



Evaluation of Sustainable Livelihoods, Internally Displaced Persons' (IDP) Support, and Emergency Seed Distribution Projects in Eritrea

Full Report

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

February 2007

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB

Evaluators: Unknown

I. Introduction

Eritrea has suffered four consecutive years of drought with an estimated 2.3 million (67% of the total population of the country) affected in 2005. Debu Zone is one of the drought-affected areas and is also one of the most populated areas in Eritrea with a population of about 770,000 residing within 12 sub zones, 209 kebeles (administrative villages) and 912 villages.

The drought has been particularly significant for the estimated 80% of the population that depend on traditional livestock rearing and rain-fed agriculture for their livelihood. The current situation has been compounded by the ongoing stalemate in the peace process between Eritrea and Ethiopia which has limited cross-border trade, and locked-up valuable manpower in military service, placing an unprecedented burden on women and children and postponing much needed public investment.

The Sustainable livelihood Project has been implemented in 24 satellite villages in Mai Mine and 1 village in Mendefera sub zones of Debu during January, 2006 to February 2007. The project was focused on seed multiplication, Livestock restocking, small business (pottery, small scale irrigation and community nursery) benefiting 3,957 household.

The IDPs' support project has been implemented in Una Argenay settlement camp in Tsorona sub zone during July to December 2006. The project focused on seed distribution and tractor service provision for 600 IDP households.

The emergency seed distribution has been implemented in 7 villages in Dekemhare sub zone. The project was focused on emergency seed (chickpea) distribution for 1,683 farmers affected by hailstorm.

The specific objectives of each projects are:

1. Sustainable Livelihood Project(ERIA44):
 - To improve the food and income security of 19,785 people (3,957 household) living in poverty.
2. IDP project support project (ERIA51)
 - To improve agricultural production of 600 IDPs HH
 - To improve preparedness and response capacity of the target communities, the MoA and Debu Zone administration
3. Emergency Seed Distribution (ERIA56)
 - To increase crop production of 1,683 HH
 - To support the response capacity of the target communities, the MoA and Debu Zone Administration during the emergency.

To realize the impact of each project, an evaluation was conducted by Oxfam GB and the Ministry of Agriculture, Debu branch during 15th -22nd January 2007. The evaluation has been conducted in six villages in Mamine, one village in Mendefera sub zone, in Una Argenay IDP resettlement camp in Tsorona and three villages in Dekemhare sub zone.

II. Evaluation Issues

The main evaluation issues identified at the beginning of the evaluation are as follows:

1. Achievement of Program Objectives:

- Number of vulnerable families received animals.
- Farmers organized into small scale irrigation cooperatives.
- Farmers participated in seed multiplication.
- Women engaged in small business.
- Farmers received seed and tractor services.
- IDP household received local variety seed.
- Hail damaged farms received chickpea (short cycle seed).
- Impact on target communities' livelihood:
 - Income
 - Production

3. Participation:

- Level of community participation in program activities

4. Project Management and Coordination:

- Level of coordination of program activities between various partners
- Challenges or threats encountered during program implementation

5. Sustainability:

- Level of capacity built of target communities.
- Linking of humanitarian to long term food and income security needs.

III. METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

The objectives of the evaluation were to determine the evaluation issues outlined above and to provide appropriate recommendations for future projects.

The evaluation included collection of primary and secondary data from a range of sources. Secondary data included various project reports and project proposals. Primary data included the results of structured and semi structured, formal and informal interviews with a range of project stakeholders including the project beneficiaries, Oxfam GB staff, staff of the MoA and Kejabi Administrators and village committees(seed and restocking committee)(see Annex I: Evaluation Questionnaire). Results were triangulated by different stakeholder groups and through direct observation during field work.

In order to obtain first hand information on the implementation and impact of these interventions, the assessment team made a field visit to six villages in Mai Mine sub zone (Adi Kudada, Debremariam, Adi Meho, Adi Beza, Adi Tsetser and Adi Mashawi) and in three villages in Dekemehare sub zone (Awlietsoru, Damba and Adi Kerets) and Una Argenay IDP resettlement camp in Tsorona sub zone and Adi Shipti in Mendefera sub zone. The MoA and Oxfam staff randomly chosen these villages within selection criteria designed to be representative of the projects. These criteria included small and big villages, remote and non remote villages and highland and lowland villages and type of project implemented. These villages represent 32% of the 34 project villages.

