



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**ZOA**   
RELIEF | HOPE | RECOVERY

# **Combatting food insecurity in south-eastern Fizi District; South-Kivu Province in D.R. Congo**

## **Final Results Report**



**PHOTO ZOA:** Joyful beneficiary during seed distribution in Sebele

**November 2013**

Implemented by:  
ZOA RDC, Fizi Program

**ZOA | RELIEF | HOPE | RECOVERY**

Avenue de la Corniche 52, Goma, Democratic Republic of the Congo  
[zoardcongo@gmail.com](mailto:zoardcongo@gmail.com) | [www.international.com](http://www.international.com) | +243 814 836 305

# Final Results Report

## Combatting food insecurity in south-eastern Fizi District; South-Kivu Province in D.R. Congo

- **Program Period: September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013**
- **Grant No: AID-OFDA-G-12-001143 DRC**

Headquarters Contact Information	Field Contact Information
<p><b>Ane de Vos</b> Institutional Donor Relations Manager</p>	<p><b>Jan Huls</b> Country Director ZOA DR Congo</p>

### Program Summary Information

Country/Region : Eastern DR Congo/South Kivu Province/Fizi district  
 Type of Disaster/Hazard : Complex Emergency, rehabilitation and food security  
 (War affected populations in Fizi district)  
 Time Period Covered by the Program : September 1, 2012 – August 31, 2013 (12 months)  
 Time Period Covered the final Report : September 1, 2012 – August 31, 2013 (12 months)

### Program Goal

To contribute to the sustainable recovery of the Agriculture and Food Security situation of the target communities with many returnee in the south-eastern coastal zone of Fizi district south from Baraka (South Kivu Province, DR Congo).

### Table des matières

1. Number of beneficiaries targeted and reached .....	3
2. A description of assessments and surveillance data used to measure results. ....	7
3. Success stories and an explanation of successes achieved, constraints encountered, and adjustments made for achieving each objective. ....	8
4. A discussion of the overall performance of the program .....	10
5. Overall cost effectiveness .....	13
6. A comparison of actual accomplishments, with the established goals and objectives, and expected results.....	15
7. Other pertinent information.....	19

## 1. Number of beneficiaries targeted and reached

### (i) Number of beneficiaries targeted, by objective, during the reporting period.

Objective: Agriculture and Food Security

Number of Beneficiaries Targeted:

**32,560**

Number of IDP Beneficiaries Targeted, among these:

**13,000** (of whom **11,800** returned IDPs and **1,200** current IDPs)

**Table 1. Population and beneficiaries in target villages**

No	Health Area ( <i>Aire de santé</i> )	Total population <sup>(1)</sup>	Total # of households	Agriculture <sup>(2)</sup>	
				Target villages	# of beneficiary households
1	KATENGA	5385	727	Katenga i, Katenga ii	<b>500</b>
2	DINE	7348	993	Mizimu, Dine	<b>700</b>
3	MWAYENG A	11993	1621	Mwayenga, Kihimino, Lobilo, Lwambana	<b>1150</b>
4	SOME	3475	470	Some, Tongwe	<b>250</b>
5	SEBELE	12506	1690	Sebele & Mainda	<b>1050</b>
6	NEMBA	7044	952	Nemba i & Nemba ii	<b>550</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>KIKONDE</b>	<b>3935<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>532</b>	<b>Kasanjala</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>51,686</b>	<b>6985</b>	<b>15 villages</b>	<b>4400</b>
<b>%</b>			<b>100%</b>		<b>63%</b>

As presented in the table, ZOA targeted to assist **4,400** households, which, based on the needs assessment in January 2012 (refer to annex 2) had 7.4 persons in average in the program area and amounted to **32,560** persons. The direct beneficiaries are located in 15 villages. Indirect beneficiaries were to be all **51,686** people living in the **7** health areas in South-eastern Fizi.

