  - i. Productivity increase?
  - ii. Total production growth?
  - iii. HH income increase?

- iv. HH asset protection? (livestock, farm land, farm tools and other domestic assets)
- i. SWOT analysis of the use of improved technologies:
  - i. What were the main strengths observed?
  - ii. What were the main weaknesses observed?
  - iii. What were the main opportunities encountered that were used or not used?
  - iv. What were the main challenges encountered and solutions sought to solve them?

- Conduct beneficiary interview;
- Make overview observations.

### III. Natural Resources conservations and environmental protection

#### a. Planned and accomplished activities

S/N	Activities	Unit	Planned	Accomplished	Beneficiary HHs			Remarks
					MH	FH	T	
1	Afforestation							
2	Soil conservation 1. 2. 3.							
3	Water harvesting 1. 2. 3.							
4	Integrated water shade management							
5	Feeder roads constr.							

- b. What were the criteria used for identification and selection of:
  - i. Catchments:
  - ii. Beneficiaries:
- c. Organization, management and monitoring of the implementation:
  - i. Organization:
  - ii. Management:
  - iii. Monitoring:
- d. Who will follow up the long term sustainability of the activities?
- e. SWOT analysis of the NRC & EP:
  - i. What were the main strengths observed?
  - ii. What were the main weaknesses observed?
  - iii. What were the main opportunities encountered that were used or not used?
  - iv. What were the main challenges encountered and solutions sought to solve them?

- Conduct a random check on registration books;
- Conduct beneficiary interview;
- Make overview observations.

#### IV. Capacity Building

- a. What were planned for whom?
- b. Was the capacity of the project staff technically sufficient?
- c. What were the capacity building components given to:
  - i. Partner stakeholders
  - ii. General community
  - iii. Specific beneficiary HHs
- d. How far the capacity of the community enhanced to handle and solve their own problems in development?
- e. Are the implemented capacity building activities effective, efficient and appropriate?
- f. How was the preparation of local government partners to sustain the capacity building after the project phase out? (TOT given)
- g. SWOT analysis of the Capacity Building:
  - i. What were the main strengths observed?
  - ii. What were the main weaknesses observed?
  - iii. What were the main opportunities encountered that were used or not used?
  - iv. What were the main challenges encountered and solutions sought to solve them?

- Check whether the supports include: technical, material, financial and improved systems;
- Conduct beneficiary interview;
- Make overview observations;

#### V. Health, Nutrition and HIV/AIDS

- a. What were the activities planned and accomplished?

S/N	Activities	Unit	Planned	Accomplished	Beneficiary HH			Remarks
					MH	FH	T	

- b. What are the feedbacks from:
  - i. Local government partners
  - ii. Local NGOs
  - iii. beneficiaries
- c. How was the preparation of local government partners to sustain the services after the project phase out? (in terms of special trainings and infrastructures)
- d. SWOT analysis of the HN & HIV/AIDS:
  - i. What were the main strengths observed?
  - ii. What were the main weaknesses observed?
  - iii. What were the main opportunities encountered that were used or not used?
  - iv. What were the main challenges encountered and solutions sought to solve them?

- Conduct beneficiary interview;
- Make overview observations;

## VI. Off farm activities

### a. Planned and accomplished activities

S/N	Activities	Unit	Planned	Accomplished	Beneficiary HH			Remarks
					MH	FH	T	

### b. SWOT analysis of the off farm activities:

- i. What were the main strengths observed?
- ii. What were the main weaknesses observed?
- iii. What were the main opportunities encountered that were used or not used?
- iv. What were the main challenges encountered and solutions sought to solve them?

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct beneficiary interview;</li> <li>• Make overview observations;</li> </ul> |
|---|

## VII. Overall assessment

- a. Was the project planning or technical proposal appropriate?
  - i. Were the SOs and IRs well structured?
  - ii. Were the implementation strategies coherent with SOs and IRs?
  - iii. Were the activities sufficiently detailed?
  - iv. Were the funding and time sufficient to attain the intended results?
- b. Was the project successfully implemented?
  - i. Are all activities implemented?
  - ii. Are the intended beneficiaries reached?
  - iii. Are the intended areas (PAs) covered?
- c. To what extent the community has participated:
  - i. On planning and designing (need identification)?
  - ii. On implementation?
  - iii. On monitoring and follow-up?
- d. Was the RIT actively involved in implementation and monitoring?
  - i. Were their meeting schedules regular and effective? How many meetings were conducted in three years of project life?
  - ii. Were they make frequent field visits to verify the reported accomplishments of activities? How many?  

Check for field visit reports if any.
---------------------------------------
  - iii. Were they providing technical and administrative supports? For example, like what?
- e. Were the woreda and kebele level RITs established and actively involved in implementation and monitoring?
  - i. Were their meeting schedules regular and effective? How many meetings were conducted in three years of project life?
  - ii. Were they make frequent field visits to verify the reported accomplishments of activities? How many?  

Check for field visit reports if any.
---------------------------------------

- iii. Were they providing technical and administrative supports? For example, like what?
- f. Was the mid-term internal evaluation conducted? By whom? When? Where is its report?
- g. Was the project phasing out accomplished properly?
  - i. Is there a terminal report submitted to government and donor?
  - ii. Were the project activities handed over to responsible government bodies?
  - iii. Were the project capital assets handed over to appropriate partners?
- h. What are the effects of the project on:
  - i. Increasing productivity and production?
  - ii. Increased income of the beneficiaries?
  - iii. Diversification of beneficiary's income and asset?
- i. How far the project is replicable in terms of :
  - i. Area? Activities? Cost effectiveness or efficiency? Coordination?
  - ii. Monitoring and follow up?
  - iii. SWOT?
- j. What are the best practices learned from the project to be replicated some where else?