A total of 192 respondents were interviewed representing each of the projects stakeholder groups (see Table One below). From the project beneficiary category, 96 men and 96 women were randomly selected from each of the sample villages (2,250 persons) representing 8.5% of the projects beneficiaries. In addition, ten Kebabi Administrators were interviewed, representing 58% of the project beneficiaries Kebabi administrations, three MoA staff at the zoba and sub-zoba level were interviewed and four field staff from Oxfam GB. In order to verify the results of the evaluation, validation check has been carried out before data processing and analysis.

Table One: Evaluation Respondents

Sub Zone	Villages	Sector	Total Number of beneficiaries			Respondents	
			Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Medefera	Adi Shibti	Seed distribution			132	15	15
Minimize	Debremariam	Restocking	28	44	72	6	10
		small scale Irrigation	3	3	6	4	2
	Adi kudada	Restocking	32	28	60	6	5
		Seed Multiplication	47	39	86	6	8
		Small scale Irrigation	3	3	6	3	2
	Adi Mreho	Restocking	15	30	45	8	8
		Seed Multiplication	32	48	96	5	6
	Adi tsetser	Small Business(pottery	0	4	4	0	2
	AdeBeza	Small Business(pottery	0	3	3	0	1
Adi mushawi	Small Business(pottery	0	5	5	0	3	
Dekemhare	Damba	Emergency seed distribution			400	11	9
	Adi kerts	Emergency seed distribution			285	9	2
	Awulietsoru	Emergency seed distribution			450	11	7
Tsorona	Una Argenay	Emergency seed distribution			600	12	16
Total					2250	96	96

VI. Targeting Strategies.

During the projects start up, Oxfam GB conducted participatory needs assessment through discussions with community members, the Kebabi-Administrations, the MoA and the Ministry of Local Government authorities. Based on the information gathered a drought-mitigation intervention was decided to be implemented in 24 villages in Mai Mine sub zones and 1 village in Medefera sub zone; under ERIA44 and 1 village in Tsorona sub zone under the ERIA51 and 7 villages in Dekemhare sub zone under ERIA56. The villages were selected based on the following criteria:-

- Are the most areas facing disaster and displacement.
- Contain a high proportion of female-headed, disabled and elderly households.
- Have few NGOs working there.
- Community readiness to participate in the project

The community priorities were identified as seeds, tractor services, small scale irrigation and income generating activities. Identification and registration of beneficiaries within these villages was undertaken by community elders and the local authorities such as the Kebabi Development Committee (KDC) and Kebabi Administrators in collaboration with

the MoA. Regarding the selection criteria the evaluation respondents appreciated the criteria set by the KDCs as it was non discriminatory and democratic among women and men. However, there were some weaknesses. These were identified as:-

1. Some vulnerable groups were excluded because the expectation of the community was beyond the capacity of the project.
2. The number of beneficiaries identified was less compared to the number of households made vulnerable after the four consecutive years of drought.
4. Delayed planning and approval of projects by the MoA at the central level resulted in rushed implementation; leaving less time for consultation and strategic adjustment.

1. Distribution Approach

The distribution approach for each item was decided on consultation with the MoA and the KDCs. For foundation seed, the National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI) is the main supplier whereas for the local seed; it was made available by local farmers and traders. Consultation with the MoA, the target communities and other organizations indicated that the best mode of distribution of seed for IDPs and hail damaged farmers was by direct distribution through the existing marketing network. The purchase and the distribution of the seed have been conducted by the MoA and the village seed committee and facilitated by Oxfam GB.

1.2 Foundation Seed Distribution

In order to promote the adaptation of the improved seed varieties, by the local farmers, Oxfam GB integrated its activities with NARI who researched the outstanding performance of the improved varieties over local seeds. However, NARI, lacks financial and human resources to promote the utilization of the improved seed among farmers. Under this circumstance, Oxfam GB used this opportunity to complement to NARI's effort by demonstrating the seed at farm level.

208 volunteer farmers have been identified and registered by the local administrator and the village seed committee, each of them allocated with 0.5-0.25 hectare of land and received an average of 4 kg of seed.

