



**ZIMBABWE LIVESTOCK FOR ACCELERATED RECOVERY AND IMPROVED
RESILIENCY (ZRR)**

**Mid-term Evaluation Report
Agreement AID-OFDA-G-12-00032**

Contents

1.0	Introduction and Background.....	3
1.1	Need for the Program	9
1.2	Program goals and Objectives.....	9
1.3	Interventions, Implementation Strategies and Anticipated Results	10
1.4	Geographic coverage.....	11
1.5	Purpose of program Evaluation.....	11
2.0	Evaluation Methods and Limitations.....	13
2.1	Methodology.....	13
2.2	Limitations.....	13
2.3	Structure of the report	14
3.0	Findings	15
3.1	Project progress	15
3.2	Processes that affect achievement of project results (behavior change and capacity strengthening).....	24
3.3	Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes.....	25
3.4	Challenges and lessons learnt	26
4.0	Recommendations.....	28
5.0	ZRR Program Response to Midterm Evaluation Recommendations	29
6.0	Annexes	34
	Annex 1: Scope of Work.....	34
	Annex 2: Midterm Evaluation tools	40
	Annex 3: List of information sources (including documents reviewed, sites visited, and key informants, assuming they gave permission to be identified).....	59

Executive Summary

A Mid Term evaluation for the Zimbabwe Livestock for Accelerated Recovery and Improved Resiliency (ZRR) Project implemented by Land O'Lakes was carried out in June and July 2013 with the purpose of answering two key evaluation questions:

- How has and to what extent has ZRR met, not met, or exceeded its objectives?
- What are the key strengths and weaknesses of the project, including specific activities and overall program strategy?
- The above evaluation questions will provide concrete (doable) recommendations to strengthen the project and address any areas of concern in the second half of the project.

Evaluation results show that the ZRR project has realized some impressive results in its first year of operation, especially regarding the output indicators. Notable achievements include distributing goats to 617 households in the first year against a target of 700 in life of project, realized some reduction in Kidd mortality through increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services, and benefitted 5770 individuals against a target of 6000 in the life of project. Results are positive and provide a favorable indication of what the program will achieve at the end of its life. Considerable progress in both components was observed, though some activities still require extra work and focus if they are to be achieved before project ends in April, 2014. In some cases however, more time than the two years proposed – especially for IR 2 Rangeland management activities – is needed if the project outcomes are to be realized

Program background

The ZRR project objective is to expedite recovery, reduce risk and mitigate effects of economic and environmental disasters on Zimbabwe's vulnerable communities through livestock production, management and marketing. To achieve this objective, Land O'Lakes and its partner, the African Holistic Rangeland Management (ACHM) are addressing gaps in human knowledge and capacity with targeted trainings; the lack of a sustainable and productive asset base at the individual household level by establishing a goat distribution and pass on scheme; weaknesses within the livestock value chain by training goat producer groups in basic business skills and marketing; how to better protect against disease outbreaks and foster animal productivity through training and by developing a network of Community Livestock Workers (CLW) who can improve access to animal health services; and restoration of a degraded natural resource base through capacity building in improved rangeland management techniques, implementation of prescribed grazing plans, and integration of fodder and forage production into conservation agriculture methods.

ZRR results are to be achieved through implementation of activities under two Agriculture and Food Security subcomponents and divided into three Intermediate Results (IRs), as follows:

Subcomponent 1: Livestock: IR 1: Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities; and IR 2: Increased communities' capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management; and;

Subcomponent 2: Veterinary Medicines and Vaccines: IR 3: Increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation team conducted an extensive review of project reports and other technical documents before embarking on the exercise. In order to obtain a reasonable picture of the strengths and weaknesses of project implementation, a household survey (from a representative sample of 194 participating farmers, 15 Focus Group Discussions with participating farmers, and Key Informant Interviews with project partners, relevant

stakeholders' extension agents and traditional leaders. Key findings and recommendations were then shared with project staff for their input and to inform Year two activities.

Key Findings

The ZRR project has been well implemented and has realized impressive results in its one year of operation in two out of the three result area. The project also is meeting its intended result, that of building resiliency to economic and environmental shocks. As observed in our field visits, participating farmers appreciate the project approach – that is distributing three goats, and that every household in the target area has a chance to benefit through a well-established and implemented pass on scheme. Farmers we talked to appreciate goats because 'goats can rapidly increase in number and can easily be sold in case one has a problem'. Nutritional and soil treatment benefits – manure and goat milk and meat, were also mentioned as critical benefits of the project design and approach. In terms of targeting the most vulnerable, results indicate that the poor, households with sick members, and orphans have benefitted, with the community members assisting them to build appropriate goat housing, which is the basic requirement by the program to get goats.

ZRR project has distributed goats to 617 households (88%) of project targeted goat beneficiary households and provided trainings on goat management to 1154 households, about 58% of the project target. Sixty-eight Community Livestock Workers, 36% more than the project target have been trained and equipped. Trainings have covered animal health, feeding, housing, fodder production, breeding, among other livestock management practices. At household level, some progress has been realized in the uptake of livestock husbandry practices that ZRR promotes, especially those targeting improved animal health. However, no major changes have been observed from baseline in terms of outcomes. Practices that have shown considerable change in terms of adoption by farmers from baseline are vaccination and dipping. Achievements that have been observed in terms of adoption of recommended practices and resulting changes in animal – especially goat - productivity include:

- About 60% of individuals participating in the project are women. Evaluation findings indicate that more male headed households have adopted promoted veterinary practices than the female headed households. However, an interesting observation was that no considerable differences were noted at the outcomes level – kidding interval, age at first kidding, goat mortality, among others.
- 61.3% of respondents did not report any deaths for mature goats in the last one year. This again is not different from baseline, at 64.1%. On Kid mortality, a slight decrease in proportion of those reporting Kid deaths was observed, at 41.7% compared to 49.6% at baseline.
- On breeding, respondents mention adopting recommended practices and recording one mating per pregnancy, a maximum of ten months as the average age at first kidding (Mean of 8.9 months for Male HH and 8.4 for Female HH), and a maximum of 6.1 months kidding interval from 8.13 at baseline (mean of 5.5 months for Male HH and 5.2 for Female HH). Results due to adoption of promoted management practices include an increase in number of litter to two on average, from 1.15 kids at baseline, and reduced abortion rates, reported by 9.2% of those surveyed.
- Those surveyed have realized 2.2 additional kids to their goat herds in the first half of 2013 as opposed to 2.6 additional kids in the entire 2012.

About 83.5% of participating farmers are highly satisfied with the ZRR project services, with project activities on dipping campaigns, training on fodder production, CLWs' services and timing of training rated the best five

Project design, implementation and achievements, including changes in context and review of assumptions

Participating farmers appreciate the project approach – that is distributing three goats (does), and that every household in the target area has a chance to benefit through a well-established and implemented pass on scheme. Farmers interviewed appreciate goats because 'goats can rapidly increase in number and can easily be

sold in case one has a problem'. Nutritional and soil treatment benefits – manure, goat milk and meat, were also mentioned as critical benefits of the project. Farmers interviewed mention specific benefits they have received from the project. These benefits by program result area are:

IR 1: Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities

- Training in goat husbandry, fodder production and conservation and goat production as a business.
- Increased goat population in the project area was also mentioned. The project has distributed goats to a number of households in the area, and goats now give birth twice in 12 months kids than before.
- Feed preservation: Farmers have learnt to produce fodder in the demo plots. Farmers also mentioned preserving maize stovers and ground nut stocks which they then treat with urea and feed their livestock.

IR 2: Increased communities' capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management

Some progress reported in this result area, though limited. Movable kraals were observed to be in very high demand, sometimes leading to misunderstandings in the target communities due to its perceived benefits in improving soil fertility, comfortable to cattle because if the kraal is moved, cattle get to sleep in a clean place, and for easy breeding because whole community can benefit from a few bulls instead of all villagers acquiring a breeding bull. Those interviewed mentioned there is limited grazing areas in the communities due to new settlements and 'because of the increasing number of goats in the village', which corroborates the statement on increasing goat herd.

IR 3: Increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services

The MTE results demonstrate considerable progress in this result area compared to baseline findings. At baseline, farmers expressed that access to veterinary drugs and vaccines was a challenge, as these were not sold locally, and that CLWs only assisted in disease identification, and were not able to treat many diseases, as they do not have access to veterinary drugs. Communities were in addition not paying for CLW services, and hence, it is difficult for the CLWs to purchase drugs on behalf of the farmers. Now CLWs treat livestock and get paid for their services in some districts.

- Improved livestock health due to the establishment of a drug revolving fund and training of CLWs, improved livestock body condition as a result of improved goat management – due to the fact that they have abandoned tethering and now free graze.
- Project has organized farmers who now contribute money to buy animal health drugs as a group, saving them money and time – on transport.
- Reduced goat mortality

Implementation strategies and impact on progress towards results

Some factors that were observed and/or mentioned to have contributed to the success in the two result areas are:

Project implementation is utilizing the existing structures in the target area. ZRR has not created parallel structures within the wards it operates in. Rather, it is using the community structures, most notably the Ward Development Committees/Ward Executive Committees. All farmer groups are required to develop a constitution and laws governing their operation, which are then enforced by the Ward Executive Committees. This has ensured a smooth enforcement of the goat pass on scheme and will be critical in implementing the communal grazing plans once these are operationalized. The project also uses the Provincial Veterinary Officer to train the CLWs. While other players, especially the ward level veterinary service providers

complained about the duration of the CLWs training, we noted that they do not complain about the quality of the training or its content. Farmers also mentioned that the CLWs working with the project have similar skills to the veterinary service providers and therefore call them first given their closeness to the community.

Another critical factor that was observed to have contributed to the ZRR success is that the project is working in wards and districts that had participated in the Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe a USAID funded Economic Growth project that initially had a goat distribution component but which was eliminated. This continuation – in a few Wards – ensured a quick start up since most of the households in the wards had already put up goat houses and attended some goat trainings – even though they still required refresher trainings – to receive the goats and implement the improved management practices adopted by the project.

Some activities are still lagging behind however. The ZRR management will need to revisit its implementation approach for the project to achieve its intended results.

Rangeland management

Discussions with ACHM, the ZRR partner in Rangeland Management mentioned a number of issues which the project team needs to consider going forward. These include:

Use of the community action cycle to ensure all community members are consulted, engaged and empowered to act to ensure ownership of the grazing plans, movable kraals among others. We noted that the project team trained by ACHM has trained CLWs and empowered them to carry on activities related to rangeland management. ZRR has also exposed community leaders to the Holistic Land and Rangeland Management approach through the trip to the ACHM. Results have been varied. The consistent observation however was that there is lack of ownership of and none of the communities ZRR works in is implementing a grazing plan. The project therefore needs to revisit the community action cycle – explore and plan with the entire community- to make sure members identify the problem and solutions, and design the grazing calendar themselves.

Time to recovery of rangelands: ZRR should ideally have more time to develop and integrate this concept at community level than the two years proposed. Even in the ACHM Campus, recovery took longer than the two years ZRR will be implemented.

Marketing

The ZRR project has introduced a good marketing concept – that of selling based on goat weight. However, Land O'Lakes is the only one buying based on this concept at the moment for restocking purposes. This is not sustainable. ZRR needs to link producer groups with buyers who will buy based on this concept in year two.

Fodder production

Two issues were observed: Approach to promote fodder production has been through the demonstration farms. This has been appreciated by farmers interviewed. However, farmers lack fodder seeds. In fact the demonstration farms main objective was to produce fodder seeds and may have compromised quality of fodder. ZRR needs to ensure farmers get seeds as proposed to ensure they this concept is adopted. The ZRR project intended to work closely with the local research stations in Grassland and Matopos to select fodder seeds, including seed testing of up to seven fodder varieties . However, this has not been accomplished given that USAID does not allow projects to pay for goods or services provided by government agencies.

Challenges

Lack of grazing lands in some communities

Lack of grazing land in some communities bordering those that work with ZRR, who may not comply with the plans once developed was identified by both project staff and community members. Appropriate measures, involving incorporating such communities in the plans will be mandatory. Another challenge is the cultivation or habitation of formerly designated grazing lands in ZRR target communities, which locals say, could render such lands nonexistent.

Fodder seed production

ZRR intended to work closely with the local research stations in Grassland and Matopos to select fodder seeds; including seed testing of up to seven fodder varieties. However this activity cannot be implemented because of USAID does not allow projects to pay for goods or services provided by government agencies.

Project duration

The two years proposed will not be adequate to realize results for IR 2. As discussed, it takes at least 4 years at community level to see any results from Holistic Rangeland management initiatives. Other activities that will require additional time to adequately implement include:

- Goat marketing: The ZRR project has improved goat production to an extent that improves resiliency. The project will require more time for farmers to learn how to engage in the markets, both local and urban. For the innovation of purchasing goats based on weight to be entrenched in the project area, ZRR will need to link the benefitting households to urban goat markets. This can only happen if there is enough supply of goats to sustain demand which will need more time for the benefitting households to build their goat herds.
- Fodder production: The ZRR project has only had one cropping season which was used to introduce the concept of fodder production in demonstration plots. Given that fodder production is a new concept in the project area, it will require a few more seasons to be an established practice in the area.

It is the evaluation team's considered view that more cropping seasons/ an extended program duration would help fodder production, rangeland management, market integration and commercialization and thus enable the project to achieve its targets.

Lesson learnt

- Holistic Rangeland management initiatives, commercial goat production and marketing and introduction of fodder production goat generally take longer than two years. This needs to have been factored in at design. It will be difficult for the project to realize the intended results - IR2.4: and IR2.5 within two years.
- ZRR has introduced an innovation in the program area – that of local sourcing of goats which has enabled the program to realize two critical results – to reinvest USAID funds within neighboring communities and to purchase goats based on weight, age and teeth thus showing farmers that quality pays. Purchase of goats based on weight has not only resulted in a sharp increase in goat prices in the area, but also opened the eyes of the community members that commercial goat production is can be achieved.