## **Annex B: Scope of Work, Methodology, Work Plan**

### **i. Scope of Work**

The final R2D evaluation will have the following specific objectives:

- To assess, analyze and document the achievements/performance against the plan and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation through the review of documents, inspection of field activities and assessment of the views of the target groups, project staff, partner institutions, USAID/E, and other stakeholders.
  - assess the views of target groups, project staff, partner institutions, funding agency (in particular USAID/E BEAT and ALT) and key stakeholders.
  - assess, analyze and document the impact of and change brought about by the project and evaluate against the planned impact as envisioned in the project document.
- To assess the sustainability and replicability of project achievements.
  - Assess and analyze the overall impact attributed by the project
  - Assess the sustainability and replicability of the project.
  - Analyze the extent to which the project has influenced the wider policy environment in order not to run the risk of being an island of excellence and a one time showcase.
  - Comment on gaps, constraints, prospects and conditions for future sustainability of project.
  - Based on the assessments, draw relevant recommendations and lessons learnt for future project direction and areas of emphasis.
- Identification and planning
  - Analyze on how the project was identified and planned. Assess the strengths and weaknesses in project design, and flexibility in adjusting to prevailing constraints, gaps, opportunities and other conditions.
- To assess the progress of the project towards achieving its goal and objectives and the appropriateness of the objectives in addressing the saving lives and linking relief to development activities to meet the food security problems of the project areas.
- To assess the relevance of purpose, outputs and activities of the project in light of the external and internal environment and make recommendations on future programming combining relief aid and livelihoods.
  - Inspect field activities and review achievements in line with the set goals and objectivities.
- To assess any improvements made in reference to the initial outputs, purposes and activities of the project. To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the project approaches and activities accomplished so far to achieve its objectives.
- To evaluate contribution to USAID strategic objectives as stated in the PMP and gather information on the impact indicators evaluating the measurable (quantitative and qualitative) impact of R2D towards those strategic objectives.
- To review factors (internal and external) those are negatively or positively affecting the implementation of the project and come up with potential recommendations.
- To identify the major problems/constraints and issues which need to be addressed in the safety nets proposal and to fine-tune any future implementation practices based on analysis of R2D interventions.

- **Project Organization and Management**
  - Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the overall organization and management of the project
  - Assess the approaches used for reaching and organizing the target group. Assess the issues of equity-how women and other disadvantaged groups have been addressed and benefited from the project.
  - Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the project in involving the stakeholder in project implementation.

Based on the above analysis, the team is expected to document lessons learned and brings specific practical recommendations.

## **Outputs**

Outputs will include the following:

- 1) Analysis at the institutional level on capacity building to implement relief and food security programs.
- 2) Analysis of the effectiveness of the joint program planning, implementation and monitoring at different levels (Watershed, Kebele, Woreda, regional and national).
- 3) Analysis at the community level to implement food security and public works interventions and to mobilize communities in the planning and implementation process.
- 4) Assessment of the impact on communities of the relief (EGS & FFW) and development activities using the PMP impact indicators as guidelines but utilizing additional indicators and information to make the assessment.
- 5) Analysis of the impact on individuals and household income and asset protection and restoration of the specific livelihood interventions.
- 6) Lessons learned from the modalities of interventions used (or not used) by all stakeholders and implementers (SC UK, Regional and Woreda governments, ORDA, AMAREW and communities) and review of the significant issues that have helped or hindered implementation and impact of the project.
- 7) Stakeholder workshop that will review initial findings and incorporate comments from partners.
- 8) Draft report for comment from partners (USAID, Regional and Woreda governments, ORDA and SCUK).

## **Methodology and approach**

The team expected to use the different participatory assessment methods and tools. The following methods shall be considered:

### **Review of documents**

Review relevant documents, which include but not limited to: -

- Memorandum of understanding ( MOU) for the tri-partiat agreement between the USAID/Ethiopia mission, Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC), and the Amhara National Regional State (ANRS) for the pilot implementation of relief to development (R2D) program in two woredas (Gubalafto and Sekota) of ANRS
- R2D project documents, project amendments, study reports.
- Review of R2D annual, quarterly and periodic reports.
- RFA from USAID for the R2D initiative
- Safety Nets proposal

- PMP for R2D
- HIV/AIDS proposal
- Annual plans for the different years
- Different survey documents (Nutritional/health survey, food aid impact etc)
- Consultant report – ethnomet
- Consultant report – micro-enterprise development

### **Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions**

- Discuss with target and non-target beneficiary farmers in the project woredas and kebele.
- Visit activities (relief food distribution, food for work activities, seed and grain banks, agricultural, natural resource and income generating activities) at project sites.
- Discuss with institutions, communities, stakeholders, and collaborators in the target *woredas* and various zonal, regional and federal offices.
- Discuss with different training participants.
- Meet with SC UK staff, USAID, AMAREW project, relevant government officials in the Region and Woredas and ORDA staff.
- Have discussion with relevant USAID/E Business, Environment, Agriculture and Trade (BEAT) and Asset and Livelihoods (ALT) office chiefs, Project CTO and other relevant staff,
- Gather evidence on the PMP impact indicators and assess the impact on specific interventions on the overall objectives.
- Conduct interviews with farmers, short-term trainees, stakeholders, heads of institution or their delegates, program staff, funding agency (in particular with the staff of USAID/E and incorporate their attitude about the program.

### **Field visits and observations**

Visit various field activities in representative sites.

### **Synthesis and recommendations:**

- Analyze all the information and derive lessons from the project for methodologies that worked and ones that can be improved for future project activities to show impact.
- Document effects on individuals, households and the communities directly or indirectly involved in the project activities and how changes in the way households and communities are managing the resources provided under the project to restore and protect their assets.
- Record changes in the food security institutional capacity to implement future projects (Safety Nets and others).
- Make recommendations for future project, specifically including safety nets, on the basis of relevance, effectiveness, efficacy and sustainability of the project at a household, community and institutional level

### **Conduct a one day stakeholder's workshop**

- Based on all the assessments, findings and recommendations produce a zero draft evaluation report and present it to a one day stakeholder's workshop.
- Prepare the draft evaluation report based on the comments and feedback from the stakeholders' workshop.