1.3 Seed fair

132 beneficiaries were identified and issued with a seed voucher valued at Nakfa 600(£21.42) and redeemable for seeds at a seed fair market organized by the community on a specific day at a specific location agreed to in advance by the seller and buyers. Sellers of seed were able to set prices for their seed and at the end of the seed fair day received the cash equivalent of the vouchers they have received in exchange for seed. This approach for the distribution of seed allows the beneficiaries to exercise choice in the variety of seed received, the quantity of each variety received and access to local varieties that they are familiar with. In addition, the seed sellers benefit from sale of seeds and in general the local economy receives a cash injection equal to the value of the vouchers redeemed (a total of Nakfa 79,200 or £2,828). The use of vouchers instead of cash ensures that the project funds are used for the intended purpose

4. Animal fair:

257 beneficiaries were identified by the village committee and each of them was issued with a voucher of Nakfa 1,860(£66.4). The principles and procedures followed were the same to the seed fair approach described above.

Table Two; Projects Inputs

Sub Zone	Villages	Intervention	Project Title	Inputs			
				Type	Quantity	Distribution Approach	
Mendefera	Adi Shibti	Seed distribution	Sustainable Livelihood; ERIA44	Local Verities	600kg	Seed fair	
Minimize	Debremariam	Restocking		Goats and donkeys	142	Animal fair	
		small scale Irrigation		Pumps, tools and seeds and training	1 set ¹	Local purchase By beneficiaries	
	Adi kudada	Restocking		Goats and donkeys	120	Animal fair	
		Seed Multiplication		Improved verities	250kg	Purchase from NARI ²	
		Small scale Irrigation		Pumps, tools and seeds and training	1set	Local purchase By beneficiaries	
	Adi Ashker	Restocking		Goats and donkeys	47	Animal fair	
		Seed Multiplication		Improved verities	200kg	Purchase from NARI	
	Adi Hanse	Restocking		Goats and donkeys	54	Animal fair	
	Adi Mreho	Restocking		Goats and donkeys	90	Animal fair	
		Seed Multiplication		Improved varieties	200	Purchase from NARI	
	Adi tsetser	Small Business(pottery)		Donkeys and hand tools	1 set ³	1 set	Local purchase by the beneficiaries
	AdeBeza						
	Adi mushawi						
Adi Wurti							
Adi Serenta							
Adi Gurdi							
Dekemhare	Damba	Emergency seed distribution	Emergency Seed Distribution; ERIA56	Chickpea	870kg	Local purchase by the seed committee	
	Adi kerts			1430kg			
	Awulietsoru			200kg			
	Arato			490kg			
	Dengel			530kg			
	Adi Guebo			880kg			
	Guakat			300kg			
Tsorona	Una Argenay	Emergency seed distribution	IDP Support; ERIA51	Local Varieties	2400kg	Local purchase by the seed committee	

¹ 1 set of Small scale Irrigation equipment includes; 1 water pump and accessories, 400 liters of diesel, 6 wheelbarrows, 6 hoes, 6 shovels, 8 buckets, 3 sprayers, 6 rake, seed enough for three hectares of land

² National Agricultural Research Institute

³ 1 set of small business equipment includes; 1 donkey, 2 Jerry cans, 1 metal basin, 1 shovel, 1 pick axe

V. Findings

1. Achievement of Program Objectives

1.1 Seed Distribution:

1.1.1 Foundation seed

Under this scheme, the program distributed 600kg of improved varieties of sorghum to 208 volunteer farmers representing 53hectars of land in Adi Ashker, Adi Merho and Adi Kudada villages in Maimine sub zone. The evaluation compared the production of the improved varieties with the local seed during the rainy season of 2005 and 2006. The evaluation process reveals that the production of the improved varieties has been decreased by 25% over the local varieties. However, monitoring report by the MoA, field staff estimated the production would increase by 258% comparing with the local varieties. The evaluation tried to assess the extent to which decrease in production is due to poor performance of the improved seed or due to the general conditions prevailing during the project period by comparing the production of participating with non-participating farmers within the same village during 2006. The production of participating farmers has shown an increase of 162% compared to the non beneficiaries farmers⁴. However, it is interesting to note that in many areas, non-participating farmers are opting to adapt the improved variety when they saw the performance. Focus group discussion with the respondents indicated that the injera⁵ made from the improved varieties is better in terms of palatability and taste.