Recommendations

Project activity related recommendations:

- Project to request for additional time to implement activities and realize results on Rangeland management, goat marketing and fodder production.
- Goat restocking: Goat distribution should be finalized by as soon as possible for staff to monitor implementation of the pass on scheme. Buck distribution should target higher quality goat breeds than those in local communities
- Project should prioritize linkage with commercial buyers in the second year, who can buy based on weight as promoted. Households say they have enough goats to sell.
- Fodder production: ZRR to distribute seeds to farmers in the second year early enough for fodder production at farm level. Farmers mentioned having the knowledge to enable the produce fodder but lack seeds.
- Rangeland management: Project staff to conduct planning events – explore issues around rangeland management and design community maps and grazing plans with all community members. Project staffs need to spend more time on ground on this activity and not leave it entirely to leaders and CLWs, including training herders. Regarding movable kraals a more involved approach by staff in preparing the roster and monitoring its use is recommended. In addition, ZRR staff should encourage communities to invest in their own Kraals. This result area however requires more time, at least four years to see benefits/results.
- Animal health: CLWs complained of lack of coordination with relevant stakeholders’ livestock and agriculture extension people. In addition, some trained CLWs (very few though in Bulilima District) do not have bicycles and kits and so provide limited extension services – farmers do not pay them for ‘advising and training’, when farmers buy syringes, medicine. ZRR should therefore equip all CLWs as soon as possible and to ensure all CLWs are linked to veterinary service providers and other relevant extension personnel to ensure they refer complicated cases to them, since private vets are non-existent in the program area.

Management related recommendations

- Monitoring: It was observed that some project target districts have many issues which have not been identified but which the evaluation team was of the opinion should have been rectified earlier. A clear case is the problem with the rangeland management activity - both communal grazing planning and movable kraal. While it is not possible to correct all problems in implementation, it pays to identify emerging problems early.
- Reconciling sustainability concerns with stakeholder buy in: In some districts village heads demand to be given goats in exchange for enforcing the pass on scheme and marketing groups’ constitutions. The ZRR project need to ensure that all community leaders understand our focus – which is to empower vulnerable members of their communities.

1.0 Introduction and Background

This report presents the Midterm Evaluation results and recommendations of the Zimbabwe Livestock for Accelerated Recovery and Improved Resiliency (ZRR) Project. The Project is funded by the United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), and is assisting targeted vulnerable households in Matabeleland South and Manicaland to reduce vulnerability to both economic and climatic disasters, diversify livelihoods, build assets, and rebuild resiliency to shocks.

1.1 Need for the Program

The ZRR Project is assisting targeted vulnerable households in Matabeleland South and Manicaland to reduce vulnerability to both economic and climatic disasters, diversify livelihoods, build assets, and rebuild resiliency to shocks through training in livestock production; restocking of household herds; building community capacity in rangeland management; development of rangeland management plans; reviving livestock infrastructure; and increasing returns from livestock sales gained by smallholder farmers. Goat distribution, paired with training and support of community-based goat production and improved natural resources management, will provide an opportunity for individual households that are vulnerable to climatic shocks and recovering from economic turmoil to build a sustainable productive asset base.

While stressing individual ownership of the productive assets, ZRR works to strengthen existing goat marketing groups to solidify community-level engagement, increase market access, improve economic returns to livestock keepers and their communities, and enable efforts to use livestock for proactive environmental restoration through communal herding. ZRR in addition is building the foundation for increased access to animal health services through the development of a community-based preventive animal health program that is closely linked to private veterinary and drug suppliers. Building a grassroots animal health network linked to larger private enterprises will improve herd productivity, reduce mortality, and increase the availability of breeding stock in the area. Finally, ZRR is addressing the need to improve the natural production base of livestock systems; specifically, ZRR is building the local capacity and applying Holistic Rangeland Management (HM) techniques to restore degraded farm and rangelands for more resilient and productive forage, feed and fodder resources.

1.2 Program goals and Objectives

The Zimbabwe Livestock for Accelerated Recovery and Improved Resiliency (ZRR) project is being implemented in Zimbabwe since May, 2012 with expected completion date of April, 2014. The project objective is to expedite recovery, reduce risk and mitigate effects of economic and environmental disasters on Zimbabwe's vulnerable communities through livestock production, management and marketing.

To achieve this goal, Land O'Lakes and its partner, the African Holistic Rangeland Management (ACHM) are addressing gaps in human knowledge and capacity with targeted trainings; the lack of a sustainable and productive asset base at the individual household level by establishing a goat distribution and pass on scheme; weaknesses within the livestock value chain by training goat producer groups in basic business skills and marketing; how to better protect against disease outbreaks and foster animal productivity through training and by developing a network of Community Livestock Workers (CLW) who can improve access to animal health services; and restoration of a degraded natural resource base through capacity building in improved rangeland management techniques, implementation of prescribed grazing plans, and integration of fodder and forage production into conservation agriculture methods.

ZRR results are to be achieved through implementation of activities under two Agriculture and Food Security subcomponents and divided into three Intermediate Results (IRs), as follows:

Subcomponent 1: Livestock

- IR 1: Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities;
- IR 2: Increased communities' capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management; and;

Subcomponent 2: Veterinary Medicines and Vaccines

- IR 3: Increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services.

1.3 Interventions, Implementation Strategies and Anticipated Results

Key activities implemented by ZRR and their associated outputs and outcomes are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Results Framework

Goal/Intermediate Result	Description	Activity	Key Performance Indicator:
OFDA Subsector Goal	Farmer resiliency to environmental and economic shocks enhanced through development, testing, documentation and dissemination of sustainable fodder and fodder seed production and marketing systems	<i>Na</i>	<i>Indicator A: Number of animals benefitting from or affected by livestock activities</i> <i>Indicator B: Number of people benefitting from livestock activities</i> <i>Indicator C: Number of veterinary interventions, treatments or vaccinations administered</i> <i>Indicator D: Number of animals treated or vaccinated</i>
Program Goal	Expedite recovery, reduce risk, and mitigate effects of economic and environmental disasters on Zimbabwe's vulnerable communities through livestock production, management and marketing.	<i>Na</i>	<i>Indicator E: Number of individuals participating in disaster risk reduction activities</i> <i>Indicator F: Percentage of beneficiary households with improved productive asset base</i> <i>Indicator G: Percentage of Female Headed Households with improved productive asset base</i>
<i>Sub Component 1: Livestock</i>			
IR 1	Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities	Activity 1.1: Goat production Activity 1.2: Restocking Activity 1.3: Goat Marketing Activity 1.4: Fodder production Activity 1.5: Goat Marketing	<i>IR1.1: Number of households trained or receiving technical assistance in goat production and marketing (Output)</i> <i>IR1.2: Average value of assets (tools, livestock, domestic) in targeted participating households (Impact)</i> <i>IR1.3: Number of households receiving goats from the project and participating in producer groups (Output)</i> <i>IR1.4: Number of goat producer groups formed or strengthened (Output)</i> <i>IR1.5 Proportion of producer group membership comprised of females (Output)</i> <i>IR1.6: Number of producer groups linked to markets (Output)</i>

IR 2	Increased communities' capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management	Activity 2.1: Training of trainers Activity 2.2: Community and farmer training Activity 2.3: Rangeland management planning and extension services provision	IR2.1: Number of CLW's trained in farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Output) IR2.2: Number of people trained in improved farm and rangeland management (Output) IR2.3: Number of grazing management plans developed and utilized by communities (Outcome) IR2.4: Communities applying improved farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Outcome) IR2.5: Number of hectares (Ha) under improved land management (Outcome) IR2.6: Percentage of community farmers applying improved farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Outcome)
Sub component 2: Veterinary medicines and vaccines			
IR 3:	Increased Capacity of and Access to Animal Health and Livestock Extension Services	Land O'Lakes will identify potential CLWs through existing goat producer groups and work with them to provide animal health services to participating farmers.	IR3.1: Number of CLW's trained (Output) IR3.2: Percentage of CLW's utilizing their training and skills to train farmers (Outcome) IR3.3: Number of women responsible for making household decisions in veterinary care and management of their goats (Outcome) IR3.4: Number of Households served by CLW's (Output)

The ZRR project supports USAID/OFDA Southern Africa DRR strategy 2012-2014 as well as the UN-ISDR Hygro framework.

1.4 Geographic coverage

ZRR project is being implemented in two provinces of Matabeleland South and Manicaland (five districts) found within agro-climatic Zones IV and V.

1.5 Purpose of program Evaluation

The main objective of the Midterm evaluation (MTE) was to assess ZRR's strengths and weaknesses to improve its effectiveness. The evaluation team looked at project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. Working with project staff, the team identified successes, problems or constraints (design, administrative, or operational), focusing on both components, and developed actionable recommendations on the work plan for the remainder of the project period.

Specific objectives included:

- Assessing the extent to which ZRR has met, not met, or exceeded its objectives;
- Identifying key strengths and weaknesses of the project, including specific activities and overall program strategy; and

- Providing concrete (doable) recommendations to strengthen the project and address any areas of concern

Specific areas evaluated were:

- Project progress
- Project design, implementation and achievements, including changes in context and review of assumptions
- Processes that affect achievement of project results (behavior change and capacity strengthening)
- Sustainability of project outcomes
- Unintended outcomes if any
- Challenges and lessons learnt

Findings of the evaluation are meant to guide the rest of program implementation and accordingly redefine approaches and pace of work. The MTE also focused on corrective actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact.

2.0 Evaluation Methods and Limitations

2.1. Methodology

2.1.1 Preparation

The Evaluation team started by designing the Midterm Evaluation Terms of Reference, complete with the purpose, key questions and methodology to be used in undertaking the evaluation (See Annex 1 for the complete Scope of Work). Before commencing field work, the lead Evaluator reviewed program documentation, including program proposal, program reports, baseline evaluation report, follow on household data, Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), and the program work plan (2012-2013).

2.1.2 Fieldwork

To investigate project impact on beneficiaries – households and at farmer group level, a survey, using mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative interviews – Annex 2a, 2b and 2c) was designed and executed. A score card was also included as part of the survey to elicit beneficiary feedback on the program and their satisfaction with implementation. The purpose was to give them a chance to participate in the evaluation by anonymously expressing their views about the work and results achieved to date and their ideas as to how the program might be strengthened. A total of 194 participating farmers in the five target districts, selected by simple random sampling, were surveyed.

In addition to the quantitative survey, the evaluation team carried out 15 focus group discussions (FGDs), three in each focus district - with women and men farmers separately, and a FGD with Community Livestock Workers (CLWs). Key ZRR stakeholders in each district were also interviewed. The key informants included representatives from Agritex, Ministry of Livestock, Political leaders; mainly ward councilors, village headmen and chiefs/traditional leaders. Thereafter, through field visits to the project sites in Mutare Rural and Buhera Districts, Evaluator met and held discussions with farmers in five sites. Meetings were also held with a representative of ACHM, a ZRR partner, a Councilor, Agritex personnel, a village headman and CLWs. At the end of each day, the team leader ensured the questionnaires were correctly filled in and all notes from semi structured interviews were coherent and legible. A consolidation of findings from the focus group discussions was then done. The Evaluators then met with ZRR staff for a briefing on the survey findings, ZRR design, implementation status and results achieved to date. The staff meetings also discussed the challenges and lessons learnt in implementation, and explored, with the project staff, various options to maximize program results. ZRR management responses to some of the recommendations are included in Chapter 6 of this report.

Assessment results reveal significant progress in implementation and results achieved to date. Beneficiary feedback – from score cards and field observations - in addition provided a snap shot of feelings and observations which complemented the information gathered from PH9 staff and partners. References to survey responses will be found in many sections of this report.

2.2 Limitations

Three limitations were noted.

- In conducting the household, CLWs and farmer group level surveys, we hired three enumerators, with the ZRR M&E Specialist also being part of the team. This may have biased responses touching on adoption of improved goat husbandry practices promoted by the program and beneficiary score card responses on questions relating to satisfaction with program activities.
- The other limitation noted was the lack of a control sample to compare project results to. We considered a performance evaluation approach to the MTE, and do not think that these limitations in any way impact validity of the results.

- At baseline, data was collected from households that participated in the Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe (ZLD). Farmers interviewed had received training and goats from the project. The evaluation team observed that some results at midterm were not different, or lower than the baseline figures. This will be observed in the report.

2.3 Structure of the report

The report is organized by the questions contained in the Midterm evaluation Scope of Work (Annex 1), as well as by others that are worth mentioning given the findings. It first presents the findings regarding program progress towards set targets and in the process, tests the validity of the assumptions on which the program is based. It then looks at overall program operations, and how they have contributed to program progress and where they could be strengthened. It also looks at the important issue of synergy between ZRR and other initiatives who work along similar lines and in the same area. Although not covered in the scope of work, the report also discusses the program results and provides recommendations given performance so far and the implementation context. Finally, it offers recommendations on improving the ZRR project.

3.0 Findings

Overall, the ZRR project has realized some impressive results in its first year of operation, especially regarding the output indicators. Notable achievements include distributing goats to 617 (So far 1773 does purchased and a balance of 33 will be bought by end of August 2013. 26 bucks have so far been purchased and a balance of 124 will be bought by end of this quarter) households in the first year against a target of 700 in life of project, realized some reduction in Kidd mortality through increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services, and benefitted 5770 individuals against a target of 6000 in the life of project.

These results are positive and provide a favorable indication of what the program can achieve at the end of the project period. Considerable progress in both components was observed, though some activities still require extra work and focus if they are to be achieved before project ends. In some cases however, more time than the two years proposed – especially for IR 2 Rangeland management activities – is needed if the project outcomes are to be realized as discussed in the sections below. Results of the program’s interventions in each of the three program Intermediate Result areas are presented below (Table 2). It was however observed that most outcome level results are however yet to be felt by participating households given that the project has just got into the second year of implementation. ZRR project management has devised a plan to meet the set activities and indicator targets as shown in Chapter 4.