### **Debriefing and reporting**

At the end and before finalizing the report, the evaluation team shall debrief the findings of the evaluation to USAID in Addis Ababa. The overall assessment and stakeholders discussion will take 25 days and the final draft evaluation report is expected to be submitted within 10 days period after completion of the evaluation.

The consultants are expected to deliver the following to USAID/Ethiopia on timely base:-

- Prior to the resumption of the task included in this SOW, a one week time is allowed for the consultants to propose and submit their detailed plan of action for approval by USAID/Ethiopia,
- Bi-weekly progress report, and
- Draft evaluation report
- Final evaluation report

The evaluation report should have the following format:

- The report format should be “Times New Roman” with 12 -font size.
- Executive Summary (not more than three pages);
- Findings, recommendations and other contents of the main report (not more than 25 pages)
- Annexes that include background and technical information ( $\leq$  10 pages).

USAID/Ethiopia will provide comments within two weeks of receipt of the draft. Within 15 working days of receipt of comments, the evaluator will provide USAID/Ethiopia with the final version of the report, after incorporating feedback on the draft. The contractor will also send one copy of the final report to PPC/CDIE/DI, in order to make the document available in the USAID library and database.

## ii. Methodology

A table indicating specific objectives of the scope of work, actions and means of verification of the end of project evaluation is presented below:

SOW Objectives	Action	Means of verification
1. Assess, analyze and document achievements/performance	1. a) Review objectives, indicators, targets and actual outcome of project; b) Interview target beneficiaries; c) Analyze qualitative and quantitative change in production, income, assets, wealth of target groups bench mark vs. actual); d) Assess views of stakeholders	Project document, progress reports (periodic reports), surveys; field visits; Interviews;
2. Assess the sustainability and replicability of project achievements	2. a) Assess overall benefit/impact of the project both at the household, village, community and woreda level; b) Assess how beneficiaries are geared to continue progress post-project, c) Assess if there is spillover effect on non target groups and woredas, d) Assess if the project is internalized and institutionalized in the community structure d) Identify gaps, weaknesses and constraints and strengths and opportunities for future projects	Interview non target groups, Interview partners, NGOs, etc, SWOT analysis
3. Assess Project Design and Planning Exercise	3. Identify approaches and methods used in the design and planning of the project and subsequent modifications and rectifications including participation, accountability, division of work, etc	Review documents, Interview core stakeholders
4. Assess project progress towards achieving its goal and objectives their appropriateness in saving lives and linking relief to development	4. Analyze how the qualitative and quantitative changes made in target beneficiaries is making a difference in their livelihoods, i.e., changes that brought sustained improvements in the lives of household members	Interviews, Physical observation of the household, Field assessment
5. Assess relevance of purpose, outputs and activities of project and make recommendations on future programming	5. Analyze field activities and outputs, and examine how each is linked to objectives and goals thru intermediate results and indicators;	Take inventory of activities and outputs and determine indicators
6. Assess improvements made on initial purpose, outputs, activities made and assess effectiveness	6. Review annual/periodic plans and reports and assess if changes result in increased efficiency	Documents and interviews
7. Evaluate contribution to USAID SOs,	7. Compile impact indicators and match with that of USAID's relevant SO, results and indicators	Documents, strategic objective document of USAID, PMPs.
8. Identify causes/factors that affect implementation positively and negatively	8. Prepare a short questionnaire by stakeholder to compile major causes and determine alternative recommendations	Interviews and own analysis and experience
9. Identify major problems and	9. Prepare a short questionnaire to compile major	Interviews and teams experience

<b>SOW Objectives</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>
<p>issues to be addressed to fine tune future projects</p> <p>10. Assess effectiveness and efficiency of the overall organization and management of the project</p> <p>11. Document lessons learned and propose practical recommendations</p>	<p>problems and issues and determine alternative solutions</p> <p>10. Assess how the project was organized and managed (review structure, staffing, decision making process, flow of information, allocation of resources and responsibility); Assess approach used to identify, reach and organize target beneficiaries including women and other disadvantaged group; assess involvement of each stakeholder in implementation, etc.</p> <p>11. a) Analyze and synthesize all the primary and secondary information, b) Document how project driven changes are making an impact on livelihoods at the individual, household and community level, c) Document institutional capacity to plan and implement future projects and d) Make recommendations for future R2D projects</p>	<p>Various documents, interviews, observation</p> <p>Analyses, facts and figures; best practices; stakeholders workshop etc.</p>

### iii. Work Plan

Detailed activities within the evaluation of the Relief to Development program, including preliminary document review, data processing, analysis and write-up are presented below:

Activity/Output	Starting/ending Day																																								
	May																			June																					
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Meeting with stakeholders, and funding agency	█	█																																							
Preparation & approval of work-plan proposal		█																																							
Collection and preliminary review <sup>10</sup> of project related documents			█	█	█																																				
Preparation of field check list and semi-structured interview questions ...etc					█	█	█																																		
Travel to Bahir Dar										█																															
Meeting and assessment of R2D project with regional government and project stakeholders											█																														
Travel to Sekota and meet project staff & local leaders												█																													
Assessment of project with implementers and partner institutions ( SWOT analysis)													█																												
Visit project activities and assess project with project beneficiaries (semi-structured interviewees)														█	█																										

<sup>10</sup> Preliminary document review is undertaken to acquire information on the R2D project nature, previous evaluations made and to identify gaps that need to be filled through the field assessment.