Table three: Seed Performance Matrix:

Parameters	PP290(Improved variety)	Chimro(local variety)	Koden(local variety)	Remarks
Date of sowing	16/07/2006	5/7/2006	4/7/2006	
Date of Germination	21/07/2006	10/7/2006	10/7/2006	
Seed Setting	9/8/2006	25/08/06	12/9/2006	
Date of Maturity	24/10/2006	12/10/2006	25/11/2006	
Yield Per Hectare	27.77	8.5	10.6	
Resistance to drought	very good	good	moderate	
Test for Injera	very good	good	very good	
Test for local beer ⁶	good	moderate	very good	
Stem strength	very good	moderate	very good	
Resistance for pest	very good	moderate	good	
Resistance to birds	moderate	very good	poor	
Palatability	very good	moderate	good	

Sources care International December 2006

⁴ Care International assessed the production increase of the improved varieties over the local seed during 2006 in the same project area(Maimine Area).

⁵ Traditional bread made of sorghum flour

⁶ Local drinks made of sorghum

However, the possible justifications for the low finding of the improved seed could be combination of the following reasons.

1. The farmers were aware that government would impose them to sale their harvest at lower price, thus, they decided not to disclose their actual production.
2. As per the initial agreement with Oxfam, beneficiaries were committed to pay cost of agricultural inputs in grain. Therefore, it is most likely that farmers were telling extremely lower harvest thinking Oxfam would waive their payment.
3. Erratic rainfall during the cropping season.
4. Errors in data collection and miss interpretation of information provided by farmers
5. Because of travel restriction and unavailability of fuel, the evaluation was conducted late after the harvesting is completed. Consequently, families might have consumed a big portion of the yield; this was triangulated by asking beneficiaries on the taste of Injera and local beer made of the improved varieties (refer table three above).

1.1.2 Seed Fair

Identified beneficiaries were issued with a seed voucher valued at Nakfa 600(₺21.42) and redeemable for seeds at a seed fair market organized by the community on a specific day at a specific location agreed to in advance by the seller and buyers. Sellers of seed were able to set prices for their seed and at the end of the seed fair day receive the cash equivalent of the vouchers they have received in exchange for seed. This approach to distribution of seed allows the beneficiaries to exercise choice in the variety of seed received, the quantity of each variety received and access to local varieties that they are familiar with. In addition, the seed sellers benefit from sale of seeds and in general the local economy receives a cash injection equal to the value of the vouchers redeemed Nakfa 79,200(₺ 2,828.5). The use of vouchers instead of cash ensures that the project funds are used for the intended purpose.

[Photo Removed]

Under the seed fair scheme, the program has distributed an average of 35 kg of local varieties to 132 households 60% women headed household representing 200 Hectare of land in Adi Shipti village in Mendefera sub zone. The evaluation indicated that the production has increased by 1000% for each household over the baseline as farmers were abandoning farming activities due to chronic and severe drought conditions. During the evaluation, participating farms witnessed that they have produced enough harvest for at least 12 months and thus, enough seed for the next planting season. The increase in production is attributed to;

1. Good rain throughout the cropping season,
2. Double ploughing strategy which improved soil fertility
3. Good planning in terms of appropriateness of the intervention, timing and scale of agricultural inputs.

1.1.3 Seed Distribution and Tractor Services for IDPs

The IDP's support project has distributed 24000kg of Taff(local variety seed) and tractor services for 600 household(65% women headed) representing 613Hectars of land. The evaluations revealed that the average production per household is 300kg. The program has laid a framework for self sufficiency in the short and long term perspectives for the IDPs in Una Argenay by rejuvenating their farming practices which they have been abandoned for at least 8 years following the border dispute between Eritrea and Ethiopia in 1998. During the evaluation, farmers have witnessed that few months ago, Una Argenay was typical IDP camp; but now it is a settled village and has become symbolic for other IDPs within camps. Focus group discussion during the impact assessment indicated that farmers appreciated the approach of providing seed, tractor service and creating access to land helping farmers to produce enough instead of providing direct food aid. This lesson has been well taken by the MoA and the Debu Zoba Administration. It is therefore clear that the program intervention led to a significant increase in crop production and thus, productive capacity of the target community promoted. Though this program was an emergency intervention, it has been able to demonstrate linking relief and development approaches. While producing crop for their immediate food needs, families are able to produce enough seed for the next season and create access to sustainable use of the agricultural land.