<sup>1</sup> Source: Statistics Fizi Health District, May 2012

<sup>2</sup> Only households who did not benefit from the ZOA pilot project in late 2011 or the GIZ program in March 2012 will qualify

<sup>3</sup> Including Kikonde village, which will not be included in the program

**(ii) Number of beneficiaries reached, by objective, during the reporting period.**

In the selection of beneficiary households, the vulnerability criteria as presented in the proposal<sup>4</sup> provided a starting point. The criteria were finalized in close coordination with the program management committees, as presented in table 2.

**Table 2: Selection criteria of vulnerable households.**

N <sup>o</sup>	List of criteria to be considered a vulnerable household and program target
01	Household repatriated, returned or internally displaced, and residing in one of the 15 target villages and not having received assistance after displacement or return
02	Household headed by a minor;
03	Widow, female head of household, with family dependents: children under 5 years.
04	Household without livestock or small animal husbandry, or fishing tools, or cassava fields, or other unit of production;
05	Household hosting IDPs and/or unable to send children to school by lack of means and not having been previously assisted in food security by an NGO;
06	Household with at least one member with signs of malnutrition ;

Thereafter beneficiaries have been identified by the Program Management committees, by evaluating every household against the criteria through the door to door strategy under the supervision of partner staffs. The lists of all beneficiaries per village were validated at a public meeting at the village level, in the presence of local authorities, members of the local partner NGO and ZOA staffs.

In total 4400 beneficiary households were selected, among which 1574 men and 2826 women represented their household (see table 3). This is interesting as the final survey conducted in September 2013 indicates that 81% of the households are headed by men (refer to Annex 4).

---

<sup>4</sup> For its food security programs, ZOA is working with vulnerability criteria such as households that: have never received assistance after displacement or return; of which tools/seeds/cattle have been looted in the past year; with malnourished children; with key adult affected by a disability, permanent disease or weakness; female headed households; child headed households etc. These criteria will be adapted to the context and to the sub-sector in close collaboration with the communities.

**Table 3: Numbers of beneficiary households**

<b>Nº</b>	<b>Villages</b>	<b>Male HH representative</b>	<b>Female HH representative</b>	<b>Total</b>
1	Katenga 1, Katenga 2	172	328	500
2	Mizimu, Dine	254	446	700
3	Mwayenga, Kihimino, Lobilo, Lwambana	560	590	1150
4	Some, Tongwe	96	154	250
5	Sebele, Malinde	238	912	1150
6	Nemba 1, Nemba 2	200	250	450
7	Kasanjala	54	146	200
	<b>Total number of households</b>	<b>1574</b>	<b>2826</b>	<b>4400</b>

In view of the targeted numbers per group of villages, it appeared that the number of households matching the selection criteria was excessive in Sebele and Malinde, as compared to Nemba 1 and 2, reason why 100 were added to the number of beneficiary households in Sebele and Malinde and 100 were deducted in Nemba 1 and 2.

The final survey revealed that the household size has decreased to 6.9 by September 2013 (refer to table 2 in annex 4) as compared to 7.4 during the needs assessment in January 2012 (refer to annex 2) which provided the information for the program proposal. As a result the 4,400 households represent 30,360 individuals. The same survey established that 7.8% of the population is currently IDP while 21.2% are returned IDPs (within the last 2 years). The number of current IDPs who were supported through the program arrives at 2368 (refer to Annex 4). This is more than was planned originally as their number was estimated at 1,200 in January 2012 (refer to Annex 2). The number of returned IDPs has clearly reduced from 11,800 by January 2012 to 6436 by September 2013. Many returnees by January 2012 have now settled and are no more considered as returnees (as many returned more than 2 years ago).

Objective: Agriculture and Food Security

Number of Beneficiaries Reached:

Number of IDP Beneficiaries Reached, among these:

**30,360**

**8,804** (of whom **6,436** returned IDPs and **2,368** current IDPs)

For their gender and age breakdown, see table 4.