3.1 Project progress

Table 3: Summary of project progress by component and indicators

Activity	Activity status	Key Performance Indicator	Indicator status
OFDA Subsector Goal: Farmer resiliency to environmental and economic shocks enhanced through development, testing, documentation and dissemination of sustainable fodder and fodder seed production and marketing systems			
N/A		<i>Indicator A: 6200 animals benefitting from or affected by livestock activities</i> <i>Indicator B: 6200 people benefitting from livestock activities</i> <i>Indicator C: 2000 veterinary interventions, treatments or vaccinations administered</i> <i>Indicator D: 1500 animals treated or vaccinated</i>	<i>Indicator A: 8747 animals benefitting from or affected by livestock activities</i> <i>Indicator B: 5770 people benefitting from livestock activities</i> <i>Indicator C: 6748 veterinary interventions, treatments or vaccinations administered</i> <i>Indicator D: 6189 animals treated or vaccinated</i>
Program Goal: Expedite recovery, reduce risk, and mitigate effects of economic and environmental disasters on Zimbabwe’s vulnerable communities through livestock production, management and marketing.			
N/A	Outcomes generally good with participating households mentioning improved nutrition (meat and milk), access to health services and education for households not able to access these before through ale of goats. Kidd mortality also mentioned to have reduced to	<i>Indicator E: 6200 individuals participating in disaster risk reduction activities</i>	<i>Indicator E: 5770 individuals participating in disaster risk reduction activities</i>

	by half. Lagging activities are fodder production and goat marketing. Farm gate sales mentioned as the dominant channel.	<i>Indicator F: 60 per cent of beneficiary households with improved productive asset base</i> <i>Indicator G: 60 per cent female Headed Households with improved productive asset base</i>	<i>Indicator F: 31 per cent of beneficiary households with improved productive asset base</i> <i>Indicator G: 49.2 per cent female Headed Households with improved productive asset base</i>
Sub Component 1: Livestock			
IR 1: Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities Positive response, including reduced mortality, increased litter size with a 6 month kidding interval. Main concerns are on goat distribution and marketing.			
Activity 1.1: Goat production Activity 1.2: Restocking Activity 1.3: Goat Marketing Activity 1.4: Fodder production	<p>Training going on very well and appreciated by farmers.</p> <p>So far 1773 does bought and a balance of 33 will be bought by end of August 2013. Bucks 26 so far bought and a balance of 124 will be bought by end of this quarter; Talk of non-compliance with pass on list when distributing goats by project staff in one program area, noted to be an isolated case. Still lagging. Goat marketing study has been finalized though. Rehabilitation of marketing infrastructure not yet done; linkage with other marketing channels not realized yet with Land O'Lakes mentioned as the buyer.</p> <p>ZRR has introduced a good concept on goat marketing of purchasing based on weight. However, no commercial buyers buy goats.</p> <p>ZRR was to work closely with the local research stations in Grassland and Matopos to select fodder seeds, including seed testing of up to seven fodder varieties. However this has not been done since USAID does not allow payment for goods or services provided by government agencies.</p> <p>Distribution of fodder seeds to all participating farmers to establish fodder plots not done in first year. Fodder production at farm level was not achieved in year one. ZRR advanced this activity through demo plots (2 per district).</p> <p>No farmer produces fodder for livestock, a number use urea treatment on maize Stover's though. In addition, poor rains impacted fodder production. Farmers said they were concentrating on seed production and may have impacted quality of fodder in the process within the demo plots.</p>	<p><i>IR1.1: 2000 households trained or receiving technical assistance in goat production and marketing (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.2: Average value of assets (tools, livestock, domestic) in targeted participating households (Impact) – 2070 USD</i></p> <p><i>IR1.3: 700 households receiving goats from the project and participating in producer groups (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.4: 10 goat producer groups formed or strengthened (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.5 30 per cent of producer group membership comprised of females (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.6: 10 producer groups linked to markets (Output)</i></p>	<p><i>IR1.1: 1154 households trained or receiving technical assistance in goat production and marketing (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.2: Average value of assets (tools, livestock, domestic) in targeted participating households (Impact) – USD 2141</i></p> <p><i>IR1.3: 617 households receiving goats from the project and participating in producer groups (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.4: 10 goat producer groups formed or strengthened (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.5 60 per cent of producer group membership comprised of females (Output)</i></p> <p><i>IR1.6: 0 producer groups linked to markets (Output)</i></p>
IR 2: Increased communities' capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management			
Activity 2.1: Training of	Changed as per the agreement but done –	IR2.1: 50 CLW's	IR2.1: 68 CLW's

<p>trainers</p> <p>Activity 2.2: Community and farmer training</p> <p>Activity 2.3: Rangeland management planning and extension services provision</p>	<p>ACHM trained program staffs who then have trained Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) as community based facilitators. This was done well as observed by ACHM staff.</p> <p>Some progress was observed, though not as intended. Community members have been trained on range land management by project staff and CLWs. However, study tour of key community leaders was done late. Last lot of community leaders visited ACHM in June, 2013 rather than in the first three months as proposed; all leaders receptive and say approach will be implemented in their areas; say ZRR should help them in planning. One district has grazing plans which are not implemented. Challenge observed in this is that Some villages do not have designated grazing areas and so cannot implement a communal grazing plan. In addition, communal grazing is a new concept in the project area and will take time to be adopted. Some community members say this approach will starve their animals.</p> <p>This activity is seriously lagging – only one district has grazing plans but none is being implemented. ACHM’s view is that the communities were not involved in planning. Project staffs shall involve communities in coming up with grazing plans in the second year so that they get their buy in.</p>	<p><i>trained in farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Output)</i></p> <p>IR2.2: 6200 people trained in improved farm and rangeland management (Output)</p> <p>IR2.3: 6 grazing management plans developed and utilized by communities (Outcome)</p> <p>IR2.4: 6 Communities applying improved farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Outcome)</p> <p>IR2.5: 2000 hectares (Ha) under improved land management (Outcome)</p> <p>IR2.6: 50 per cent of community farmers applying improved farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Outcome)</p>	<p><i>trained in farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Output)</i></p> <p>IR2.2: 3220 people trained in improved farm and rangeland management (Output)</p> <p>IR2.3: 1 grazing management plans developed and utilized by communities (Outcome)</p> <p>IR2.4: 6 Communities applying improved farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Outcome)</p> <p>IR2.5: 125 hectares (Ha) under improved land management (Outcome)</p> <p>IR2.6: 45% per cent of community farmers applying improved farm and sustainable rangeland management techniques (Outcome)</p>
<p>Sub component 2: Veterinary medicines and vaccines</p>			
<p>IR 3: Increased Capacity of and Access to Animal Health and Livestock Extension Services</p>			
<p>Land O'Lakes will identify potential CLWs through existing goat producer groups and work with them to provide animal health services to participating farmers.</p>	<p>Good progress in this. Farmers appreciate CLWs skills and effort; say ‘they call them first when they have a problem with their livestock’. CLWs however complained of lack of coordination with relevant livestock and agriculture extension personnel, some trained CLWs (very few though in one District) did not have bicycles and kits and so do not practice – farmers do not pay them for ‘advising and training’, when farmers buy syringes, medicine, etc, by the time of the evaluation. This has however been corrected and all now have kits.</p> <p>In addition, the revolving fund is working in most communities; farmers vaccinate, spray, deworm and seek treatment when their animals are sick. This has led to a reduction in Kidd mortality and general goat mortality in the target area.</p>	<p>IR3.1: 50 CLWs trained (Output)</p> <p>IR3.2: 60 per cent of CLWs utilizing their training and skills to train farmers (Outcome)</p> <p>IR3.3: 2480 women responsible for making household decisions in veterinary care and management of their goats (Outcome)</p> <p>IR3.4: 2000 Households served by CLWs (Output)</p>	<p>IR3.1: 68 CLWs trained (Output)</p> <p>IR3.2: 90 per cent of CLWs utilizing their training and skills to train farmers (Outcome)</p> <p>IR3.3: 1154 women responsible for making household decisions in veterinary care and management of their goats (Outcome)</p> <p>IR3.4: 1200 Households served by CLWs (Output)</p>

Evaluation findings show positive but mixed results in the various project's IRs. Progress has been realized in the uptake of livestock husbandry practices that ZRR promotes, especially those targeting improved animal health. Practices that have shown considerable change in terms of adoption by farmers from baseline are vaccination and dipping as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Proportion of participating households practicing various veterinary interventions

Veterinary Intervention	Per cent (%) practicing at Baseline	Per cent (%) practicing at Mid term	Per cent (%) of Female HH practicing at midterm	Per cent (%) of Male HH practicing at midterm
Treatment of diseases	59.5	33	39%	30%
Dehorning	4.6	10	2%	12%
Castration	13	16	11%	13%
Vaccination	51.9	68	47%	61%
Dipping	36.6	68.4	60%	71%
De worming	43.5	25	21%	27%

Results indicate that more male headed households have adopted ZRR promoted veterinary practices than female headed households, with treatment of diseases being the only practice with more females than males practicing. A similar trend was observed for livestock ownership. The ZRR team needs to put in place a strategy to ensure female headed households adopt these practices to realize greater results.

This seems to have resulted to a slight increase in number of livestock¹ owned by participating households interviewed, as indicated in Tables 5.

Table 5: Livestock ownership: Proportion owning and number owned by type

Livestock type	Per cent (%) owning at baseline	Average number per HH owning at baseline	Per cent (%) owning at mid term	Per cent (%) Male HH owning	Per cent (%) Female HH owning	Average number per HH owning at mid term
Cattle	80.9	4	75	81%	63%	5.3
Goats	93.9	6	90	93%	84%	7.1
Sheep	9.2	1	5	7%	0	3.4
Poultry	88	9	85	89%	77%	9

Activities aimed at increased productivity and market access were observed to have been implemented, although not all as proposed. ZRR project has distributed goats to 88% of the total number of households targeted, and plans to finalize goat distribution by end of quarter two of the 2012/13 FY. The same success was however not observed for activities targeting fodder production and goat marketing.

The ZRR project has introduced a good concept on goat marketing - that of purchasing based on weight. However, no linkage with commercial buyers has been done, with farmers citing the project as the main goat buyer. This is not sustainable. The project has finalized a goat marketing study though and aim to do more on linkages in the remainder of the project duration. The other task lagging in marketing include rehabilitation of

¹ The proportion of respondents owning appears to have declined compared to baseline. This could be explained by the fact that the baseline survey was conducted in areas targeted by the Land O'Lakes implemented dairy project, while the Mit term included households not targeted by the dairy project.

marketing infrastructure. Evaluation results indicate that farmers do not access formal markets, but sell goats locally amongst themselves as shown in Table 6. As shown, no major difference was observed compared to baseline on the market channel used.

Table 6: Goat marketing: Main market cited (Percent of farmers citing)

Marketing channel	Per cent (%) citing at Mid term	Per cent (%) citing at Mid term
Farm Gate	66.4	64.4
Rural District Council Cattle Pens	9.2	3.4
Collection points	Na	12.3
Business center	24.4	10.3
Other	Na	9.6

This needs to be fast tracked since farmers say they have enough goats to sell but lack a favorable buyer.

Fodder production at farm level is another activity that should be fast tracked. ZRR worked to demonstrate fodder production in its first year by establishing demonstration plots in all the five districts, with the intention of producing seeds and fodder which would then be shared by the farmers to plant in their own plots. This realized mixed results in Year 1. Table 7 shows the proportion of farmers participating and the quantity of seeds harvested in the year.

Table 7: Fodder production results

Fodder crop	Sum Area(HA)	Sum Yield (kgs)
Velvet beans	0.95	48
Sugar graze	1.27	122
cowpeas	0.85	155
Soya beans	0.92	100
Yellow maize	0.62	85
Ground nuts	0.27	132
other	1.2	550

All this was realized in the demo plots. This is another activity that ZRR needs to give more emphasis in year two, especially since the project proposed to pay *'Special attention to forage and fodder production and storage. Land O'Lakes will distribute certified forage seeds to all goat producer group members for establishment of simple and effective home-based fodder storages constructed with locally-available materials'*

3.1.1 Other ZRR results

Household Dietary Diversity Score

Analysis of program progress in improving household dietary diversity revealed a drop in household dietary diversity score to a mean of 6, a 14% drop compared to the baseline mean of 7 (Table 4). The evaluation team however notes that the drought that affected crop production in 2013 could have contributed to this drop.

Table 4: HDDS Scores by District

District	HDDS at Baseline	HDDS at MTE
----------	------------------	-------------

Buhera	7	7
Makoni	7	7
Mutare rural	7	6
Mangwe	5	5
Bulilima	Na	6
HDDs for the sample	7	6

Beneficiary Scorecard

About 83.5% of participating farmers are highly satisfied with the ZRR project services, with project activities on dipping campaigns, training on fodder production, CLWs' services and timing of training rated the best five (Table 5). This mirrors the challenges that farmers experience in the area, especially with animal health – goat mortality, and animal feeds.

Table 5: Beneficiary Scorecard

Service	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied
Dipping Campaigns	79.9	6.7
Fodder production	76.8	8.2
CLWs	76.3	13.4
Training materials	66	23.2
Training delivery	71.1	19.6
Training structure	68.6	22.2
Training duration	71.6	19.1
Training timing	75.3	15.5
Drug revolving fund	72.2	13.9
Rangeland management	71.6	17
Goat marketing	74.7	11.9
Overall rating	83.5	6.2

Some comments that the ZRR project management may want to consider going forward regarding the various project services include:

- Goat dipping: Knowledge on goat dipping that participating farmers have acquired is appreciated. However respondents say they have not yet dipped their goats, as they do not have dip tanks.
- Fodder production: Some respondents said they need to put in practice what they have learnt in the demonstration plots in their own plots. This corroborates the recommendation that fodder production at farm level needs to be fast tracked in the second year.
- Timing of training, training content and structure very well rated and appreciated. A few respondents however said the sessions are sometimes too long given house chores. Some mentioned not attending all sessions.
- Revolving drug generally appreciated, with respondents saying they can easily access drugs when they need to. Some communities have not established the revolving fund however. This need to be followed up.

- Rangeland management: A few respondents said they need additional information on this. Some communities, in the FGDs, mentioned a need for the ZRR team to assist them hire cartographers and land surveyors to help them design grazing plans. This demonstrates a lack of understanding of the ACHM concept and how it works. The project team therefore needs to organize planning meetings with all communities to ensure this move forward. Otherwise, this result area will not realize the intended outcomes.
- Goat marketing: Respondents said they now know the importance of selling goats based on weight – ‘scaling’. However, they mention Land O’Lakes as the only buyer they know who buys based on this concept. A number also said they need additional information on markets, implying a need for market linkages.