[Photo Removed]

1.1.4 Emergency Seed Distribution to farmers affected by Hail storm.

The program was originally requested by the Debu Zone Administration. Following the request, the Oxfam livelihood team undertook a rapid appraisal of the villages affected by hailstorms. The Ministry of Agriculture has also been involved during the initial assessment. The program distributed 47000kg of chickpea to 1683 household (64% women headed). The purchase and distribution of seeds have been conducted by the village seed committee, MoA and Oxfam field staff. The impact of distributed chickpea on the farmers who lost their long cycle crops has been demonstrated by an increase of production. According to the evaluation result 60% of the beneficiaries have produced 100kg of chickpea which otherwise would had been lost by the hail storm. In addition, Observations and witnesses from the communities indicated that the program achieved its immediate objectives of mitigating the effect of the hail storm by allowing the affected farmers to plant an alternative crop (chickpeas) before the end of the planting season. Focus group and individual interview with the target communities indicate that this project was flexible and rapid enough to allow the affected farmers to take advantage of the last rains.

[Photo Removed]

The program imparts an important learning for the key stakeholders in the food security sector, particularly the MoA for the need to promote joint contingency planning which has been less demonstrated during the onset of this program. Poor coordination and delays of decisions at a higher level may have been caused target communities in lost opportunities.

1.2 Animal Restocking:

257 vulnerable farmers have been identified and registered by the village animal fair committee. The baseline survey indicated that 97.3% of those beneficiaries didn't have any livestock. During the program implementation, each of the beneficiary bought either 2 goats or one donkey using a voucher system during a market day organized at each village. The dates

and place were determined by the village committee in consultation with Oxfam and the MoA. To guarantee the health of the animals, each of them were vaccinated and treated using broad spectrum drugs during the animal fair day.

Preprogram evaluation reveals that 96.3 % of the beneficiaries who purchased goats do have an average of 3.8 goats now. 91.7% of the families who bought goats have at least one new birth. Although it is difficult to measure actual milk production, according to statements from beneficiaries, participating families do experience a substantial increase in milk production. Thus, families' nutritional intake especially children has been improved because of better milk production and an increase in income from sale of animals. In addition, families have gained significant quantity of manure from the animals which contributed to soil fertility.

[Photo removed]

3.7% of the beneficiaries bought donkeys they preferred. During the focus group discussion and individual interview, beneficiaries highlighted their satisfaction with the donkey and witnessed that the donkeys are playing prime roles in taking over the arduous task facing women and children such as carrying water and firewood and transporting goods allowing women to engage in gainful activities contributing to family's foods and income security. Children were able to attend schools instead of looking after domestic activities.

The families' income has been increased from sale of animals and animal products. The evaluation report revealed that the cash income of each beneficiary family has increased by 3534Nakfa/family/year (£126/ family/year) over the baseline (about 290 % increases).

General observation and statement from the beneficiaries and village administrators indicated that beyond to increasing in income and nutritional intake, this intervention has even greater social impact. It has promoted household's social standing in the communities; render them worthy for credit and enhance social integrity. It further promoted the social ability of the target communities to form future social safety network. The results of this evaluation confirmed that livestock-centered projects are efficient, quick and high-impact interventions.

1.3 Small Scale Irrigation

Through Small scale Irrigation, Oxfam seeks to enhance household Livelihood strategies in target communities by increasing their productive capacity through income-generation activities. Oxfam in collaboration with the MoA, Debu branch, implemented two small scales Irrigation in Adi Kudada and Debrameriam village in Maimine sub zone. Under this initiative 12 members (6 men and 6 women) have been selected by the community and organized in to producers cooperative. According to the baseline information, none of the farmers have ever practiced small scale irrigation. However, during the evaluation, the members themselves have witnessed that they are now professional farmers in the sector.

Oxfam organized and provided initial trainings to 26 (18 men and 8 women) the training was focusing on procurement procedures, technical skills on irrigation and marketing and project implementation, monitoring and reporting. Each cooperative formalized operational guidelines, instituted an organizational structure with clear roles and responsibilities for elected committee.

[Photo Removed]

After three months of well and land preparation and fencing activities, the farmers began cultivating a variety of crops: tomato, cabbage, green pepper, peas and improved crops varieties. Some crops are currently being harvested and marketed locally. Even though, it is early to measure the full impact on the target community, focus group discussion with the beneficiaries indicated that the production per hectare of land has been increased by 177% compared to the local varieties of sorghum. The average income of each member has increased by 3600Nakfa/family/year (£128/ family/year) over the baseline. The nutritional intake of participating families and their communities at large also improved due to increased access to vegetables.

An unexpected outcome of this program is the transfer of knowledge and skill to non Participating farmers, some of whom actually started adapting irrigation practice and are openly requesting Oxfam to expand its support.