**Table 4. Breakdown of beneficiary numbers by age and gender**

*(Based on annex 4, final survey with 3090 persons counted)*

Age group	Male		Female	
	#	Percent	#	Percent
0 – 4 years	3095	<b>10%</b>	2692	<b>9%</b>
5 – 9 years	3321	<b>11%</b>	3400	<b>11%</b>
10 – 19 years	4254	<b>14%</b>	3557	<b>12%</b>
20 - 59 years	4254	<b>14%</b>	5040	<b>17%</b>
60+ years	432	<b>1%</b>	314	<b>1%</b>
Total	15357	<b>51%</b>	15003	<b>49%</b>

**(iii) Cumulative number of beneficiaries targeted, by objective, to date.**

As in (j) above

**(iv) Cumulative number of beneficiaries reached, by objective, to date.**

As in (ii) above

**(v) Total numbers of beneficiaries targeted and reached to date.**

Objective: Agriculture and Food Security

Number of Beneficiaries Targeted:

**32,560**

Number of Beneficiaries Reached:

**30,360**

Number of IDP Beneficiaries Targeted, among these:

**13,000** (of whom **11,800** returned IDPs and **1,200** current IDPs)

Number of IDP Beneficiaries Reached, among these:

**8,804** (of whom **6,436** returned IDPs and **2,368** current IDPs)

As explained above in (ii) the deviation from the reached beneficiaries as compared to the targeted beneficiaries is only the result of the slightly changed household size. All households have been served according to the planning. The deviation from the reached IDP beneficiaries as compared to the targeted IDP beneficiaries is strongly linked to the increased stability in most villages in the area. The result is that the number of people who were displaced in the area over the last 2 years has reduced. On the other hand, the number of current IDPs served

by the program has been much higher (at 2368) as compared to the original program (at 1200).

## 2. A description of assessments and surveillance data used to measure results.

During the preparation of the program ZOA conducted a rapid needs assessment in the area in January 2012 (refer to Annex 2 for the report). After the start of the program a baseline study was conducted under the guidance of the ZOA monitoring officer in October 2012, which resulted in an extensive baseline report (refer to Annex 3). In September 2013 a final survey, with a structure similar to the baseline study, was conducted under the guidance of the ZOA monitoring officer in October 2013, which resulted in an extensive final survey report (refer to Annex 4). All reports include a presentation on the survey method and sampling.

In September-October 2013, an external evaluation of this program was conducted by GAP RDC. The agency was selected based on a documented technical evaluation of its evaluation proposal as compared to some other submissions. The Terms of Reference for its mission are included as an annex to the evaluation report (Refer to Annex 5). The external evaluation focused on the following criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The sample for this evaluation as selected by the evaluators took into account 47% of the sites (villages) where the program was implemented. During the evaluation, seven (7) of the 15 villages were visited as selected by the evaluators, either in focus groups or individually.

### 3. Success stories and an explanation of successes achieved, constraints encountered, and adjustments made for achieving each objective.

Success stories

Refer to Annexes 5-10 for 5 success stories.

Some lessons learned as proposed by the external evaluation (refer to Annex 5)

Lesson A: To promote social cohesion in communities, it is important to highlight the concept of "do no harm" in all the program implementation phases. In a context of instability and social tension that prevailed at the beginning of this program, ZOA has managed to maintain social cohesion between different segments of the population in the villages affected by the program: returnees, repatriated, IDPs, etc.

Lesson B: The level of qualification and motivation of facilitators/technicians is important in achieving the objectives pursued by a program. The majority of program managers at ZOA level and partner NGOs have the required competencies in the field of agronomy and support for farm households.

Lesson C: An organization that wants to be effective needs to develop a stern, transparent and result-based management. The contacts the external evaluators had with the various ZOA services (finance, administration, program management, etc.) have shown the quality of organization and expertise in management

Lessons learned as proposed by the ZOA Fizi team

Some aspects have been identified and analyzed by the management team of OFDA-Ubwari program with the following lessons learned to improve the future:

Issue	Lesson learned
Season C (dry season) as a way to involve men in agriculture	In the dry season (June-August) the low areas are used for gardening. At the moment households are equipped with the appropriate tools to these lands, men are helped to spend more efforts in agriculture as the tools involved such as spades or picks are traditionally a matter of men.
Promote awareness among beneficiaries on flooding and erosion risks.	In hilly terrain with steep slopes such as Ubwari, it is important to raise awareness of beneficiaries on aspects of protection of fields and environment. This includes site selection, impact of slope and importance of vegetation cover. Sessions in demonstration sites can be used for this also.