Overall, farmers said they can now sell goats to pay school fees, buy food, clothing among other things.

3.1 Project design, implementation and achievements, including changes in context and review of assumptions

The ZRR project has been well implemented and has realized impressive results in its one year of operation in two out of the three result area. The project also is meeting its intended result, that of building resiliency to economic and environmental shocks. As observed in our field visits, participating farmers appreciate the project approach – that is distributing three goats, and that every household in the target area has a chance to benefit through a well-established and implemented pass on scheme.

Farmers we talked to appreciate goats because ‘goats can rapidly increase in number and can easily be sold in case one has a problem’. Nutritional and soil treatment benefits – manure and goat milk and meat, were also mentioned as critical benefits of the project design and approach.

Those who did not have goats in their households can now own one. If any of my children fall sick, I can sell one of my goats and take him/her to the hospital. We also slaughter the goats whenever we need meat’

In terms of targeting the most vulnerable, results indicate that the poor, households with sick members, and orphans have benefitted, with the community members assisting them to build appropriate goat housing, which is the basic requirement by the program to get goats.

As shown in Table 2, the project has surpassed some indicator targets and achieved more than half the targets in almost all remaining indicators, with the exception of IR 2 - Increased communities’ capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management.

Farmers we interviewed mention specific benefits they have received from the project. These benefits by program result area are:

IR 1: Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities

- Training (in goat housing, feeding, goat management techniques, heat detection), fodder production in demonstration plots, fodder harvesting and storage, goat production as a business, and goat health.
- Increased goat population in the project area was also mentioned. The project has distributed goats to a number of households in the area, and goats now give birth twice a year to many kids than before.
- Feed preservation: Residents have learnt to produce fodder in the demo plots. Farmers also mentioned preserving maize stovers and ground nut stocks which they then treat with Urea and feed their livestock.

'Goat feathers are now healthy and shiny; body shape is better than before, and that shedding of goat feathers has now stopped'

Female farmers FGD, Mutare Rural

IR 2: Increased communities' capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management

Some progress reported in this result area, though limited. Movable Kraals were observed to be in very high demand, sometimes leading to mis understandings in the target communities due to its benefits in treating soil, comfortable to cattle because if the Kraal is moved, cattle get to sleep in a clean place, and for easy breeding because whole community can benefit from a few bulls instead of all villagers acquiring a breeding bull.

Those interviewed mention said there is limited grazing areas in the communities due to new settlements and 'because of the increasing number of goats in the village', which corroborates the statement on increasing goat herd.

IR 3: Increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services

The MTE results demonstrate considerable progress in this result area compared to baseline findings. At baseline, farmers expressed that access to veterinary drugs and vaccines was a challenge, as these were not sold locally, and that CLWs only assisted in disease identification, and were not able to treat many diseases, as they do not have access to veterinary drugs. Communities were in addition not paying for CLW services, and hence, it is difficult to for the CLWs to purchase drugs on behalf of the farmers. Now CLWs treat livestock and get paid for their services in some districts.

'CLWs are close to us, are fast and reliable. They are the ones we call first when we have a problem with our livestock. If she/he does not have drugs, they will call another CLW to get the drug. If the problem is complex, they call other experienced vets for assistance. Before, we used to travel up to 10 kilometers with the sick animal to see a government veterinary officer.'

Male farmer in Mutare Rural

- Improved livestock health due to the establishment of a drug revolving fund and training of CLWs, improved livestock body condition as a result of improved goat management – due to the fact that they have abandoned tethering and now free graze.
- Project has organized farmers who now contribute money to buy animal health drugs as a group, saving them money and time – on transport.
- Reduced goat mortality

'In the past, it used to be up to 60%, now it is at most 20%. Livestock deaths only occur if one delays asking a CLW to come visit once you notice a problem'

Male farmer FGD, Mutare Rural District

3.1.1 Implementation strategies and impact on progress towards results

The ZRR project has realized good results as discussed above in two out of the three result areas. IR 2 however requires more work and the intended outcomes will require more time to be observed than the two years originally proposed.

Some factors that were observed and/or mentioned to have contributed to the success in the two result areas are:

- Project implementation is utilizing the existing structures in the target area that has ensured maintenance of existing power relations and enforcement of rules necessary for goat distribution,

including the pass on scheme. ZRR has not created parallel structures within the wards it operates in. Rather, it is using the community structures, most notably the Ward Development Committees/Ward Executive Committees. All farmer groups are required to develop a constitution and laws governing their operation, which are then enforced by the Ward Executive Committees. This has ensured a smooth enforcement of the goat pass on scheme and will be critical in implementing the communal grazing plans once these are operationalized.

The project also uses the Provincial Veterinary Officer to train the CLWs. While other players, especially the ward level veterinary service providers complained about the duration of the CLWs training, we noted that they do not complain about the quality of the training or its content. Farmers also mentioned that the CLWs working with the project have similar skills to the qualified veterinary service providers and therefore call them first given their closeness to the community.

- Another critical factor that was observed to have contributed to the ZRR success is that the project is working in a few wards and districts that had participated in the Rebuilding Livelihoods and Resiliency in Zimbabwe a USAID funded Economic Growth project that initially had a goat distribution component but which was eliminated. This continuation – in a few Wards – ensured a quick start up since most of the households in the wards had already put up goat houses and attended some goat trainings – even though they still required refresher trainings – to receive the goats and implement the improved management practices adopted by the project.

“Farmers have a very good perception of the project and enforcement of the pass on scheme will not be a problem”

Area Councilor, Ward 11, Mutare Rural

As mentioned, some activities are still lagging behind. The ZRR management will need to revisit its implementation approach for the project to achieve its intended results.

- Rangeland management: Discussions with ACHM, the ZRR partner in Rangeland Management mentioned a number of issues which the project team needs to change going forward. These include:
 - ✓ Use of the community action cycle to ensure all community members are consulted, engaged and empowered to act to ensure ownership of the grazing plans, movable kraals among others. We noted that the project team trained by ACHM has trained CLWs and empowered them to carry on activities related to rangeland management. ZRR has also exposed community leaders to the Holistic Land and Rangeland Management approach through the trip to the ACHM. Results have been varied. The consistent observation however was that there is lack of ownership of and none of the communities ZRR works in is implementing a grazing plan, with some farmers saying the approach, combined with communal kraaling, ‘will starve their livestock’, while community leaders we talked to said the approach is good and that ‘they will ensure all members comply with the project grazing plans once designed’. As currently implemented, it will not yield results and is not sustainable given the ‘policing approach’ that some community leaders are thinking of.

‘Go and plan, when you have planned, come to me and tell me what you have planned and I will ensure it is implemented’

Village headman, Buhera District

The project therefore needs to revisit the community action cycle – explore and plan with the entire community- to make sure members identify the problem and solutions, and design the grazing calendar themselves.

Lack of awareness is one of the main problems leading to noncompliance with the grazing plans that we have experienced. If only a few people understand the concept, recovery takes longer because the bigger the herd, the faster the impact, but once majority understand, they will enforce the grazing plans. This is why we introduced the community action cycle in 2010 to build ownership. We noticed that people would act when we were still working with them because of policing but would not push it further once we leave.'

ACHM Representative

- ✓ Time to recovery of rangelands: ZRR should ideally have more time to develop and integrate this concept at community level than the two years proposed. Even in the ACHM Campus, recovery took longer than the two years ZRR will be implemented. The ACHM representative said that 'In ACHM, it took more than three years and we had a bigger herd. At community level, people have personal differences and other cultural issues also play a big role in delaying results. It is only in the fourth and fifth year that people will start appreciating the results because it will be visible in some plots'.
- Marketing: The ZRR project has introduced a good marketing concept – that of selling based on goat weight. However, Land O'Lakes is the only one buying based on this concept at the moment for restocking purposes. This is not sustainable. ZRR needs to link producer groups with buyers who will buy based on this concept in year two.
- Fodder production: Two issues were observed:
 - ✓ Approach to promote fodder production has been through the demonstration farms. This has been appreciated by farmers interviewed. However, farmers lack fodder seeds. In fact the demonstration farms main objective was to produce fodder seeds and may have compromised quality of fodder. ZRR needs to ensure farmers get seeds as proposed to ensure they this concept is adopted.
 - ✓ The ZRR project intended to work closely with the local research stations in Grassland and Matopos to select fodder seeds, including seed testing of up to seven fodder varieties . However, this has not been accomplished given that USAID does not allow projects to pay for goods or services provided by government agencies. The project will be engaging private players for the sourcing of certified seeds for distribution to all Goat Producer Groups in the second year. This is in the Management's response to evaluation recommendations in section 4.

3.2 Processes that affect achievement of project results (behavior change and capacity strengthening)

The ZRR project has distributed goats to 88% of project targeted households, and provided trainings on goat management to 1154 farmers, about 58% of the project target. Trainings have covered animal health, feeding, housing, fodder production, breeding, among other management practices. No major changes have been observed from baseline in terms of outcomes. Achievements that have been observed in terms of adoption of recommended practices and resulting changes in animal – especially goat - productivity include:

Goat husbandry

About 60% of households participating are headed by women. Evaluation findings indicate that more male headed households have adopted promoted veterinary practices than the female headed households. However, an interesting observation was that no considerable differences were noted at the outcomes level – kidding interval, age at first kidding, goat mortality, among others.

- About 90.7% of farmers attending training practice open grazing of goats as opposed to tethering. This however is not different from baseline – at 93.1% of respondents practicing open grazing.

- 61.3% of respondents did not report any deaths for mature goats in the last one year. This again is not different from baseline, at 64.1%. On Kidd mortality, a slight decrease in proportion of those reporting Kidd deaths was observed, at 41.7% compared to 49.6% at baseline.
- On breeding, respondents mention adopting recommended practices and recording one mating per pregnancy, a maximum of ten months as the average age at first kidding (Mean of 8.9 months for Male HH and 8.4 for Female HH), and a maximum of 6.1 months kidding interval from 8.13 at baseline (mean of 5.5 months for Male HH and 5.2 for Female HH). Results due to adoption of promoted management practices include an increase in number of litter to two on average, from 1.15 kids at baseline, and reduced abortion rates, reported by 9.2% of those surveyed.
- Those surveyed have realized 2.2 additional kids in to their goat herds in the first half of 2013 as opposed to 2.6 additional kids in the entire 2012.

Rangeland management

Only one community has developed grazing plans which is not implemented. The issues, as discussed above, were identified to be non-engagement of all livestock owners in exploring the problems and coming up with appropriate solutions.

Another problem to this is the lack of grazing land in some communities bordering those that work with ZRR, who may not comply with the plans once developed. Appropriate measures, involving incorporating such communities in the plans will be mandatory.

Animal health

Two observations were made:

- Over 90% of the trained CLWs are supporting farmers – they castrate, deworm, and vaccinate livestock in their various areas. The CLWs have been trained and equipped with the exception of a few in Bulilima District. The evaluation team observed that most of the CLWs already equipped are paid by farmers for their services, including in kind.

Some CLWs however complained of not being paid by farmers. ZRR should therefore equip the CLWs as soon as possible. On the broader issue of payment for service - even though recorded in a few project sites - one area the project should look at is using the CLWs who are charging for their services as their champions to ensure this succeeds for it to be a sustainable approach.

- All communities/farmer groups have not adopted the revolving fund for purchasing animal health. The fund also faces operational challenges in some areas. ZRR should ensure these challenges are corrected.

3.3 Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes

In assessing ZRR sustainability initiatives, efforts to ensure an ongoing transformational process to address the different interests of all players in the project area were considered. Project integration with relevant institutions in the area was also assessed. Three issues came out:

- The ZRR project's use of existing administrative structures, especially the Ward Development Committee/Ward Executive Committees will possibly ensure that results, especially implementation of the goat pass on scheme and grazing plans, are sustainable. The project should however desist from appeasing the local administration by jumping the pass on list as mentioned in Buhera as this could lead to internal group conflicts and negatively impact sustainability.
- The evaluation team noted that ward level veterinary service providers are not as engaged in the project, and therefore do not work closely with the CLWs. Program use of these personnel for

especially for capacity strengthening and supervision of CLWs will link ZRR beneficiaries to their resources and can sustain program results after closeout. ZRR should therefore aim to involve them more in the last year of implementation as this was an area that the CLWs pointed out as wanting in implementation.

- Community involvement in rangeland management activities has to be reconsidered to ensure sustainability, especially since this will take longer than the project duration for all to see the benefits.

3.4 Challenges and lessons learnt

3.5.1 Challenges

Lack of grazing lands in some communities

Lack of grazing land in some communities bordering those that work with ZRR, who may not comply with the plans once developed was identified by both project staff and community members. Appropriate measures, involving incorporating such communities in the plans will be mandatory. Another challenge is the cultivation or habitation of formerly designated grazing lands in ZRR target communities, which locals say, could render such lands nonexistent.

Project duration

The two years proposed will not be adequate to realize results for IR 2. As discussed, it takes at least 4 years at community level to see any results from Holistic Rangeland management initiatives. Other activities that will require additional time to adequately implement include:

- Goat marketing: The ZRR project has improved goat production to an extent that improves resiliency. The project will require more time for farmers to learn how to engage in the markets, both local and urban. For the innovation of purchasing goats based on weight to be entrenched in the project area, ZRR will need to link the benefitting households to urban goat markets. This can only happen if there is enough supply of goats to sustain demand which will need more time for the benefitting households to build their goat herds.
- Fodder production: The ZRR project has only had one cropping season which was used to introduce the concept of fodder production in demonstration plots. Given that fodder production is a new concept in the project area, it will require a few more seasons to be an established practice in the area.

It is the evaluation team's considered view that more cropping seasons/ an extended program duration would help fodder production, rangeland management, market integration and commercialization and thus enable the project to achieve its targets.

3.5.2 Lessons learnt

- Holistic Rangeland management initiatives, commercial goat production and marketing and introduction of fodder production goat generally take longer than two years. This needs to have been factored in at design. It will be difficult for the project to realize the intended results - IR2.4: and IR2.5 within two years.
- ZRR has introduced an innovation in the program area – that of local sourcing of goats which has enabled the program to realize two critical results – to reinvest USAID funds within neighboring communities and to purchase goats based on weight, age and teeth thus showing farmers that quality pays. Purchase of goats based on weight has not only resulted in a sharp increase in goat prices in

the area, but also opened the eyes of the community members that commercial goat production is can be achieved.