Activity/Output	Starting/ending Day																																			
	May														June																					
	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	12	16	19	
and focus group discussion)																																				
Travel to Gubalafto and meet project staff and local leaders																																				
Assessment of project with implementers and partner institutions ( SWOT analysis)																																				
Visit project activities and assess project with project beneficiaries (semi-structured interviewees and focus group discussion)																																				
Travel back to AA																																				
Comprehensive data analysis, interpretation and write-up																																				
Produce a Zero- draft evaluation report																																				
Stakeholders workshop																																				
Incorporate stakeholders comment and submit final evaluation report																																				

## **Annex C: List of Documents Reviewed**

### **Documents from Save the Children UK**

Proposals and reports

Relief to Development initiative in Sekota and Gubalafto woredas ANRS. Technical application for RFA # 663-02-A-005 revised proposal submitted by SC-UK, August, 2002, AA. Ethiopia.

SC-UK (Save the Children- United Kingdom), 2003. Relief to Development initiative for Sekota and Gubalafto woredas,ANRS. Summarized proposal for partners, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

----- Relief to Development project- Summary of accomplishments in the year 2003. (Oct 1/2002- Sept.30, 2003)

----- Relief to Development initiative for Sekota and Gubalafto woredas, ANRS, Annual Report for the period October 1to September 30, 2003, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

----- Relief to Development initiative for Sekota and Gubalafto woredas, ANRS, Annual Report for the period October 1 to September 30,2004, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

Reducing Dependency and increasing resiliency, improving capacity to implement safety net and farmer led livelihood development programs ANRS, Annual report 2005, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

#### *Study reports*

SC-UK(Save the Children- United Kingdom), 2003. Baseline KAP (Knowledge, Attitude and Practice) survey Gubalafto woreda, SC-UK, North wollo zone- Amhara region, Ethiopia

SC-UK(Save the Children- United Kingdom), 2004. Nutrition and Health Baseline Survey Sekota woreda (Wag Hamra Zone, Amhara region) Ethiopia.

SC-UK(Save the Children- United Kingdom), 2005. Impact of the Relief to Development Project, Gubalafto and Sekota woredaas, Amhara National Regional State on Food AID and Non Food AID Transfers, Nov. 2005, A report produced jointly by Acacia and Save the Children, Acacia Consultants Ltd. Nairobi, Kenya.

### **Documents from AMAREW**

Amhara Micro-enterprise development, Agricultural Research, Extension and Watershed management (AMAREW) Project Annual report 2003, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

----- Annual Report 2004, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

----- Annual Report 2005, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

### **Documents from ORDA**

ORDA(Organisation for Rehabilitation and Development in Amhara), 2005. Performance report of the R2D Project, February, 2005.

ORDA, 2004. R2D Project Annual Report for the year 2003, Bahir Dar, 2004.

Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2004. Productive Safety Net Program, Programme Implementation Manual, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

### **Memorandum of Understandings**

Memorandum of Understanding between AMAREW and SC-UK.

Project implementation agreement between Organization for Rehabilitation and Development in Amhara (ORDA) and Save the Children- UK on R2D initiatives in Gubalafto woreda of North wollo and Sekota woreda Wag Hamra Zones.

SC-UK Nutrition Assessment report- Ethiopia. Sekota woreda, wag Hamra zone Amhara region, June 2005, AA.

USAID mission to Ethiopia, Memorandum of Understanding for the Tripartite Agreement between the USAID/Ethiopia mission, Federal Disaster prevention and preparedness commission (FDPPC) and Amhara National regional State (ANRS) for the implementation of the R2D pilot program in two woredas (Gubalafto and Sekota ) of ANRS.

## Annex D: Offices and Farmer Communities Visited

### i. R2D project, donor, and implementing partners visited

Offices	Name of persons met and position
USAID- Ethiopia Addis Ababa	Dr. Belay Demisse Missilal Abraha Judith Sanford
SC-UK, Addis Ababa	Catherine
SC-UK, Bahir Dar	Georgia Rowe (Chief of Party (RDIR)) Getenew Zewdu (Regional Coordinator)
Regional FSPC/DP office, Bahir Dar	Amlaku Asres (Head)
ORDA, Bahir Dar	Debebe Degeffe (Desaster Prevention) Simegh Eshete (Planning Department) Yonas Gedamu (Monitoring and evaluation)
AMAREW Project, Bahir Dar	Dr. Birhane G/kidan (Manager) Getachew Bayaferse (Watershade management expert)
EPLAUA Office, Bahir Dar	Dr. Zerfu Hailu (Deputy Manager) Bayeh Tiruneh (Land tenure security and certification expert)
SC-UK project office, Sekota	Alebachew Aklile (Project coordinator) Teshome Sisay (Livelihood officer (RDIR)) Girmay Abadi (Nutrition, Health and HIV/AIDS officer)
Sekota Woreda, Wag Hamra Zone <i>(administration, agriculture &amp; rural development office, health office)</i>	Hailu Misaw (Administrator) Nigusu Tadesse (Head, Zone ARD Dept.) Mihiretu Molla (Team leader, agric. and natural resource team) Yilma Molla (Head, health office)
SC-UK Gubalafto office	Tesfu Kassaye (Senior project manager) Mohammed Kebede (RDIR project manager)
Gubalafto woreda <i>(Agriculture office, Health office, ORDA, Youth, Culture &amp; Sport office)</i>	Agegh Shebeshi (Deputy head, Agricultural office) Hamid Mekonen (Head, Health office) Solomon Asres (Head, ORDA office) Demisse Abebe (Head, Youth, Culture and Sport office)

ii. Farmer Groups met (Focus Group Discussion)

<b>Woreda</b>	<b>Communities</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
Seklota	Yeku Watershade	24	8	32
	Tiya	17	7	24
	Sirar	36	8	44
Gubalafto	Ahun Tegegh	22	11	33
	Hara	28	12	40
Total		127	46	173