Theft of cassava cuttings by non-beneficiaries Consider in future programs to cover a higher number of beneficiaries per village, and/or support farmers to unite in groups of seed producers and multipliers in order to increase access of the producers to good quality cassava cuttings.

Constraints encountered

1. The planned numbers of households selected per village, at 63% on average, left some other vulnerable households in some beneficiary villages unserved. This did not make the task easy as ZOA and partners had to make a lot of effort to help the population to understand and, thus, prevent the outbreak of conflict. In some cases it also led to the **theft of healthy cassava cuttings in beneficiaries' fields by those who want to do** agriculture but were not selected for one reason or another
2. The hilly terrain in some villages along the lake causes at times natural disasters. In April this year, a landslide in Katenga village occurred and destroyed 255 fields of corn, beans, cassava, groundnuts and others while households lost items. Affected beneficiary households were helped with extra tools supplies and are helped to restart agriculture through a new program (AID-OFDA-G-13-00104).
3. On August 8 and 9, 2013 armed confrontations developed between troops of the armed group from May-May Yakutumba and FARDC troops in Nemba 1 and Sebele. These clashes caused the displacement of population towards Nemba 2, but the following days the clashes extended to Nemba 2 causing further displacement of the population of Sebele and Nemba 1 and 2 towards Ubwari, Misha and Kichanga. This has resulted in widespread looting of crops by armed groups in flight and military at the front, thus throwing people back in hunger, including beneficiaries of program OFDA (Sebele, Nemba I and Nemba II). As a result many households there will miss out on the coming growing season and will be in need of humanitarian assistance before the short season starting in February 2014.

Adjustments made for achieving each objective

Not applicable

## 4. A discussion of the overall performance of the program

Some important findings of the external evaluation (refer to Annex 5) are the following:

1. 100% of farm households (vulnerable families), interviewed by the external evaluators, said that they have increased their agricultural production and have sufficient food to meet the family food needs. 71% of the program beneficiaries reported eating two meals a day actually and 19% eat 3 meals, against respectively 58% and 8% when launching the program (data from the baseline report).

*Explanatory note from ZOA: At the same time, it should be noted that many households who became a victim of the lootings in Sebele and Nemba were no more in a position to feed and support their household members despite the preceding agricultural production.*

2. Around 70% of households report being able to feed their families pays their children's school fees as well as health care through income from their fields. Several testimonies of all the villages visited inform that through the sale of products from their fields (cassava, peanuts, corn and vegetables), the beneficiaries have purchased cattle to develop the small domestic livestock, purchased sheets to build their homes, etc.

3. Most farming households in the region can be characterized as subsistence, and cassava, maize and peanut are three important determinants of household food security. It was reported that in the previous season, 100% of beneficiary households planted cassava as the principal crop.

4. In terms of area planted, households can have now an average of 0.71 hectares, while they were 0.25 hectares during the baseline. Cassava remains the most important food crop next to maize and peanut as it is drought-tolerant, and it is cultivated for household consumption and stored in the ground and harvested on demand, but sometimes may be dried as a reserve food.

5. Opportunity to earn non-farm income remains minimal in the area. For most households, farming is the dominant source of food and cash. Despite reduced maize and peanut yields in the previous season, and limited livestock ownership, in the month of survey, 98% of households depended on the sale of crops and/or livestock as the main source of cash income. On the other hand, households practiced various strategies concurrently including cash for work, small business, etc. in addition to sale of crops and/or livestock.