4.0 Recommendations

Project activity related recommendations:

- Project to request for additional time to implement activities and realize results on Rangeland management, goat marketing and fodder production.
- Goat restocking: Goat distribution should be finalized by as soon as possible for staff to monitor implementation of the pass on scheme. Buck distribution should target higher quality goat breeds than those in local communities
- Project should prioritize linkage with commercial buyers in the second year, who can buy based on weight as promoted. Households say they have enough goats to sell.
- Fodder production: ZRR to distribute seeds to farmers in the second year early enough for fodder production at farm level. Farmers mentioned having the knowledge to enable the produce fodder but lack seeds.
- Rangeland management: Project staff to conduct planning events – explore issues around rangeland management and design community maps and grazing plans with all community members. Project staffs need to spend more time on ground on this activity and not leave it entirely to leaders and CLWs, including training herders. Regarding movable kraals a more involved approach by staff in preparing the roster and monitoring its use is recommended. In addition, ZRR staff should encourage communities to invest in their own Kraals. This result area however requires more time, at least four years to see benefits/results.
- Animal health: CLWs complained of lack of coordination with key stakeholders’ livestock and agriculture extension personnel. In addition, some trained CLWs (very few though in Bulilima District) do not have bicycles and kits and so do not practice – farmers do not pay them for ‘advising and training’, when farmers buy syringes, medicine. ZRR should therefore equip all CLWs as soon as possible and to ensure all CLWs are linked to relevant extension personnel to ensure they refer complicated cases to them, since private vets are non-existent in the program area.

Management related recommendations

- Monitoring: It was observed that some project target districts have many issues which have not been identified but which the evaluation team were of the opinion should have been rectified earlier. A clear case is the problem with the rangeland management activity - both communal grazing planning and movable kraal. While it is not possible to correct all problems in implementation, it pays to identify emerging problems early. This is currently lacking in some project districts. To correct this, we recommend that project field facilitators should spend more time in the field while M&E personnel should make frequent monitoring visits. If this happens, you will identify problems much earlier and act sooner before they get out of hand like in Manzununu Ward where the movable Kraal has overstayed in one CLWs farm and her neighbor since its distribution in April, with the rest of the community members requesting for ‘their’ movable Kraal.
- Reconciling sustainability concerns with stakeholder buy in: In some districts village heads demand to be given goats in exchange for enforcing the pas on scheme and marketing groups’ constitutions. The ZRR project need to ensure that all community leaders understand our focus – which is to empower vulnerable members of their communities.

5.0 ZRR Program Response to Midterm Evaluation Recommendations

Evaluation Recommendations	Key issues (I) from field and Recommendations	Management Response	Time Frame to Address
<p>Goal: Expedite recovery, reduce risk, and mitigate effects of economic and environmental disasters on Zimbabwe's vulnerable communities through livestock production, management and marketing.</p>	<p>I: Outcomes generally good - households mention improved nutrition (meat and milk), access to health services and education for households not able to access these before Lagging activities are fodder production and marketing. HHs mentioned farm gate as the dominant channel. R: Recommend program to prioritize linkage with commercial buyers in the second year. Households say they have enough goats to sell. This could be achieved by hiring someone to focus on marketing. Restocking needs to be finalized in the first quarter of year two to enable staff to monitor the pass on scheme for sustainability.</p>	<p>So far 1773 does bought and a balance of 33 will be bought by end of August 2013. Bucks 26 so far bought and a balance of 124 will be bought by end of this quarter Training of Trainers on Marketing will be done and market sourcing This will be done looking at a balance of only 33does</p>	<p>Does By August 2013 Bucks by end of this quarter By end of this quarter</p>
Sub Component 1: Livestock			
<p>IR 1: Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities</p>	<p>I: Positive response, including reduced mortality, increased litter size with a 6 month kidding interval. Main concerns are on goat distribution and marketing. R: As above on goal.</p>		
<p>Activity 1: Goat production: Training</p>	<p>I: Training going on very well and appreciated by farmers.</p>		
<p>Activity 2: Restocking: Distribution of 1,500 goats to 700 individual households</p>	<p>I: Goats yet to be distributed to all targeted HHs; quality of bucks distributed – farmers want better quality – boar goats to improve herd; Talk of non-compliance with pass on list when distributing goats by project staff in one program area, noted to be an isolated case. R: Goat distribution should be finalized by end of quarter one for staff to monitor pass on scheme R: Buck distribution to target higher quality goat breeds than those in local communities R: We need to follow the pass on list prepared before to ensure sustainability R: Tag all distributed goats and the pass on ones</p>	<p>High quality bucks to be sourced and distributed Yes this is agreed but we have situations when a beneficiary on the list does not coming for training and has no standard housing. All project goats will be tagged</p>	<p>By end of this quarter By end of this quarter</p>
<p>Goat marketing</p>	<p>Still lagging. Goat marketing study has been finalized though. Rehabilitation of marketing infrastructure not yet done; linkage with other marketing channels not realized yet with Land O'Lakes mentioned as the buyer. LOL has introduced a good concept on goat marketing of purchasing based on weight. However, no commercial buyers buy goats. This needs to be fast tracked.</p>	<p>The project is going to put up new marketing infrastructures in the program areas Linking farmers to commercial buyers</p>	<p>By end of second quarter of year 2 By end of 1st quarter</p>

<p>Activity 3 a: Fodder production: work closely with the local research stations in Grassland and Matopos to select fodder seeds, including seed testing of up to seven fodder varieties</p>	<p>I: Not done. USAID does not allow us to pay for goods or services provided by government agencies.</p> <p>I: Fodder production changed – <i>‘Special attention will be paid to forage and fodder production and storage. Land O’Lakes will distribute certified forage seeds to all goat producer group members for establishment of simple and effective home-based fodder storages constructed with locally-available materials’</i></p> <p>This has not been done. Farmers intended to produce seeds in demo plots which may have impacted quality of forage.</p> <p>R: Distribute seeds to farmers in the second year early enough for fodder production at farm.</p> <p>R: This needs to be communicated to donor. Program has to find another organization to work with on seed production, otherwise, this component will negatively impact fodder production at farm level.</p>	<p>Because of this we shall engage private players for the sourcing of certified seeds for distribution to all Goat Producer Groups</p> <p>Farmers shall be encouraged to put up fodder conservation structures for safe storage of their fodder</p>	<p>By end of September 2013</p> <p>By February 2014 before harvesting starts</p>
<p>Activity 3b: Promote household conservation and storage of fodder (grasses, stovers, crop byproducts) at the appropriate times to improve the nutritional status of the goats at the end of the dry season</p>	<p>I: Mixed results. Program advanced this activity through demo plots (2 per district). No farmer produces fodder for livestock, a number use urea treatment on maize Stover’s. In addition, poor rains impacted fodder production. Farmers said they were concentrating on seed production and may have impacted quality of fodder in the process.</p> <p>R: More focus on fodder production in second year. Link farmers to seed suppliers too.</p>	<p>Urea treatment is currently on going with maize stover and shall be continued during the second year.</p> <p>Farmers will also be encouraged to conserve groundnuts stover as well as other materials from leguminous crops</p>	<p>By May 2014</p>
<p>IR 2: Increased communities’ capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management: This is lagging behind, with the bulk of the work left to the community - CLWs and community leaders to do. Requires a lot of focus in the second year.</p>			
<p>Activity 1: Training of trainers: Project identified trainers from the community and Land O’Lakes trained by ACHM</p>	<p>I: Changed as per the agreement but done– ACHM trained program staffs who then have trained CLWs as community based facilitators. This was done well.</p> <p>R: Communicate why changed</p>		
<p>Activity 2: Community and farmer training: Project to facilitate a study tour of key community leaders to the ACHM Dimbangombe Ranch within the first three months</p>	<p>I: Some progress. Community members have been trained on range land management by project staff and CLWs. However, study tour of key community leaders was finalized late – June, 2013 – Last lot of community leaders visited ACHM in June, 2013 rather than in the first three months as proposed; all leaders receptive and say approach will be implemented in their areas; say LOL to help them in planning. One district has grazing plans which are not implemented. Some villages do not have grazing areas.</p> <p>R: Done even though late</p>		

<p>Activity 3: Rangeland Management Planning and Extension Services Provision: Trained CLWs and local traditional leadership will assist each community to develop an annual grazing and rangeland management plan</p>	<p>I: This activity is seriously lagging – only one district has grazing plans but none is being implemented. ACHM’s view is that community was not involved in planning. This is also my view.</p> <p>R: Project staff to conduct planning events – explore issues around rangeland management and design community maps and grazing plans with community; Project staff to spend more time on ground on this activity and not leave it entirely to leaders and CLWs, train herders, involve entire community in exploring problems around grazing land and constructing the grazing plans instead of leaving it to the community to do.</p> <p>R: Movable kraals – prepare a roster and use; encourage communities to invest in their own.</p> <p>R: Need more time, at least three years to see benefits/results so may seek for more time.</p>	<p>Project staff shall involve communities in coming up with grazing plans so that they get their buy in.</p> <p>Project staff will assist the community leaders in coming up with grazing plans and spend more time with them to see the implementation</p> <p>The roster will be made</p>	<p>By September 2013.</p> <p>May 2014</p> <p>Mid July 2013</p>
<p>Subcomponent 2: Veterinary Medicines and Vaccines: Trained CLWs will focus on a community-based preventive animal health program</p>	<p>I: Good progress in this. Farmers appreciate CLWs skills and effort, say ‘they call them first when they have a problem with their livestock’.</p> <p>CLWs complained of lack of coordination with key stakeholders’ livestock and agriculture extension personnel, some trained CLWs (very few though in one District) do not have bicycles and kits and so do not practice – farmers do not pay them for ‘advising and training’, when farmers buy syringes, medicine, etc.</p> <p>R: Equip all CLWs as soon as possible;</p> <p>R: Ensure all CLWs are linked to relevant extension personnel to ensure they refer complicated cases to them, since private vets are non-existent in the program area</p>	<p>CLWs shall be encouraged to work closely with extension agencies this is important for sustainability.</p> <p>Administration is in the process of acquiring some balances for the Vet kits for distribution</p>	<p>September 2013</p> <p>By July 2013</p>
<p>IR 3: Increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services: CLWs, with the support of private-sector veterinarians and Land O’Lakes staff, will work with goat producer groups and livestock owners to develop treatment programs, including timely livestock dip campaigns and clinics to control ticks and tick-borne diseases; vaccinations of goats to prevent clostridial</p>	<p>Revolving fund working in most communities; farmers vaccinate, spray, deworm and seek treatment when their animals are sick.</p> <p>However, CLWs mention lack of cooperation by key stakeholder extension workers when they need to refer complicated cases. They also complain of compensation, with some saying they do not get compensated through the revolving fund. We observed that this is currently working for some CLWs and in some communities.</p> <p>R: Work with CLWs charging for their services as champions for this for the other CLWs to learn.</p>	<p>For sustainability the issue of remuneration of CLWs should left to the communities guided by the Goat Producer Associations</p>	<p>On going</p>

diseases such as tetanus, black leg, or enterotoxaemia; and strategic dewormings			
Cross cutting issue: Gender: A minimum of 60 percent of participants targeted shall be women	Only 50% currently women. Some districts have as high as 90% participation by women however. R: Project to have more targeted selection of participants going forward		
Selection of program participants: Farmers	In some districts, those without goats are excluded. In some areas, community interview revealed that no household in program area is denied participation and even households without goats in the districts where LOL is distributing bucks have enrolled and actively participating in group activities – including contributing to the drug Revolving Fund. Community interviews reveal that no one is denied participation – free will. In addition, households with orphans, elderly and the sick have also benefitted from goat distribution. R: All community members willing to participate in program activities should be allowed to enroll. Currently in Buhera and Makoni, households without goats are not allowed to enroll.	Enrollment should be allowed for all community members with or without goats - we still have pass on and if left there is room to benefit from the pass on	Ongoing until May 2014
Selection of program participants: Communities	Satisfactory – vulnerable (drought prone areas mostly) communities targeted		
Selection of program participants: CLWs	Apart from Mutare Rural where some group members had issues with one CLW, their selection seems to have been done well. A number are carry over from the ZDL project.		
Management: Field monitoring	I: It was observed that some areas have many issues which have not been identified but which I felt should have been rectified earlier. A clear case is the problem with the rangeland management activity - both communal grazing planning and movable kraal. While it is not possible to correct all problems in implementation, it pays to be on top of things. This is currently lacking in some project districts. R: Project field facilitators should spend more time in the field R: M&E personnel should make frequent monitoring visits. If this happens, you will identify problems much earlier and act sooner before they get out of hand like in Manzununu Ward where the movable Kraal has been labeled to belong to Nyama and one CLW, with the community requesting	Project activity monitoring shall be on top of the agenda for this second year of implementation. Field visits by management supported by written reports shall be used to monitor M&E to make more frequent visits to project areas for monitoring purposes and compliment the Technical lead person's efforts.	Throughout the year to May 2014 Through to May 2014

	for 'their' movable Kraal.		
Management: Staffing	<p>I: Some districts need additional support from the program technical lead person to ensure everything runs smoothly. Not all project field facilitators have equal strengths. It was observed that in some areas, even though there are problems, there's a general appreciation of the field staff and the project as a whole. In some Districts, this is starkly lacking, with some activities lacking behind. This was also observed by ACHM in their supervisory visit, leading to the lag in the rangeland management activity.</p> <p>R: Technical lead to be more in touch with field facilitators and provide support as necessary.</p>	The technical lead person shall constantly make follow ups and give the necessary guidelines and support to field staff	Through to May 2014
Management: Reconciling sustainability concerns with stakeholder buy in	<p>I: Village heads demand to be given goats in exchange for enforcing the pas on scheme and marketing groups' constitutions.</p> <p>R: Program need to ensure community leaders understand our focus – on vulnerable members of their communities. If this is not complied with, as is happening in other districts</p>	Compliance through and through	May 2014

6.0 Annexes

Annex 1: Scope of Work

Zimbabwe Livestock for Accelerated Recovery and Improved Resiliency Program Mid Term Evaluation Scope of Work

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Objective of the Midterm Evaluation (MTE)

The main objective of the Midterm evaluation (MTE) is to assess ZRR's strengths and weaknesses to improve its effectiveness. The assignment will involve assessing what the project proposed to accomplish and the progress to date in realizing these accomplishments. Working with project staff, the midterm assessment team will identify successes, problems or constraints (design, administrative, operational, among other). The team will focus on the four project activities and develop actionable recommendations to improve implementation.