## Annex E: List of Participants in Stakeholder Workshops

Name & Position	Address (office)
Solomon Demeke	SC-UK, Addis Ababa
Esayas Tadiowos	“
Tesfu Kassaye	SC-UK, Woldya
Missilal Abraha	USAID/Ethiopia
Tsegaye Boru	FSC/DP, Bahir Dar
Getanew Zewdu	SC-UK, Bahir Dar
Million Araya	SC-UK, Woldya
Mohamed Yemer	DPPC, Gubalafto
Wondyefraw Abebe	SC-UK, Sekota
Daniel H/Giorgis	ARDO, Sekota
Mesfin Arega	FSC/DP, Bahir Dar
Asamenew Abebe	“
Dr. Belay Demisse	USAID/Ethiopia
John Graham	USAID/Ethiopia
Georgia Rowe	SC-UK, Bahir Dar
Geremew Jemal	FSC/DP, Bahir Dar
Molla Tafere	BoARD, Bahir Dar
Shimelis Mohamed	ORDA, Bahir Dar
Dagnechew Gebeyehu	
Abate Maru	FSC/DP, Bahir Dar
Amlaku Asres	FSC/DP, Bahir, Dar

## Annex F: Accomplishment of Planned Activities in 2004

S.N	Descriptions of activity	Unit	FY Plan to date	FY Achievement to date	%	Remark
<b>1</b>	<b>Capacity Building</b>					
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Project coordination &amp; management</b>					
	Strengthening the existing steering committee	No	26	26	100	Woreda too busy
	Delivering management skill training for the steering committee	No	16	1	6	
	WSC conducts quarterly regular planning/review meetings and visiting projects	No	8	7	88	
	Delivering training for woreda technical team	No	-	-		
	Partners Monitoring cost	Birr	83,300	40,994	49	Woreda paid in Oct.
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Capacity of community based institutions enhanced</b>		-	-		
	Delivering COLTA for kebele coordination & other management comm.	Participant	110	81	74	
	Facilitating experience sharing visit with the woreda for farmers	Participant	25	19	76	
	Equipping DA's with necessary field equipment		-	-		
	Supporting community based institutes	No.	20	-	-	
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Participatory monitoring and evaluation systems developed &amp; put in place</b>		-	-		
	Delivering training on monitoring and evaluation	No.	21	-	-	
	Conducting annual participatory impact monitoring	PA's	10	5	50	Woreda busy and delayed until Dec.
	Conduct bi-annual project review meetings	No.	2	1	50	
	Compiling, analyzing and circulating market survey reports in each quarter	No.	5	4	80	
	Establish data base for the project	No.	2	2	100	
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Experience and lessons are documented &amp; disseminated</b>		-	-		
	Multidisciplinary experience sharing visit within & out of the woreda (experts & farmers)	No.	1	2	200	44 participants
	Woreda steering committee visiting communities & organizations in & out of the area	"	4	3	75	
	Preparation, circulation and presentation of technical papers based on experience of R2D	No.	3	1	33	
<b>1.5</b>	<b>Strengthening Woreda Early Warning System</b>		-	-		
	Calculating the 2004 annual appeal using house hold economy approach		2	2	100	

	Presentation of identified thematic issues for the woreda steering committee		-	-		
	Organizing household food economy training for woreda experts	part.	28	26	93	
	<b>2 Agriculture and Livestock</b>		-	-		
	<b>2.1 ICM-FFS established</b>		-	-		
	Follow up and strengthening existing FFS (inputs, equipment cost)	No.	11	11	100	
	Facilitate the establishment of FFS technology	No.	17	20	118	
	Establishing ICM-FFS for early adopters (risk minimization)	.	-	370		
	Provisions of field equipment and improved tech. (14 FFS x 2000 birr)	set	23	23	100	
	Provision of seeds (improved & local)	qt	24	23	96	
	Provision of seeds (improved & local) and other inputs	LS	5	12	240	
	Farmers and experts experience sharing visit	visit	3	-	-	
	Curriculum and guideline development for ICM-FFS	No.	2	2	100	
	TOT training on ICM-FFS for woreda experts	part.	13	7	54	
	Training of farmers on ICM-FFS	Part.	454	610	134	
	Training for follower farmers		-			
	Training of development agents on integrated crop production	part.	10	12	120	
	Production of extension materials (leaflet, posters etc)		2,500	-	-	
	Provisions of others pesticide control measures (peas fumigation center)	center	-	-		
	Collection of monitoring indicators	No.	4	3	75	
	Annual joint review meeting	No.	1	-	-	To be done in Dec.
	Training on compost preparation	part.	-	1,496		
	<b>2.2 HHs fruit trees in the homesteads</b>		-	-		
	Community consultation and site selection	PA's	8	3	38	
	Establishment of fruit gardens	site	2	2	100	
	Provisions of vegetable seeds	kg	40	31	76	
	Provisions of fruit seeds & seedlings	No.	1,700	1,061	62	
	Supporting the horticulture nursery site	site	2	2	100	
	Training farmers on fruit production	part.	174	12	7	Expert not available
	Training development agents on fruit production	part.	-	-		
	Monitoring and supervision of the fruit gardens	sup.	1	2	200	
	<b>2.3 CAHWs trained and equipped</b>		-	-		

	Training of CAHW's	trainees	15	14	93	
	Purchase and provision of veterinary drugs	set	-	-		
	Assess the impact of existing CAHW	No.	5	5	100	
	Carry out supervision and lessons learnt work shop with technicians & CAHW	W/p	1	-	-	Vet not available
	Selection and organizing of community management committee	comm.	11	11	100	
	Facilitation of management training for the community management steering committee	participants	50	68	136	
	Facilitate refreshment training for CAHW's	participants	15	15	100	
	Monitoring of CAHWs by the near by clinic on monthly basis	No.of visits	72	15	21	
	Monitoring of CAHWs by the near by clinic on monthly basis	No.of visits	5		-	
	Community evaluation of the CAHWs performance	No.of evaluation	-	-		
	Experience sharing among CAHWs	No.	1	1	100	
	Develop operational guide line for CAHWs	Guideline	1	-	-	
	Annual joint review of CAHWs performance at woreda level	No.	-	-		
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Healers of FFS identified &amp; strengthen and trade. Herbal medication recognized</b>		-	-		
	Establishing healers-FFS and deliver training	part.	90	-	-	
	Producing Ethno vet tech. guidelines and curriculum (expert support cost)	guideline	3	1	33	
	Provisions of protective clothing	set	35	-	-	
	Certification & recognitions of herbal	species	-	-		
	Supervisions and follow up (including CAHW)	sup.	3	-	-	Consultancy delayed, began this
	Facilitation of workshop with partners to discuss on findings		1	-	-	past qtr and will finish next qtr with report and continuation of activities.
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Forage development &amp; animal nutrition</b>		-	-		
	Forage development and animal nutrition training for DA's		10	-	-	
	Farmers training on forage development		75	214	285	
	Forage seed collection/purchasing (local & exotic)	qt	50	40	80	
	Forage seedling production	seedling	8,500	16,000	188	
	Forage strips establishment	km	30	1	3	
	Private/group forage nursery support (HH)	Households	30	15	50	
	Forage seed multiplication center establishment (1.5 Ha)	No.	1	1	100	
	Forage development on various developmental strategies	ha	13	40	308	
	Mixed pasture improvement on area closure	ha	-			