6. Focusing the analysis on the relevance, it appears that this program was implemented in line with the objectives and results formulated in the program proposal as well as the requirements of USAID/OFDA (the donor). Results and objectives achieved at the end of the implementation of the program have significantly contributed to the availability, accessibility, quality and stability of the food for the target program households. The results for the baseline conducted at the beginning of the program indicate that there are more than 10% of households in severe insecurity and more than 40 % moderately food insecure. Contrary to the initial situation, households now have enough food and have access to other basic social services such as health

care, education for children, except for households in Nemba and Sebele who became victim of the recent lootings.

7. Regarding the effectiveness which focuses on the relationship between the activities in the program and the achievement of objectives, outcomes and indicators, it appears that, in general, the activities carried out during the implementation of the program are those that were planned. For instance, the number of vulnerable households identified as beneficiaries was 4400 as initially planned, a rating of effectiveness of 100%; all trainings were provided by ZOA and **local partners as initially planned. Briefly, ZOA's intervention has contributed to improve the situation of vulnerable households with key planned activities such as the constitution of local committees (PMC), the distribution of agricultural tools and improved seeds, trainings...**

8. On the program impacts, after 12 months of implementation, the program has largely contributed to the improvement of livelihoods for the target households. Several observations made on ground confirm it, such as (a) the new farming techniques introduced by the program, especially row planting and crop association have greatly improved the yield; (b) the new variety of cassava introduced, Sawa Sawa variety, has doubled cassava production compared to the traditional varieties, giving around 32 tons per hectare while with the local varieties the yield averaged at most 15 to 17 tons per hectare; (c) improved cassava cuttings, seed corn, peanuts and amaranth are available not only for the beneficiaries of the program, but for all the community; and, finally, (d) people attribute to the program the lower prices of some basic foods observed in the region since a certain period (especially cassava leaves, flour and tubers).

In addition, by comparing the baseline survey (Annex 3) and the final survey report, ZOA concludes in annex 4 that the following has been achieved through the program:

1. Considering the results obtained, it is concluded that the implementation of the OFDA program was successfully completed and almost all the indicators measured during the baseline study, namely those relating to consumption, income, and production were achieved. A relatively low percentage (7%) of the households has to survive during the **most critical 'hunger months' of the year (August-September)** with a critical food consumption score. In the baseline survey, only 29% of households had a food stock, while they are 66% in the final survey during the most difficult time of the year.
2. Yields by the average household of the popular main crops cassava, peanuts and corn (three cultures among those promoted by the OFDA program) have increased with at least 78% since the baseline survey. In addition, amaranth yields have importantly contributed to household nutrition while they helped many households also to access some cash during a critical season.
3. Significant improvements were observed regarding agricultural methods, including reduction of the infestation and plant diseases. In addition, significant reductions were observed with regard to the number of farm households affected by the cassava mosaic disease, which is in part related to the improved planting material.
4. While the average household income has increased, the average expenditure per capita increased, including non-food expenditures. This is probably linked to the increase in

agricultural production, while households see benefit in their resources from the sale of their crops elsewhere (education, health, etc.).

5. In general, the OFDA program has had positive results in the targeted communities, including improving food access and availability, and in the extension of agricultural practices. However, it is clear from the final survey data, with only 20% of the households arriving at an acceptable food consumption score, that much work remains to be done to increase food security and resilience of these communities in the long term, in order to have the households arrive at an acceptable food consumption and household income.

#### Discrepancies between expected and actual results

The only discrepancy has been the difference between the number of individuals per household during the needs assessment in January 2012 and the real number towards the end of the program in late August 2013 (refer to Annex 4). This is presented in detail in chapter 1.

#### Recommendations for improving the design of the program

The external evaluation (refer to Annex 5) proposed several recommendations to ZOA:

1. Assist beneficiaries to set up mechanisms to protect and conserve seeds and vegetative materials distributed to households;
2. Consider the possibility of helping beneficiaries locally process their agricultural products;
3. Improve reliable data collection on activities by partner NGOs staffs at village level;
4. Strengthen the capacity of local partners in needs analysis (Humanitarian Response) and monitoring activities;
5. Strengthen the recovery of beneficiaries in program planning and execution by **promoting beneficiaries' livelihoods activities (fishing, animal husbandry, IGAs) to facilitate socio-economic reintegration in their respective return areas;**

Of these, mainly recommendation 1 and 3 are relevant to improve the design of the program, while the others are useful for follow-up programs or programs with a longer duration.