Specific objectives include

- Assess the extent to which ZRR has met, not met, or exceeded its objectives;
- Identify key strengths and weaknesses of the project, including specific activities and overall program strategy; and
- Provide concrete (i.e. doable) recommendations to strengthen the project and address any areas of concern

Findings of the evaluation will guide the rest of program implementation and accordingly redefine approaches and pace of work.

1.2 Project Description

Land O'Lakes and its sub-partner, ACHM, are implementing the Zimbabwe Livestock for Accelerated Recovery and Improved Resiliency project, which aims to assist targeted vulnerable households in Matabeleland South and Manicaland to reduce vulnerability to both economic and climatic disasters, diversify livelihoods, build assets, and rebuild resiliency to shocks through training in livestock production; restocking of household herds; building community capacity in rangeland management; development of rangeland management plans; reviving livestock infrastructure; and increasing returns from livestock sales gained by smallholder farmers.

Goat distribution, paired with training and support of community-based goat production and improved natural resources management, will provide an opportunity for individual households that are vulnerable to climatic shocks and recovering from economic turmoil to build a sustainable productive asset base. While stressing individual ownership of the productive assets, Land O'Lakes will work to strengthen existing goat marketing groups to solidify community-level engagement, increase market access, improve economic returns to livestock keepers and their communities, and enable efforts to use livestock for proactive environmental restoration through communal herding.

Land O'Lakes also proposes to build the foundation for increased access to animal health services through the development of a community-based preventive animal health program that is closely linked to private veterinary and drug suppliers. Building a grassroots animal health network linked to larger private enterprises will improve herd productivity, reduce mortality, and increase the availability of breeding stock in the area.

Finally, Land O'Lakes will address the need to improve the natural production base of livestock systems. Specifically, the project will build the local capacity and apply Holistic Rangeland Management (HM) techniques to restore degraded farm and rangelands for more resilient and productive forage, feed and fodder resources.

Key anticipated outcomes include an expanded and strengthened productive asset base, decreased prevalence of herd depleting emergency livestock sales, sustained body condition of livestock throughout dry seasons (especially during times of delayed rains), and more productive and drought resistance farmlands due to improved soil composition

1.3 Project activities: Program results are consolidated and expanded through continued implementation of activities under two Agriculture and Food Security subcomponents and divided into three Intermediate Results (IRs), as follows:

Subcomponent 1: Livestock

IR 1: Increased productivity and market access of the livestock asset base in vulnerable households and communities;

Activity 1: Goat production: Land O'Lakes will rebuild this lost productive asset base through a herd growth scheme that includes distribution of 1,500 goats to 700 individual households. The project will reach an additional 300 households through goat producer groups and increased farm productivity; trainings in improved goat husbandry; and 'planned' production, fodder establishment and storage techniques.

Activity 2: Restocking: Land O'Lakes will implement a goat distribution and pass-on scheme to increase the size of local and household herds. The goat distribution scheme will reach 700 households within the 24-month project through direct distribution of goats. Four hundred households will receive three female goats directly from

the project. Another 300 households will receive a buck or male goat for local breed improvement efforts. Target beneficiaries will purchase goats utilizing a voucher system in coordination with local livestock auctions. Although we promote individual goat ownership, our goat restocking efforts center on the producer group. A livestock record tracking system enables effective monitoring of the herd, including the number offspring produced and off-take rates

Activity 3: Fodder production: Two distinct sub activities to be implemented: Land O'Lakes will work closely with the local research stations in Grassland and Matopos to select fodder seeds, including seed testing of up to seven fodder varieties and promote the household conservation and storage of fodder (grasses, stovers, crop byproducts) at the appropriate times to improve the nutritional status of the goats at the end of the dry season.

Activity 4: Marketing groups: LOL will strengthen goat marketing groups to make them stronger and more commercially- and member-oriented. The program will also focus on the rehabilitation of existing infrastructure (e.g. goat auction pens) and establish market linkages

IR 2: Increased communities' capacity for and practice of sustainable rangeland management;

ACHM will train 15 Master Trainers from both the community and Land O'Lakes. A total of 12 communities will be reached with training in HM practices, group herding techniques, construction of movable kraals, resource mapping and development of community grazing plans.

Activity 1: Training of trainers: Project identified trainers from the community and Land O'Lakes will travel to ACHM's training center at Dimbangombe Ranch near Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe to attend a series of three sessions under the HM Master Trainer Program, lasting 5.5 days, 11 days, and 5.5 days respectively.

Once trained, Master Trainers will return to their communities and coordinate with goat producer groups to transfer their new skills to additional group members and peers in the community.

Activity 2: Community and farmer training: Project to facilitate a study tour of key community leaders to the ACHM Dimbangombe Ranch within the first three months. With the blessing and support of local leaders, Land O'Lakes' team of trainers will begin transferring their skills and knowledge to smallholders, including cattle owners. They will be trained in construction and use of moveable kraals, planned grazing and forage banking, and improved herding and group herding practices.

Utilizing a management structure perfected in our Zambia and Zimbabwe programs, each master trainer will report directly to the executive committee for the community producer organization that they serve. Land O'Lakes will work closely with each group to identify the member who will participate in the master training program. Program will also assist each group to define a clear role and reward system for the master trainers that will enable them to track progress and incentivize performance.

Activity 3: Rangeland Management Planning and Extension Services Provision: Trained CLWs and local traditional leadership will assist each community to develop an annual grazing and rangeland management plan for their animals (both goats and cattle), designed to improve rangeland productivity and reverse environmental degradation over time. They will monitor implementation of the plans and assist communities with herd and rangeland management to maximize productivity.

Subcomponent 2: Veterinary Medicines and Vaccines

Trained CLWs will focus on a community-based preventive animal health program. Although the CLWs will be trained for, and be a member of, one of the goat producer groups, he/she will also assist non-member livestock farmers within the communities through a fee-for-service arrangement. Each CLW will be provided with a toolkit that will enable them to deliver basic veterinary services within the community.

CLWs will be associated with a private-sector veterinary service or input provider in his or her area and will consult private veterinarians on more difficult or urgent cases. Routine services such as vaccinations and dewormings will be pre-paid by the producer group through contributions from the multi-purpose fund, with the service delivery fee imbedded within the cost of the drugs. This activity will improve goat productivity, reduce mortality, and increase the availability of breeding stock in project areas. Use of the multi-purpose fund to purchase veterinary medicines in bulk will enable producer groups to buy these medicines at decreased costs, with lower per unit costs passed on to the individual farmers.

IR 3: Increased capacity of and access to animal health and livestock extension services.

Emphasis will be placed on preventing illness and disease outbreaks. CLWs, with the support of private-sector veterinarians and Land O'Lakes staff, will work with goat producer groups and livestock owners to develop treatment programs, including timely livestock dip campaigns and clinics to control ticks and tick-borne diseases; vaccinations of goats to prevent clostridial diseases such as tetanus, black leg, or enterotoxemia; and strategic dewormings. Preventative and proactive treatments are necessary for the rebuilding of a fragile livestock sector. Disease outbreaks that result in death and lost production (poor animal condition) cause financial losses for smallholders, in addition to the cost of replacing valuable farm-level inputs (manure, animal traction). Although Zimbabwe once had an effective veterinary sector, the collapse of that system costs smallholder farmers thousands of U.S. dollars annually. This project will develop grassroots veterinary service provision closely linked to town-based private veterinary service providers for stability and sustainability.

CLWs will be provided with a bicycle for transportation and a toolkit of basic equipment that will allow them to provide basic services. This CLW toolkit includes: elastrator; elastrator rings; hoof clippers; weigh band, overalls, drum; trochar (bloat knife); livestock tags and a tag applicator. Refresher training and monitoring of CLWs will be conducted throughout the project by Land O'Lakes staff as well as the partnering private-sector

veterinarian to ensure effective service provision. To overcome challenges arising from a lack of payment by households, Land O'Lakes will facilitate the creation of stocks of supplies at the community-level through the goat producer groups. Resources for purchasing supplies will be raised by individual member contributions to group multi-purpose funds established by each goat producer group.

1.4 Geographic coverage

Land O'Lakes is targeting two districts (five wards) found within agro-climatic Zones IV and V, Matabeleland South and Manicaland. Our current presence within Zimbabwe will allow for rapid project start-up, as Land O'Lakes is currently operating in project sites that are adjacent to the proposed geographic location of the Zimbabwe Livestock for Accelerated Recovery and Improved Resiliency program.

1.5: Cross cutting issues

Gender: A minimum of 60 percent of participants targeted shall be women. Female involvement will be encouraged through self-help groups, the solicitation of participants through targeted campaigns, and the use of female extension staff to disseminate knowledge and tools aimed at addressing the unique socio-cultural constraints women face in Zimbabwe around livestock. Land O'Lakes will ensure that training times do not conflict with household obligations in order to ensure higher female participation rates.

1.6 Selection of program participants

1.6.1 Households: To qualify, a household must: Be a member of a producer and marketing group or be willing to join one; Be willing to build livestock housing and other necessary facilities; Have access to communal land for grazing; Have the basic resources required to participate in the program, e.g., household labor; Reside within program target area; Show clear involvement of household members in the farm activities; Be capable to initially receive three female goats from the project through the group and, later, receive another two female goats from the group through pass-on; Be willing to sell off all local male bucks and use the buck introduced by the group from the project; Be willing to establish a stand of fodder crops on their farm; and Be willing to contribute to the Multi-Purpose Fund.

1.6.2 Communities: The project will target mixed herd communities, i.e. communities that will communally graze cattle alongside of goats. Second, early identification of communities where leaders are open to new ideas about grazing practices and maintain a degree of influence within the community to ensure that improved practices take hold is critical. Third, communities that are already organizing around civic projects – such as clinics and school construction – make for more engaged individuals and more successful outcomes. Lastly, communities that tout a critical mass of early adopters, have less risk-averse farmers willing to adopt new rangeland management practices or have a level of control over their rangeland (including livestock movement), and communities with which Land O'Lakes has already worked all have a higher potential of successfully adopting holistic grazing techniques. Land O'Lakes will work closely with ACHM to develop a targeting tool to aid in the selection of high-potential communities for inclusion in the program.

1.6.3 ACHM trained master trainers: ACHM will coordinate with Land O'Lakes to select appropriate master trainers from the community.

1.6.4 Community Livestock Workers: Potential CLWs will be identified through existing goat producer groups. Selected individuals will possess characteristics necessary for serving as a valuable community resource, namely trustworthiness, commitment to the community, basic literacy skills, good communication skills, desire to serve in the role, and willingness to be called upon at any time to provide assistance to fellow farmers.

1.6.5 Private animal health input providers: While CLWs are being identified, Land O'Lakes will pinpoint established private sector animal health input and service providers, typically located in larger commercial centers. These veterinarians and animal health professionals will serve as mentors and points of reference for

the newly trained CLWs. Additionally, CLWs will acquire all vaccines and medications from identified drug shops and have the opportunity to pose technical questions to technical experts working there. In return, private sector veterinarians are able to reach more remote locations and increase their sales. Land O'Lakes will make every effort to include mentors in the CLW training program.

2.0 Mid Term Evaluation Questions

The MTE will follow four key evaluation parameters discussed in FANTA guidelines on Title II Evaluation Scopes of Work (Bonnard, 2002), and will answer the following questions:

Assessment of project progress: Has the program achieved its targets to date (See attached APDT – Annex 1)? If not, why not? What is the likelihood of achieving them upon project completion? Are the program activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project document, team and annual work plans? Are established targets reasonable given the current program context? If not, how do they need to be modified? As defined and measured, do the performance indicators provide useful and reliable data on program progress and impacts? Are M&E data collected and reported regularly and in a timely fashion? Are M&E data and anecdotal information used for management purposes?

Assessment of project design, implementation and achievements, including changes in context and review of assumptions (relevance): Do the framework, assumptions and design match the local conditions and evolving needs of target beneficiaries? Are planned activities appropriate for the problems identified? What internal and external factors (selection criteria of participants, participation of women, location) have influenced ability of beneficiary groups and project staff to meet projected targets? Which interventions are most critical and/or effective in achieving project objectives and intermediate results? Are there any unexpected but important benefits or impacts and/or negative impacts or unintended consequences of the project that should be documented? What improvements can be made to the design and/or implementation to improve results or given the changes in country, sector and operational context?

Assessment of processes that affect achievement of project outputs (behavior change and capacity strengthening): Are beneficiaries adopting desired practices or behavior? Are there certain groups (gender, age, location) within the population with lower rates of adoption and why? Which practices have beneficiaries been more inclined to adopt and why? What is their primary source of information concerning practices and behavior? What are other key channels of information? Is the beneficiary to extension agents ratio and frequency of contact adequate for the type of behavior change envisioned? Are training materials/duration/trainers capacities appropriate for participants? If necessary, how can these be improved to better meet the objectives of the training? Are the materials/content consistent with those of the key stakeholders' or other development agency?

Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes: Are project impacts sustainable? Are outcomes sustainable? Are farmers able to obtain improved and recommended animal health inputs, forage seeds without program assistance? What can be done to increase sustainability? Is there a well-developed exit and sustainability strategy? If so, has the project staff moved to initiate some aspects of those strategies?

Assessment of project implementation innovations to enhance sustainability, cost efficiency and effectiveness: What are some changes that the project team have instituted to enhance effectiveness, sustainability and cost efficiency? What informed these innovations? Quantification of their benefits and how do they affect achievement of results?