<b>2.6</b>	<b>promoting appropriate bee-keeping technology (5 colony)</b>		-	-		
	Animation and community consultation	benef.	535	450	84	
	Organize in group & deliver practical training for core farmers	trainee	175	169	97	
	training of farmers on bee-keeping	trainee	5	5	100	
	Refresher training	trainee	551	-	-	Expert not available in summer
	Facilitate purchase and Provision of colony	colony	1,705	819	48	Farmers did not complete all construction of top bar hives
	Follow up the existing demonstration site	site	1	1	100	
	Purchasing of honey extractor	set	2	2	100	
	Equipping farmers with protective clothes	set	-	45		
	Market promotion & net working service for bee products	group	1	-	-	
<b>2.7</b>	<b>Poultry</b>		-	-		
	Animation and community consultation	beneficiary.	850	900	106	
	Identifying and organize poultry beneficiaries groups	group	55	5	9	
	Training of beneficiary farmers	part.	800	37	5	
	Training of follower farmers(second level beneficiaries)	part.	-	-		
	Provisions and purchasing of birds	birds	3,600	1,392	39	Further problems in procurement
	Vaccination of birds during distribution	birds	539	1,392	258	
	provisions of grower's feed	qt	36	-	-	
	testing hay box chicken rearing technology	participants	10	-	-	
<b>2.8</b>	<b>Restocking (1:5)</b>		-	-		
	Community awareness , animation and beneficiaries selection	beneficiaries	738	906	123	
	Assist benef. to develop bye-laws in group & fund management	group	3	5	167	
	Provisions and facilitation of sheep/goat purchasing ( NEWLY TARGETED)	Sheep/goat	3,396	4,007	118	
	Provisions and facilitation of sheep/goat purchasing (Last year targeted benef.)	Sheep/goat	2,067	2,255	109	
	Provisions of vaccine service while purchasing shoats	Sheep/goat	2,196	3,026	138	
	Supervision and monitoring	sup.	x	x		
	Training of beneficiaries on restocking	trainee	800	786	98	
<b>2.9</b>	<b>Grain and seed bank established &amp; functional</b>		-	-		
	Training for management committee members of seed bank	Partic.	10	-	-	No expert available
	Support for seed bank construction	No.	3	3	100	
	Develop guideline and by-laws for seed bank	No.	2	2	100	

Supporting the existing grain bank beneficiaries	PA	1	1	100	
Identify & facilitate to organize beneficiaries for grain banks	PA	1	1	100	
Animation and facilitation to benef. to develop Governing bye-laws for grain banks	Benef.	104	100	96	
Facilitate communities to establish grain banks & store construction	store	1	1	100	
Facilitate communities to stock the start up capital of the organizational share for grain bank	qt	100	150	150	
Facilitate communities to develop operational guidelines for grain bank	guideline	-	-		
Training for grain bank beneficiaries	part.	-	-		
Training for seed bank management committee beneficiaries	part.	15		-	No expert available
Supervision and follow up of the previous grain banks	sup.	-	x		
<b>3 Micro enterprise development</b>		-	-		
Developing micro enterprise & marketing strategy	Strategy	2	2	100	Consultancy started this quarter, continuing now and no delays and continued programming ongoing.
Developing targeting operational manual	Manual	2	2	100	
Animation and identification	beneficiaries.	60	75	125	
Delivering training for target beneficiaries	Trainees	80	-	-	
Supporting target beneficiaries	Benef.	80	-	-	
<b>4 Environmental rehabilitation and protection</b>		-	-		
<b>4.1 Soil and water conservation</b>		-	-		
Soil bund construction	Km	585	106	18	
Soil bund maintenance	Km	24	-	-	
Stone bund construction	Km	-	-		
Stone bund maintenance	Km	-	-		
Stone faced soil bund construction	Km	396	268.6	68	
Fanyaju bund construction	Km	-	-		
Cut off drain construction	m3	46,140	39,113	85	
Cut off drain construction	km	106		-	
Cut off drain maintenance	Km	-	-		
Eyebrow basin construction	No.	52,500	58,616	112	
Herring bone construction	No.	16,300	8,540.0	52	
Trench construction	No.	60,000	115,100	192	
Improved pits	No.	2,081,817	2,876,392	138	
Check dam construction	m3	14,736	101,789	691	