## 5. Overall cost effectiveness

ZOA has been able to spend the full budget on the targeted beneficiaries, see table 5. The proposed cost per household has therefore been more than realized as 4400 households have been served with more inputs than planned, see below. The proposed cost per individual has been 7% higher as the household size by the end of the program amounted to 6.9 rather than 7.4 as anticipated.

**Table 5. Budget versus Actuals for Award number: AID-OFDA-G-12-00143**

Line items	Negotiated Budget (\$)	Costs incurred per 31-8-13	Balance per 31-8-2013	%
Expatriates	26,503	25,316	1,187	
Local staff	130,800	103,920	26,880	
<b>1. Total salaries</b>	<b>157,303</b>	<b>129,236</b>	<b>28,067</b>	82%
<b>2. Fringe Benefits non-local staff</b>	<b>8,547</b>	<b>8,482</b>	<b>65</b>	99%
<b>3. Travel and Transport - in country per diem</b>	<b>17,600</b>	<b>18,072</b>	<b>-472</b>	103%
<b>4. Transport of Goods truck rental</b>	<b>52,431</b>	<b>49,721</b>	<b>2,710</b>	95%
<b>5. Program Supplies</b>	<b>441,640</b>	<b>481,089</b>	<b>39,449</b>	109%
<b>6. Other Direct Costs</b>	<b>100,722</b>	<b>97,518</b>	<b>3,204</b>	97%
<b>7. Security (staff) training</b>	<b>6,300</b>	<b>6,582</b>	<b>-282</b>	104%
<b>8. USAID Branding and Marking</b>	<b>2,947</b>	<b>3,277</b>	<b>-330</b>	111%
<b>9. Sub - Awards local NGO partners</b>	<b>83,099</b>	<b>78,247</b>	<b>4,852</b>	94%
<b>10. Indirect Costs (NICRA)</b>	<b>67,297</b>	<b>62,563</b>	<b>4,734</b>	93%
Solar equipment	6,319	5,500	819	
Boat purchase	35,000	35,694	-694	
Radio HF CODAN for boat	5,400	6,275	-875	
Motor cycle purchase	8,000	10,350	-2,350	
<b>11. Equipment &gt; 5.000</b>	<b>54,719</b>	<b>57,819</b>	<b>-3,100</b>	106%
<b>12. Audit</b>	<b>7,395</b>	<b>7,395</b>	<b>0</b>	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>0</b>	100%

The two most significant cost deviations concern salaries and program supplies. Due to a delayed recruitment process some staff members started later than foreseen. Also some salaries costs of administrative staff have been spread over other programs.

The resulting savings on these lines have generally been spent on program supplies for the direct benefit of the beneficiaries. As a result ZOA has been able to supply all beneficiary households with an extra kg of maize seeds for the short season around March 2013, with an extra machete and an extra hoe, as compared to the planned inputs. Beneficiary households in Katenga 1 and Katenga (500 in number) received a 2nd extra hoe (4 in total) as these households had lost tools during the flooding disaster in April 2013.

The program has been realized at a total cost of US\$ 32.9 per individual beneficiary (which equals a cost of US\$ 227.2 per beneficiary household). Of these amounts US\$ 15.8 per individual beneficiary or US\$ 109.3 per beneficiary household have been provided as program supplies. The latter exceeds the planned amount of US\$ 95.6 with US\$ 13.7 per beneficiary household.

The purchase of equipment turned to be more expensive than foreseen, resulting in a slight overspending of 6%.

Inflation has not had any impact on the realization of the program.