3.0 MTE Methodology

Four key tasks:

- Discussions with project technical staff
- Household interviews – survey and focus group discussions
- FGD with management committee members of livestock marketing groups
- Community leaders focus group discussions – targeting sustainable rangeland management
- In Depth Interviews (IDIs) with selected trained master trainers on rangeland management
- IDIs with selected CLWs
- IDIs with selected private animal health input providers
- IDIs with key stakeholders’ livestock extension staff
- IDI with contact person at ACHM

Annex 2: Midterm Evaluation tools

Annex 2 a: Household survey tool

3 ZIMBABWE LIVESTOCK FOR ACCELERATED RECOVERY AND IMPROVED RESILIENCY (ZRR)

Dear Respondent,

You have been selected randomly from the many persons who are targeted for the Land O' Lakes intervention in this area. The purpose for the interview is to help us understand your current situation so that in future we plan the right

THE ENUMERATOR MUST READ AND INTERPRET THE PASSAGE BELOW TO THE RESPONDENT
PRIOR TO THE INTERVIEW

activities together and measure performance.

Your participation is voluntary, please feel free to ask for clarification; in instances where you feel so strongly that you don't want to answer, you have the right to do that. All the information which you will provide will be treated as strictly confidential and will not be shown to other individuals or organizations. When we compile the report, we will not attribute any statement to you, but treat everything as general.

ASSIGNMENT RECORD:

E-Code	Name of Enumerator	Signature	Date Interview Completed

S-Code	Supervisor's Name	Signature	Date Checked

HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

4 June 2013

IDENTIFICATION PARTICULARS

1. Province.....
1= Manicaland 2= Matebeleland
2. District.....
1=Buhera 2=Makoni 3=Mutare Rural 4=Mangwe 5=Bulilima
3. Ward
4. Farmers Group (Association).....
5. Locality/Village
6. Name of Farmer Group Member
7. Age and Sex of FarmerAge ex (1=Male, 2=Female)
9. Marital Status of Farmer.....
1=Monogamously Married 2=Polygamous Married 3=Divorced 4=Widowed 5=Single
10. Name of Head of Household
11. Marital Status of Household head.....
1=Monogamously Married 2=Polygamous Married 3=Divorced 4=Widowed 5=Single

12. Age and Sex of Head of Household.....**Age**

Sex (1=Male, 2= Female)

1. SECTION 1.0: DEMOGRAPHICS

1.1. How many people are members of this household?

--	--

1.2 How many are;

	Male	Female
Children<12 years		
Youth 12-18 years		
Adults> 18 years		
Disabled Members		
Chronically ill members		

1.3. What is the current occupation of the Head of the HH.....
 1=Formal 2=Farmer 3=Trader 99.Other...

--

1.4 How long (hrs) do female/male take on goat activities...Female M
 1=1-3hr 2=4-6hr 3.=7-8hr 4=More than 8hr

--

--

1.5 What is the household monthly income?

--

1=USD 0- 100 2= USD101-200 3=USD 201- 300 4=Over USD 300

1.6 What type of main house does the HH live in?

--

1=Grass thatched 2=Iron roofed 3= Asbestos/tile roof

2. Asset Ownership

2.1 Name of Asset	2.2 Total Number owned	2.4 Number owned jointly	Value US\$
Domestic			
Cooker/Gas Stove			
Refrigerator			
Radio			
Television			
DVD Player			
Mobile phone			
Sofa set			
Sewing Machine			
Others (specify)			
Transport			
Car/Truck			
Motorcycle			
Bicycle			

2.1 Name of Asset	2.2 Total Number owned	2.4 Number owned jointly	Value US\$
Others (specify)			
Farm			
Scotch cart			
Spades/shovel			
Ploughs			
Sprayer pump			
Water pump			
Planter			
Harrow			
Cultivator			
Tractor			
Hoes			
Sickles			
Others (specify)			

3. SECTION 3.0: NUMBER OF EATING OCCASSIONS, STAPLE SOURCES, DIETARY DIVERSITY AND MONTHS OF INADEQUADE HOUSEHOLD FOOD PROVISIONING

3.1. What is the main staple food for the household?

1=Maize 2=Sourghum 3= Millet 4=Rapoko

3.2. What was the **main** source of the STAPLE foods for the household for each of the last 12 months?

3.2. MONTHS											
June 13	May 13	April 13	March 13	Feb 13	Jan 13	Dec 12	Nov 12	Oct 12	Sept 12	Aug 12	Jul 12
3.2.1	3.2.3	3.2.3	3.2.4	3.2.5	3.2.6	3.2.7	3.2.8	3.2.9	3.2.10	3.2.11	3.2.12
<input type="text"/>											

Codes:

0=None

1=Own production

2=Purchase with income

3=Food Aid

4=Gift

5=Bartering commodities with food.

6=Purchase with Loan/credit

7=Selling assets to buy food

8=Purchase from remittances

10=Working for food

99=Other (Specify)

3.3 Current Crop Yields 2012/13 Season

Crop	Area planted(ha)	Yield (# of 50kg bags)
Maize		
Sorghum		
Millet		
Rapoko		
Groundnuts		
Sunflower		

3.4 Household Dietary Diversity Score - HDDS): Now I would like to ask you about the types of foods that you or anyone else in the household consumed yesterday and the day before yesterday? **NOTE:** *Firstly establish that these days were **normal** or **usual** days and not **Special** days*

3.4.1. FOOD CODE	FOOD TYPES	3.3.2. Did your household consume these food types Yesterday	3.3.3. Did your household consumed these food types the day before Yesterday
		1=Yes, 0=No	1=Yes, 0=No
A	Sadza		
B	Any potatoes, yams, manioc, cassava or any other foods made from roots or tubers?		
C	Any vegetables?		
D	Any fruits?		
E	Any beef, pork, lamb, goat, rabbit wild game, chicken, duck, or other birds, liver, kidney, heart, or other organ meats?		
F	Any eggs?		
G	Any fresh or dried fish or shellfish?		
H	Any foods made from beans, peas, lentils, or nuts?		
I	Any cheese, yogurt, milk or other milk products?		
J	Any foods made with oil, fat, or butter?		
K	Any sugar or honey?		
L	Any other foods, such as condiments, coffee, tea?		

3.5(Month of Inadequate Household Food Provisioning – MIHFP) Now I would like to ask you about your household's FOOD supply during different months of the year. When responding to these questions, please think back over the last 12 months. (*FOOD supply refers to food that may have been produced, purchased, gifted etc...*)

	QUESTIONS AND FILTERS	CODINGS	SKIP
1.	In the past 12 months, were there months in which you did not have enough FOOD to meet your family's needs? 1=Yes 0=N0 ___	IF NO GO TO 4.1
2.	DO NOT READ THE LIST OF MONTHS. PLACE A ONE IN THE BOX IF THE RESPONDENT IDENTIFIES THAT MONTH AS ONE IN WHICH THE HOUSEHOLD DID NOT HAVE ENOUGH FOOD TO MEET THEIR NEEDS. If yes, which were the months (in the past 12 months) in which you did not have enough FOOD to meet your family's needs?		
A	June 2013	A..... ___	
B	May 2013	B..... ___	

C	April 2013	C..... __	
D	March 2013	D..... __	
E	February 2013	E..... __	
F	January 2013	F..... __	
G	December 2012	G..... __	
H	November 2012	H..... __	
I	October 2012	I..... __	
J	September 2012	J..... __	
K	August 2012	K..... __	
L	July 2012	L..... __	

SECTION 4.0: LIVESTOCK Ownership

4.1 Has your household ever received any Goats from the Land O'Lakes pass on scheme?

1=Yes

0=No

If No. go to 4.3

4.2. How many goats have you received from LOL?

4.2.1. Goat name/ Tag number		4.2.2. Date received (MM/YYYY)		4.2.3. Recipient in household 1=Male 2=Female
NAME	No.	Month	YEAR	

4.3. Do you own any other livestock? (Yes =1, No =0)

(If answer is 'Yes' please fill in the Table below, if 'No' skip to question 4.3)

Livestock Species	4.3.1 Number owned by the household (total)	4.3.2 Number owned by male	4.3.3 Number owned by female	4.3.4 Number owned jointly	4.3.5 Total Value sold in the past year USD (July 2012- June 2013)	4.3.6 Price per livestock type sold July 2012 - June 2013	4.3.7 Total cost of transport, labour, levies, permits, slaughter fees, herding while awaiting slaughter incurred during selling in the year (USD) (July 2012-

								June 2013)
Cattle	Local							
	Cross / exotic							
Goats	Local							
	Cross/ exotic							
Sheep	Local							
	Cross/ exotic							
Poultry	Local							
	Cross/ exotic							
Pig	Local							
	Cross/ exotic							
Donkeys/Horses								
Rabbits								
Other, specify								

4.4 Goat Management

4.4.1 **Fodder production 2012/13 season**

Fodder crop	Area planted(ha)	Expected Yield (kg)
Velvet beans		
Sugar graze		
Cowpeas		
Soya beans		
Yellow maize		
Ground nuts		

4.4.2 What is the main method of grazing the goats.....
 1=Open range 2=Paddock grazing 3=Zero grazing 99=other (Specify)

4.4.3 What type of feed do you mainly feed the goats on?
 1=Natural pasture 2=Cultivated pasture 3=Fodder 3=Supplements
 99=Other specify _____

4.4.4 How many times have your goats (if any) been vaccinated or treated for any disease or received any known and approved veterinary intervention in the last 12 months?

4. 4.4a Veterinary intervention	Number of times the animals benefitted			
	4.4.4 .b By the Department of Agriculture	4.4.4.c By CLWs	4.4.4d By other veterinarians	4. 4.4.e By yourself
Vaccinations				
Dipping				
De-worming				

4.4.5 How many of your goats (if any) been treated for any disease or received any known and approved veterinary intervention in the last 12 months?

4.4.5a Veterinary intervention	Number of animals which benefited			
	4.4.5 .b By the Department of Agriculture	4.4.5.c By CLWs	4.4.5 d By other veterinarians	4.4.5.e By yourself
Treatment for disease				
Artificial insemination				
De-horning				
Castration				
Any other veterinary intervention				

4.4.6 How many goats have died between July 2012 and June 2013?

4.4.6.1 Adults

4.4.6.2 Young kids

4.4.6.3 What do they die from?

1=pulpy kidney 2=tick borne diseases 3=internal parasites 4=Pneumonia 5= other specify.....

4.4.6.4 Which season has the highest rate of mortality?

1=Summer 2=Autumn 3=Winter

4.4.7 Reproduction: We want to talk about 3 of your does' reproduction

	4.4.7aDoe 1	4.4.7bDoe 2	4.4.7cDoe 3
i. Litter size			
ii. Number of matings per pregnancy			
iii. Age at first kidding			
iv. Kidding interval			
v. Seasonality of kidding			
vi. Abortion rate			
vii. seasonality of abortion			

4.4.8 LIVESTOCK SUPPORT & OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

4.4.10a Structure	4.4.6.b Number/Kg owned
Livestock drinking trough (#)	
Goat Housing (#)	
Livestock feeding trough (#)	
Feeding paddocks (#)	
Stock feed stored (Kg)	
Sprayer (for ticks and others)	
Other, specify:	

4.4.9 ACCESS TO WATER, FEED & DIPPING SERVICES

	4.4.11a Immediately	4.4.11 b Takes a few hours (1 to 2 hours)	4.4.11c Takes several hours (more than 2 hours)	4.4.11d Not accessible in this

	accessible =1	= 2	hours) =3	community =4
4.4.8.1 How do you rate access to water for livestock?				
4.4.8.2. How do you rate access to pasture for livestock?				
4.4.8.3 How do you rate your access to dipping services?				

5

6 **4.5: Rangeland Management**

7 **4.5.1** How do you decide where to graze the livestock during

- i. Dry season.....
- ii. Wet season.....

1=Male household head 2=Female household head 3=Spouse 4=Community 5=Other specify

4.5.2 What differences have you realized in the veld and communal grazing over the last 5 years?

.....

4.5.3 What are the top 3 challenges in open communal grazing?

.....

4.5.4 What are your perceptions towards open grazing with regards to improving your livestock production and improving your livelihood?

.....

4.5.5 How are the goats housed at night?

1=Free range 2=in a goat house renovated once a year 3=in a goat house renovated twice per year 4=Paddock
 5=Other Specify.....

8

9 **SECTION 5.0: LABOUR ACTIVITIES for Livestock**

5.1 5.1.1 Now I would like to find out about labour for your Livestock rearing activities during the last 6 months: (**Enumerator:** Note that if the respondent says YES in 5.1.1.a, continue with the rest of the questions, otherwise go to the next labour activity)

5.1.1.a. Labour Activity	5.1.1.b. Did the household use any labour for.... 1=Yes 0=No	5.1.1.c. Labour type	5.1.1.d. Number of Males who provided labour for this activity	5.1.1.e. Number of female who provided labour for this activity	5.1.1f. Cash payment/Value of in kind payment for hired labor in the past 6 months
1=Construction of livestock shelter					
3=Forage production					
4=Feed Preparation					
5=Kid rearing					
6=Veterinary Services					
7=Transportation/ Marketing					

Codes for 5.1.1.c

- 1=Household labour/members
- 2=Hired labour for in kind payment
- 3=Hired labour for cash payment
- 4= Permanent workers
- 99=Other (Specify)

5.1.2.1 How many permanent workers working with goats do you have? Male Female
 5.1.2.2 How much do you pay the permanent workers per month?.....