	Check dam construction	km	61	36	58	
	Check dam maintenance	m3	-	1,601		
	Hillside terrace construction	km	3,891	5,496	141	
	Artificial water way construction	km.	2,800	-	-	
	Compost preparation	m3	190	220	116	
	Bund plantation	Km	1,973	575	29	
	Bund plantation	no	-	124565		0
	Gabion construction	m3	-	23,322		
	SS Dam Construction	m3	3,240	2500	77	
	Stone and sand collection	M <sup>3</sup>	-	27105		
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Afforestation</b>		-	-		
	Micro basin construction	No.	2,059,000	1,555,760	76	Nursery capacity overestimated during planning
	Support existing nurseries with materials	Birr	-	-		
	Seedling planting	No.	2,609,500	3,461,052	133	
	Seedling planting	No.	-			
	Supporting nurseries and seedling production	Seedling	1,560,000	611,786	39	
	Promote the establishment of individual nurseries	No.	-	-		
	Mobile nursery establishment	No.	15	51	340	
	Forest development and area closure	Ha.				Area enclosure and enrichment planting
			2,911		-	
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Water harvesting</b>		-	-		
	Support the on going Water harvesting structures	No.	800	407	51	
	Rock fill dam construction	No.	128	513	401	
	Series of pond construction	No.	182	1,680	923	
	Micro pond construction	No.	20	13	65	A total of 39000 M <sup>3</sup>
	Micro pond construction	M3	-	5,516		
	Pond maintenance	M3	-	170		
	Sand collection	M3	-	-		
	Stone collection	m3	7,000	49,042	701	
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Infrastructure</b>		-	-		
	Feeder road construction	Km	80	170	213	

	Feeder road maintenance	km	168	228	136	
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Capacity building/Training, workshops, review meetings, etc</b>		-	-		
	Forepersons training on SWC and rural road construction	Part.	30	433	1,443	
	Watershed planning using LLPPA for development agents	Part.	44	69	157	In Gubalafto 32 DAs were trained in the second quarter
	Soil and water conservation training for development agents	Part.	20	27	135	
	EGS familiarization workshop	Part.	-	-		
	Review on EGS, FFW and WH activities and off-the-shelf projects	Part.	130	260	200	
	Purchasing and distribution of field equipment for woreda line offices		49	49	100	
	Farmers to farmers visit	part.	39	39	100	
	Conducting workshop on area closure	part.	-	-		
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Water point development</b>		-	-		
	Spring development	No..	6	4	67	
	Spring site clearing	No..	2	-	-	
	Hand dug well	No..	1	2	200	
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Traditional Small scale irrigation</b>	Sch	-	-		
	Upgrading traditional irrigation schemes	Sch	6	6	100	
	Irrigation canal construction	Km.	-	-		
	Irrigation canal construction	m <sup>3</sup>	-	12,255		
	Irrigation canal maintenance		-	-		
<b>5</b>	<b>Health and HIV/AIDS</b>		-	-		
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Training and equipping community health promoters</b>	Part.	-	-		
	Training of village promoters	Part.	81	79	98	
	Refreshing training for promoters and supervisors	Part.	71	-	-	Project started late as SC UK staff was reassigned to emergency in east.
	Quarterly supervision meeting	No.	6	3	50	Project now moving forward well.
	Purchasing uniform for supervisors	No.	20	18	90	
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Publication</b>		-	-		
	BCC materials production	No.	2	2	100	
	Familiarization of BBC materials	workshop	2	2	100	
	Distribution of BCC materials	action	2	2	100	
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Community Nutrition</b>		-	-		
	Identification of volunteer mothers	mothers	142	134	94	

	Provision of appropriate seed/seedling	mothers	142	127	89	
<b>5.3</b>	<b>HIV/AIDS</b>		-	-		
	Training on HIV/AIDS awareness creation program	trainees	50	-	-	Proposal accepted late and Gubalafto not allowing implementation of project.
	Refreshment training on HIV/AIDS	trainees	-	-		
	Bi-annual HIV/AIDS review meeting	No.	3	-	-	

## Annex G: EGS and FFW Report in R2D Woredas

S.No.	Activity lists	Unit	Sekota		Gubalafto		Total		%
			Planned	Achievement	Planned	Achievement	Planned	Achievement	
1	Soil bund	KM	0	0	53.67	19.16	53.67	19.16	35.7
2	Stone bund construction	KM	120.476	210.604	45.83	15.415	166.306	226.019	135.9
3	Stone bund maintenance	KM	0	57.532		0	1	57.532	5753.2
4	Stone faced soil bund	KM	0	0	138.13	15.63	138.13	15.63	11.3
5	Faynaju bund	KM	0	0	3.125	0	3.125	0	0.0
6	Cut off drain construction	M3	0	0	29417	33589	29417	33589	114.2
7	Cut off drain construction	M	0	0	0	489	1	489	48900.0
8	Cut off drain maintenance	M	0	0	0		1	0	0.0
8	Cut off drain maintenance	M	0	0	0	1938	1	1938	193800.0
9	Check dam construction	M <sup>3</sup>	32675	87876	0	0	32675	87876	268.9
10	Check dam construction	M		0	48899	29007	48899	29007	59.3
11	Check dam maintenance	M		0		5290	1	5290	529000.0
12	Check dam maintenance	M3	5000	9030	0		5000	9030	180.6
13	Hillside terrace	KM	424.62	937.94	157.88	100.84	582.5	1038.78	178.3
14	Pitting & re-pitting	No.	0	0	339703	366603	339703	366603	107.9
15	Irrigation canal construction	Km	0	0	2.04	18.175	2.04	18.175	890.9
16	Irrigation canal Maintenance	KM	0	0	-	-	1		0.0
17	Micro-basinet construction	No.	0	0	339703	129665	339703	129665	38.2
18	Trench	M3	77177	86984	0	0	77177	86984	112.7
19	Pond maintenance	M <sup>3</sup>	0	0	60	4	60	4	6.7
20	Water harvesting	M <sup>3</sup>			2762	2700	2762	2700	97.8
21	Water harvesting	No.	200	218			200	218	109.0
22	Foot path construction	KM	0		37	118	37	118	318.9
23	Foot path maintenance	KM	0	0	0	70.958	1	70.958	7095.8
24	Sand collection	M <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0	789.5	1	789.5	78950.0
25	Stone collecting	M <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0	889.5	1	889.5	88950.0
26	Pond construction	M <sup>3</sup>		0	340	8	340	8	2.4
27	Road construction	KM	63.472	47.774	23	38.768	86.472	86.542	100.1
28	Road maintenance	KM	169.986	114.72	23	144.857	192.986	259.577	134.5