## 6. A comparison of actual accomplishments, with the established goals and objectives, and expected results

### Comparison of actual accomplishments with the expected results through the indicators of the sub-sector Seed Systems and Agricultural Inputs

- (Projected) increase in number of months of food self-sufficiency due to distributed seed systems/agricultural input for beneficiary families: 6 months
- Number of people benefiting from seed systems/agricultural input activities: **32,560**

Indicator 1: (Projected) increase in number of months of food self-sufficiency due to distributed seed systems/agricultural input for beneficiary families: 6 months

The projection of the increase in number of months is based on energy supply to the household. The average agricultural production per beneficiary household during the 2 seasons before the start of the program is presented in the table below.

Main crop	Total harvest over 12 months before program <sup>5</sup>	Estimated quantity available for human consumption	Energy contents (FAO estimate <sup>6</sup> in kcal/g)	Edible Energy produced in '000 kcal
Corn	178 kg	65% or 116 kg	4.12 (cereal)	477.9
Peanut	142 kg	68% or 97 kg	4.07 (dry beans)	394.8
Cassava	1198 kg	60% or 719 kg	3.84 (other underground crops)	2761.0
Amaranth	0			

In view of the table, the edible energy produced by the average households amounts to 477,900 kcal through corn, 394,800 kcal through peanuts and 2,761,000 kcal through cassava roots. The average number of members per households is 6.9 (refer to annex 4). The daily energy needs<sup>7</sup> per person in an average household with 2 or 3 hardworking adults, some adolescents and/or some children will not exceed 14,490 kcal (for 6.9 persons, based at an average of 2100 kcal per day per person).

In practice peanuts are often sold due to their attractive prices. Most households feed on cassava and corn, apart from vegetables including cassava leaves. The energy contents of corn

<sup>5</sup> Refer to Annex 3. ZOA baseline report, November 2012

<sup>6</sup> Food energy – methods of analysis and conversion factors, FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 77, December 2002

<sup>7</sup> Refer to: Human Energy Requirements, FAO, October 2001

and cassava as stated above provides the household with edible energy for 224 days or 7.4 months.

This results therefore in 7.4 months of food self-sufficiency of the average beneficiary household before the start of the program.

The average agricultural production per beneficiary household during the 2 seasons with support from the program is presented in the table below.

Main crop	Total harvest over 12 months by the end of the program <sup>8</sup>	Estimated quantity available for human consumption	Energy contents (FAO estimate <sup>9</sup> in kcal/g)	Edible Energy produced in '000 kcal
Corn	430KG	65% or 280 kg	4.12 (cereal)	1153.6
Peanut	262KG	68% or 178 kg	4.07 (dry beans)	724.5
Cassava	2137KG	60% or 1282 kg	3.84 (other underground crops)	4922.9
Amaranth	Hard to quantify			

In view of the table, the edible energy produced by the average households amounts to 1,153,600 kcal through corn, 724,500 kcal through peanuts and 4,922,900 kcal through cassava roots. The average number of members per households is 6.9 (refer to annex 4). The daily energy needs<sup>10</sup> per person in an average household with 2 or 3 hardworking adults, some adolescents and/or some children will not exceed 14,490 kcal (for 6.9 persons, based at an average of 2100 kcal per day per person).

In practice peanuts are often sold due to their attractive prices. Most households feed on cassava and corn, apart from vegetables including cassava leaves. The energy contents of corn and cassava as stated above provides the household with edible energy for 419 days or 14.0 months.

This results therefore in 14.0 months of food self-sufficiency of the average beneficiary household by the end of the program. And that does not into accounts improvements to the food security through consumption and/or sales of amaranth (good source of vitamins and minerals) and peanut (source of protein).

Conclusion

The (projected) increase in number of months of food self-sufficiency due to distributed seed systems/agricultural input for beneficiary families therefore arrives at 6.6 months (=14.0 – 7.4) which thereby exceeds the targeted increase of 6 months.