SECTION 6.0: GOAT MARKETING

6.1 What are the main markets for goats in the area?
 1.= farm gate 2=RDC cattle sales pen 3=Collection point 4=Business center 5= Other(specify)

6.1.1 What are the advantages of the main goat market options?

6.1.2 What are the disadvantages of the main goat market options?

6.2 How many goats were sold by the farmer in the past year –(July 2012 -June 2013)

6.2.1 What were the reasons for selling the goats
 1=to pay school fees 2= health expenses 3=to purchase food 4= funeral expenses 5=paying lobola 6=other -specify

6.2.2 Who decides how to use the goat income?
 1=Male head of household 2=Female spouse 3= Female head of household 4=In monogamous and polygamous marriages- Both male and female

6.3 What are the goat buyer profiles?
 1=livestock traders 2=farmers 3=local consumers 4= LOL 5 =Other specify

6.4 What are the pricing criteria used when selling the goats? (*Tick all that apply*)
 1=sex 2=size 3=body condition 4= age 5=other specify

6.5 Are farmers able to access market information for goats?
 1=Yes 2= No

6.5.1 What are the sources of information for goat markets?
 1= farmers 2=livestock traders 3=local gatherings 4=local authorities 5= Extension officers 6 =Non-governmental organizations 7=Other specify

6.6 What are the challenges in goat marketing?
 1= Low prices 2=lack of formal markets 3=small flock size 4=joint ownership/family bureaucracy 5=other(specify)

SECTION 7.0: HOUSEHOLD INCOME & ACCESS TO SAVINGS AND CREDIT

7.1. HOUSEHOLD INCOME	
Source of income	Total income (USD) from current season (July 2012 to June 2013)
All field crops sold	
All garden crops & citrus fruits sold	
Goats sold	
Other Livestock sold	
Labor/Employment	
Remittances	
Small Business/Trade	
Other sources of income (gifts, piece works, trading in non-agriculture, etc)	
7.2. ACCESS TO CREDIT AND SAVINGS	
I have no access to credit and do not save = 1 I have access to savings only = 2 I have access to credit only = 3 I have access to both credit and savings = 4	INSERT CODE

10 SECTION 8.0: EXTENSION SERVICES

8.1. I would like to ask you about the technical assistance services that you or any other member of your household have received in the past 12 months (July 2011- June 2012)

8.1.1. Service	8.1.2. Did someone in the HH receive technical assistance on . . . ? 1=Yes 0=No	8.1.3. Have someone in the HH used/applied this technical assistance? 1=Yes 0=No	8.1.4. Do you and your family members think the technical assistance is useful? 1=Yes 0=No	8.1.5 Other Main source of this technical assistance 1=Govt extension officers 2=NGO (specify) 3=Private (e.g. vets) 4=CLWs 99=Other (specify)
1) Record Keeping				
2) Animal Nutrition				
3) Animal Health				
4) Goat Management				
5) Kid Rearing				
6) Goat production as a business				
7) Feed establishment				
8) Feed Conservation				
9) Stocking				
10) Market Linkages (Selling Goats on auctions)				

If 8.1.4 has at least a YES response, then:

8.2 Is there anything you want to say about the technical extension services provided?

SECTION 9 GENDER ISSUES

9.1 Do you believe men and women should have equal opportunity access- leadership resource ownership?
 1=Yes 2= NO

9.2 Is there any female household member who holds a leadership position in the community? 1=Yes 2=NO

9.3 Do women experience different agricultural challenges from men? 1=Yes 2=NO

SECTION 10 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

10.1 (*Tick all that apply*)

What type of environmental management strategies have you put in place at your farm	Planting of fruit trees and gum trees	Composting animal waste	Labeling of chemicals	Disposal of vet waste and pesticides
--	---------------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Annex 2b – 1: FARMER FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

Name of the Province	
Name of the District	
Name of the Village	
Facilitator/Moderator	
Note take/recorder	

As participants arrive thank them warmly for coming, welcome them and put them at ease by friendly conversation. [When the group is complete] Introduce yourself and the note taker. Reaffirm from the members that they have come voluntarily to participate in the discussion and that they can still withdraw from the group if they wished to. Seek this consent by a show of hands.

INTRODUCE TOPIC OF DISCUSSION:

The principal focus of the evaluation is to document the lessons learned and impacts (intended or unintended) results –considering project design, partners’ priorities, changing extension landscape in country, budget and the results realized—to inform project implementation and design of similar projects.

AGREE ON NORMS AND CONFIDENTIALITY

- Explain the session shall be in form of a discussion.
- Stress that there are no right or wrong answers.
- Ask participants to feel free to say what they think
- Ask the group to treat what others say as confidential
- Cell phone use and leaving the room while discussion is in progress etc.
- Tell the discussants how long the discussion will take.

Remind participants this is voluntary and they are free to leave at the start or any time during the discussion.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Membership of the project and linkages

- a. How are you linked with the project?
- b. In which year did you become a member of the project?
- c. How were you identified to join the project?
- d. What were the terms required before your group joined the project? What challenges did you face when joining the project? How did you overcome them?

2. Livestock husbandry practices

- a. What kinds of livestock do you have in your farm (s)? When did you start keeping the livestock you have mentioned?
- b. What new knowledge have you acquired in since you joined the project? (Probe for each livestock)
- c. Have you received any technical assistance from CLWs in the project? What kind of assistance?
- d. Have you received any technical assistance from project staff in the project? What kind of assistance?
- e. Who else provided technical assistance to you or family members?
- f. How did such technical assistance help you improve your livestock husbandry practices?
- g. Comment on your *livestock body condition, livestock off take, livestock fertility, fodder availability, livestock health, and livestock marketing* since you joined the project (Probe for each).
- h. Where do you get livestock inputs from? Who are your main suppliers of inputs?
- i. Other than livestock input supply, what kinds of services did you receive from the suppliers?
- j. Describe some of the best farm practices you have acquired since you joined the project.

- k. Do you produce fodder for livestock? Which are your preferred varieties? Why?
- l. Has program promoted fodder production, feed preservation including urea treatment beneficial? Why?

3. Rangeland Management

- a) Do you graze your livestock communally?
- b) What are some challenges to communal grazing? How are these overcome?
- c) How has your communal grazing land changed in the last five years?
- d) How is communal grazing land managed in this village?
- e) Did you have grazing plans in this village (formal and/or informal) before the project?
- f) If yes, how were they arrived at? Who was involved in designing them? Were all farmers following these plans? What were the challenges the village had with these plans? How were these challenges managed?
- g) What benefits in terms of communal grazing has your community realized since you started participating in the project?
- h) *If better communal grazing land management is mentioned*, how relevant/appropriate is the project's approach to managing communal grazing land in this village? (Probe for both communal kraaling and grazing)
- i) *If communal kraaling is mentioned*, what are the benefits to this approach? How is the rooster developed? How is the decision to locate the Kraal in the farm made? Is it targeted to crop land or to areas suitable for cattle/livestock?
- j) In your opinion, who should lead efforts to improve the communal grazing land? Is he/she or are they doing enough? If not why? What can be done to ensure this happens?

4. Relevance of the project

- a. What is the most important benefit that you have realized since joining the project? (at household and communal levels)
- b. What are some of the benefits you have encountered since you started participating in the project?
- c. What are some of the challenges you face in keeping your livestock?
- d. What do you like about the project approach?
- e. What do you not like about the project approach?
- f. In your opinion what do think the project should do differently to help farmers maximise their benefits from livestock, especially goats?
- g. In your opinion do you think the project is using their resources well? Why?
- h. How would you compare the project approach with other approaches – e.g. from the Ministry of Agriculture, other development projects, etc?

5. Sustainability

- a. Do you think you will continue with best livestock husbandry practices when the project comes to an end? Which practices will you continue applying?
- b. Do you think you will continue seeking technical assistance from the CLWs when the project comes to an end? Who in particular will you continue seeing? Why?
- c. How has your husbandry skills improved since you joined the project?
- d. Which are your best performing livestock enterprises that you will continue with in future? Where will you get inputs from?
- e. Where do you intend to get technical livestock husbandry assistance in future?

Thank you.

Annex 2b -2: KII guide for Extension Officers

Key Informant's Name	
Position	
Interviewer(s)	
Date of Interview	

INTRUCTIONS

Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the end line evaluation.

Use the questions only as a guide and probe further where necessary.

Seek extra detailed information, in various forms if necessary

TOPICS AND QUESTIONS

1.0 Awareness and involvement in the ZRR project

- i. What do you know about the ZRR project?
- ii. How are you involved in the ZRR project?

2.0 Impact Assessment of the project

- In what ways and to what extent has the project reduced vulnerability to both economic and climatic disasters, diversified livelihoods, built assets, and rebuilt resiliency to shocks for its beneficiaries
- In what ways and to what extent has the project made a positive impact on access to livestock information and inputs at the community level?
- What is the impact of the project on use of modern livestock husbandry technologies and management practices, goat marketing, and communal grazing lands management in the benefitting communities? Which modern livestock husbandry technologies and management practices do you promote? Are these the same ones the project promotes?

3.0 Relevance and sustainability of the ZRR Project

- What other approaches have you successfully implemented in the Ministry of Livestock to promote livestock enterprises? How about goat enterprise?
- How would you compare the ZRR approach with other approaches that have been implemented in the Ministry?
- How could the ZRR approach become a sustainable model for livestock services to vulnerable farmers?
- Given that the project focuses on increasing farmer knowledge of, and access to modern inputs, what has been the change in the related knowledge, skills and practices of benefitting farmers? Are the results sustainable?
- What are some of the challenges you face in the course of your partnership with the project?
- Do think you/your department will continue with the activities initiated by the project? If yes how do you intend to continue? If no, why?
- What are some of the strengths of the project approach?
- What are some of the weakness of the project approach?
- What do you think should be done more effectively or efficiently? Why?

Thank you

Annex 2b – 3 KII GUIDE for Community Livestock Workers

Key Informant's Name	
Position	
Interviewer(s)	
Date of Interview	

INTRUCTIONS

Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the end line evaluation.

Use the questions only as a guide and probe further where necessary.

Seek extra detailed information, in various forms if necessary

TOPICS AND QUESTIONS

1.0 Involvement in ZRR project

- What is your role in the ZRR project?
- What kinds of activities are you involved in the ZRR project?
- What kinds of training have you received from the project?
- What other assistance have you received from the project?
- Which livestock are promoted to farmers in the project?
- What inputs are being demanded by farmers to improve their livestock herd – health, etc? How has this changed compared to before the project started?

2.0 Impact Assessment of ZRR project

- In your opinion, in what ways and to what extent has the project reduced vulnerability to both economic and climatic disasters, diversified livelihoods, built assets, and rebuilt resiliency to shocks for its beneficiaries
- In what ways and to what extent has the project made a positive impact on access to livestock information and inputs at the community level?
- What is the impact of the project on use of modern livestock husbandry technologies and management practices, goat marketing, and communal grazing lands management in the benefitting communities? Which modern livestock husbandry technologies and management practices do you promote? Are these the same ones the project promotes?

3.0 Relevance and sustainability of ZRR Project

- What other approaches have you successfully implemented in the area to promote livestock enterprises? How about goat enterprise?
- How would you compare the ZRR approach with other approaches that have been implemented in the area?
- How could the ZRR approach become a sustainable model for livestock services to the targeted vulnerable farmers?
- Given that the project focuses on increasing farmer knowledge of, and access to modern inputs, what has been the change in the related knowledge, skills and practices of benefitting farmers? Are the results sustainable? (Probe for each, especially practices)
- What are some of the challenges you face in the course of your partnership with the project?
- Do think you will continue with the activities initiated by the project? If yes how do you intend to continue? If no, why?

- What are some of the strengths of the project approach?
- What are some of the weakness of the project approach?
- What do you think should be done more effectively or efficiently? Why?

Thank you

Annex 2b – 4 KII guide for Chief/Village head

Key Informant's Name	
Position	
Interviewer(s)	
Date of Interview	

INTRUCTIONS

Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the end line evaluation.

Use the questions only as a guide and probe further where necessary.

Seek extra detailed information, in various forms if necessary

TOPICS AND QUESTIONS

1.0 Awareness and involvement in the ZRR project

- What do you know about the ZRR project?
- How are you involved in the ZRR project?

2.0 Impact Assessment of the project

- What are some of the project benefits for its beneficiaries in tis village?
- In what ways and to what extent has the project made a positive impact on access to livestock information and inputs at the community level?
- What is the impact of the project on use of modern livestock husbandry technologies and management practices,
- What is the impact of the project on goat marketing, and
- What is the impact of the project on communal grazing lands management in this village?

3.0 Rangeland management

- Is communal livestock grazing practiced in this village?
- What are some challenges to communal grazing? How are these overcome?
- How has your communal grazing land changed in the last five years?
- How is communal grazing land managed in this village?
- Did you have grazing plans in this village (formal and/or informal) before the project?
- If yes, how were they arrived at? Who was involved in designing them? Were all livestock farmers following these plans? What were the challenges the village had with these plans? How were these challenges managed?
- What benefits in terms of communal grazing has your community realized since you started participating in the project?
- ***If better communal grazing land management is mentioned***, how relevant/appropriate is the project's approach to managing communal grazing land in this village?
- ***If communal kraaling is mentioned***, what are the benefits to this approach? How is the rooster developed? How is the decision to locate the Kraal in the farm made? Is it targeted to crop land or to areas suitable for cattle/livestock?
- In your opinion, who should lead efforts to improve communal grazing land? Is he/she or are they doing enough? If not why? What can be done to ensure this happens?

4.0 Relevance and sustainability of the ZRR Project

- What other approaches have been implemented in the area to promote livestock enterprises? How about goat enterprise?
- How would you compare the ZRR approach with other approaches that have been implemented in the area?
- How could the ZRR approach become a sustainable model for livestock services to vulnerable farmers?
- Given that the project focuses on increasing farmer knowledge of, and access to modern inputs, what has been the change in the related knowledge, skills and practices of benefitting farmers? Are the results sustainable?
- Given that the project promotes better management of communal grazing lands, what has been the change in the practices of benefitting farmers? Are the results sustainable?
- What are some of the challenges you face in the course of your partnership with the project?
- Do think the village leadership will continue with the rangeland management activities initiated by the project? If yes how do you intend to continue? If no, why?
- What are some of the strengths of the project approach?
- What are some of the weakness of the project approach?
- What do you think should be done more effectively or efficiently? Why?

Thank you

Annex 3: List of information sources (including documents reviewed, sites visited, and key informants, assuming they gave permission to be identified)

- Zimbabwe livestock for accelerated recovery and improved Resiliency (ZRR) Program Funding Agreement / Technical Document
- ZRR Quarterly Report April – June 2013
- ZRR Quarterly Report January – March 2012
- ZRR Quarterly Report October – December 2012
- ZRR Annual Report 2012
- ZRR Quarterly Report July – September 2012
- ZRR Quarterly Report April – June 2012
- ZRR Performance Management Plan (PMP)
- ZRR Baseline Report
- ZRR Annual Work plan 2012 – 2013
- Performance Monitoring and Evaluation TIPS (1996, Vol. 2, USAID)
- USAID Evaluation Policy (Jan 2010)