29	Gabion structure	No.		0	0	10	1	10	1000.0
30	Weeding	Ha		0	0	17	1	17	1700.0
31	Seedling planting	No.	737909	598387	0	0	737909	598387	81.1

FFW

S.No.	Activity lists	Unit	Sekota		Gubalafto		Total		%
			Planned	Achievement	Planned	Achievement	Planned	Achievement	
1	Hill side terrace	Km			40	30.956	40	30.956	100
2	Micro basin	No.			154000	67910	154000	67910	100
3	Pitting and Re-pitting	No.			59000	85285	59000	85285	100
4	Check dam	Km			3.5	1.933	3.5	1.933	100
5	Cut-off drain	Km			4	1	4	1	100

## Annex H (i) PROJECT FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

(Tentative)

PROJECT NO: FFP-A-00-02-00111-00

GRANT NO: FFP-A-00-02-00111-00

NO.	APPROVED BUDGET LINE ITEM	Total Obligated Amount USD				Total Expenditure USD				Balance
		Oblig. for Year 1 2002/3	Oblig. for Year 2 2003/4	Year 3 Revised Oblig. 10/04 - 12/05**	Total Grant Obligated Amount	Expend. Year 1 08/20/02 - 09/30/03	Expend. Year 2 10/03-9/04	Year 3 x Expend. 10/04 To 12/31/05	Total Expend. Amount	
I	DIRECT LABOUR	118,710	180,705	37,143	336,558	61,468	143,562	45,672	250,702	85,856
II	FRINGE BENEFIT AND ALLOWANCE	44,586	49,852	- 2,691	91,747	44,885	52,543	- 5,356	92,072	(325)
III	TRAVEL AND PERDIEM	19,229	26,145	6,838	52,212	1,631	19,307	6,285	27,223	24,989
IV	EQUIPMENT	26,425	-	-	26,425	9,122	-	-	9,122	17,303
V	SUPPLIES	71,836	-	-	71,836	71,963	-	-	71,963	(127)
VI	CONTRACTUAL	5,876	10,000	10,000	25,876	839	-	11,026	11,865	14,011
VII	CONSTRUCTION	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VIII	OTHER DIRECT COSTS	535,438	818,704	229,363	1,583,505	479,741	589,341	208,162	1,277,244	306,261
IX	SUBAGREEMENT	-	30,765	-	30,765	-	30,765	21	30,786	(21)
	<b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>822,100</b>	<b>1,116,171</b>	<b>280,653</b>	<b>2,218,924</b>	<b>669,649</b>	<b>835,518</b>	<b>265,810</b>	<b>1,770,977</b>	<b>447,947</b>
X	NICRA <b>10.28%</b>	-	<b>43,625</b>	12,978	<b>56,603</b>	-	30,647	8,779	<b>39,426</b>	<b>17,177</b>
	<b>TOTAL PROGRAMME COSTS</b>	<b>822,100</b>	<b>1,159,796</b>	<b>293,631</b>	<b>2,275,527</b>	<b>669,649</b>	<b>866,165</b>	<b>274,589</b>	<b>1,810,403</b>	<b>465,123</b>

Annex H (ii): PROJECT FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

( Tentative)

PROJECT NO: 663-A-00-02-00381-00

GRANT NO: 663-A-00-02-00381-00

NO.	APPROVED BUDGET LINE ITEM	Obligated Amount USD			Expenditure USD			Grant Balance USD		
		Obligated 09/24/02 To 12/31/04	Oblig. for Year 1/01/05 - 12/31/05	Total Obligation 09/24/02- 12/31/05	Previously Reported 09/02 To 12/04	Reported for 01/01/05 To 12/31/2005	Total Expend. 9/24/02 To 12/31/05	Balance 09/24/02 to 12/30/04	Balance Year 01/01/05 To 12/31/2005	Total Balance 09/24/02- 12/30/05
I	PROGRAM COSTS	190,024	95,826	285,850	207,087	170,153	377,240	- 17,063	- 74,327	(91,390)
II	SUBAGREEMENTS	86,389	50,471	136,860	132,860	68,355	201,215	- 46,471	- 17,884	(64,355)
III	CONSTRUCTION	41,289	25,427	66,716	38,785	18,524	57,309	2,504	6,904	9,408
IV	TRAINING/CONFERENCE/WORKSHOPS	66,563	15,572	82,135	69,086	36,767	105,853	- 2,523	- 21,195	(23,718)
V	AUDIT, MONITORING & EVALUATION	25,032	38,498	63,530	96,870	14,703	111,573	- 71,838	23,795	(48,043)
VI	PROCUREMENT (SUPPLIES & CONTRACTUAL)	373,281	36,477	409,758	359,493	196,431	555,924	13,788	-159,954	(146,166)
VII	SUPPORT TO WOREDA AND KABELE COMMITTEES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VIII	EXPANDED INTEGRATION OF HIV/AIDS AWARENESS	369,201	-	369,201	-	-	-	369,201	-	369,201
IX	OTHER ACTIVITY COSTS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>1,151,779</b>	<b>262,271</b>	<b>1,414,050</b>	<b>904,181</b>	<b>504,932</b>	<b>1,409,113</b>	<b>247,598</b>	<b>-242,661</b>	<b>4,938</b>
X	NICRA <b>10.28%</b>		14,262	<b>95,911</b>	<b>49,966</b>	<b>44,968</b>	<b>94,934</b>	<b>- 49,966</b>	<b>- 30,706</b>	<b>977</b>
	<b>TOTAL PROGRAMME COSTS</b>		<b>276,533</b>	<b>1,509,961</b>	<b>954,147</b>	<b>549,900</b>	<b>1,504,047</b>	<b>197,632</b>	<b>-273,367</b>	<b>5,914</b>