The result has been realized at a total cost of US\$ 32.9 per individual beneficiary (which equals a cost of US\$ 227.2 per beneficiary household). Of these amounts US\$ 15.8 per individual

<sup>8</sup> Refer to Annex 4. ZOA final survey report, September 2013

<sup>9</sup> Food energy – methods of analysis and conversion factors, FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 77, December 2002

<sup>10</sup> Refer to: Human Energy Requirements, FAO, October 2001

beneficiary or US\$ 109.3 per beneficiary household have been provided as program supplies. The latter exceeds the planned amount of US\$ 95.6 with US\$ 13.7 per beneficiary household. The improved food self-sufficiency is confirmed from stories from beneficiaries (refer to the external evaluation report and success stories, annexes 5-10). It should however be noted that this analysis only refers to the AVERAGE beneficiary household. The final survey report (Annex 4) gives evidence that 7% of beneficiary households still face a critically low food consumption score during the hunger period of August/September 2013.

Indicator 2: Number of people benefiting from seed systems/agricultural input activities:  
**32,560**

The final survey revealed that the household size has decreased to 6.9 by September 2013 (refer to table 2 in annex 4) as compared to 7.4 in January 2012 (refer to annex 2). As a result the 4,400 households represent 30,360 individuals. As explained in chapter 1 the deviation from the reached beneficiaries as compared to the targeted beneficiaries is only the result of the slightly changes household size. All households have been served according to the planning. Taking into account the slightly reduced number of individual beneficiaries, the result has been realized at the cost levels as presented under indicator 1 above.

Comparison of actual accomplishments, with the established goals and objectives

Objective: To contribute to the sustainable recovery of the Agriculture and Food Security situation of the target communities with many returnees in the south-eastern coastal zone of Fizi district south from Baraka (South Kivu Province, DR Congo).

- The result of this program has proven sufficiently to have contributed significantly to the availability and accessibility of foods in the program target households. Contrary to the initial situation, many households now have enough food, and meet food needs during the year and have improved access to basic social services such as health care, education of children.
- Several intervention strategies were applied, all planned activities were carried out in order to meet the overall objective intended to boost agriculture to improve food security. This included the distribution of seeds, healthy cassava cuttings and agricultural tools to target households, training on improved farming practices and several community mobilization activities.
- The beneficiary population actively involved in agricultural activities with the support received from ZOA through the OFDA-Ubwari program. All beneficiaries planted a field and sowed the seeds received, thus achieving a rate of 100% implementation. This generally resulted in an increase in agricultural production.
- To this farm source of income, adds the small animal husbandry (goats, sheep, chickens, pigs...) started by the majority of households after selling a portion of their crop material, which allows them to obtain cash income to meet other basic needs. This is indeed an important livelihood strategy for households targeted by the program, as it represents a form of savings and a guarantee for the livelihood. Refer also to testimonies in the external evaluation (Annex 5) and success stories (Annexes 6-10).
- Hence the contribution of the program to the sustainable recovery of the Agriculture and Food Security situation of many beneficiary household has been real and is verifiable.



## 7. Other pertinent information

### COMMUNICATION and VISIBILITY

Visibility was realized according to plan, see the following table.

Planned Output		Planned	Achieved
<b>USAID branding and marking</b>			
Visibility activities in 15 villages targeted (using USAID logos in written and electronic communication, publishing stories,	Billboards at 15 program sites	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>
	130 T-shirts, vests	<b>130</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Stickers /Small Labels	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Banners	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>
Humanitarian accountability principles and complaints mechanism have been promoted towards 126 Program management committee (PMC) members.		<b>261</b>	<b>More than 100% realized</b>

As for visibility of the program, in all target villages of the program it was found that many people understood the aid background (the American people), the implementing organizations (ZOA and its partners), and the contents of the assistance to be granted per household.

In the period from 24 to 29 June 2013, the program was visited by the representative of OFDA, M Oumar M'Bareck, 8 of 15 program **villages were visited. The presence of the donor's** representative resulted in several testimonies on the functioning of accountability and two-way communication towards beneficiaries and the visibility of the program in general. The visit of the USAID/OFDA representative has strongly contributed to USAID visibility, as the communities and authorities value a personal visit as well as exchanges.