1.4 Small Business(Pottery)

Under the small business initiative, 20 women have been identified and registered by the kebabbi administrator and Kebabbi Development committee (KDC). Oxfam in collaboration with the sub zoba administration has facilitated 3 days training workshop focusing on organizational and planning capacity building. The women were then organized into producers cooperative. The members formalized operational guidelines, instituted an organizational structure with clear roles and responsibilities for elected committee (chairman, Casher and secretary).

The members have been suffering through hard working and labor intensive activities; thus, they requested Oxfam providing donkeys, Jerry Cans, Pick Axe, shovels and metal basins. Oxfam agreed and empower them to purchase and distribute the above items to each member. Oxfam and the kebabbi administrator were facilitating the process and provided technical advices. The inputs, helped women to increase their productivity by allowing enough time and energy to make pottery which otherwise was spent in traveling out to the source of raw materials and in exhaustion.

[Photo Removed]

Focus group and individual interview with members revealed that before the intervention each woman was earning Nakfa 500/ month (£17.8 family/month). However, after being supported by the program, their income has raised to Nakfa 850/month (£30.3/ family/month) with an increase of 70% over the baseline.

Mrs. Kuduson Mekonen, from Adi Serenta has witnessed” *before I received assistance from the project, I was only able to produce 10-12 coffee pots per week but after*

receiving training and inputs. I proudly produce up to 20 pots in a week. In addition, I start learning additional skills from the other members helping me to diversify my products to Sarma⁷ and Mekersemito⁸ which have more market demand⁹.

2. Level of Participation Community Participation

The evaluation has elicited a very positive response from the target communities. Everywhere, there is abundant evidence of willingness to participate in program activities, often much beyond the program's expectations. The village seed and restocking committee elected by the community have been active from the program designing, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Even though, it was not easy to quantify the exact community contribution to wards the program, similar projects implemented by other agencies in the area demonstrated a community contributed of 28.6%⁹ of the total project costs. This is combined in kind, and labor. The outstanding level of contribution reflects the high levels of commitment by program participants, whose individual and collective efforts linked directly with their ability to generate income.

3. Program Management and Coordination:

The project has managed to establish a cordial and supportive working relationship with different stakeholder, mainly the MoA at the zoba and sub zoba level, the local administrators and beneficiary community. However, the evaluation team has learned that slow feedback and delays in approval of project by the MoA at the national level resulted in rushed project implementation.

4. Sustainability:

The sustainability of the project was examined from four perspectives:

- The projects have empowered participating communities to take a leading role by allowing them to prioritize their needs and designed implementation methodologies such as targeting strategies of beneficiaries and voucher system of input distribution. The different phases of the program implementations were imbedded with a capacity building exercise which in the long term would help target communities to initiate and implement community based interventions.
- Organizing beneficiaries in to groups or cooperatives under the small business and irrigation schemes is an important element of sustainability. There is an opportunity for such groups develop in to local services provider such as agricultural inputs; fertilizers and seed. In addition, they would provide technical assistance for other groups or individuals who want to start similar venture (they can be learning centers helping to diffuse knowledge and experiences).
- Ministry of Agriculture extension workers were involved in project designing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. In addition, to promote their group facilitation skills and utilization of participatory methodologies(PRA), two extension works, one from Areza and one from Maimine sub zone have attended two weeks

⁷ Sarma: small clay pot suing to hold local drinks during special community events

⁸ Mekersemito: A smaller clay put suing to store butter and precious women jewelries

⁹ This data is referred from similar irrigation projects implemented by Mercy Corps International in 2005 in the same project areas

training sessions on Sustainable livelihood Framework and Participatory Methodologies organized by Oxfam GB. During the evaluation, the extension works highlighted that the training has enhanced their ability of information exchange with farms.

- The other important sustainability factor is the transfer of knowledge and skill from the beneficiary farmers to non Participating farmers. A good example is non participating framers have started adapting irrigation practice on their own initiatives and are openly requesting Oxfam to expand its support.

VI. Conclusions

Many conclusions about the projects' effectiveness have been describe in the preceding Sections. The main conclusions are summarized here below.

1. The project has been very successful, in fact has far exceeded expectations, in achieving the immediate objectives and their impact on target communities' income and food security needs it set out to achieve. In summary, the household's income and productive capacity have been increased. Thus, nutritional intake of young children has been by far improved.
2. The project has also been quite successful in knowledge and skill transfer to other community members who were not included in the projects, and they have understood new ways of livelihood.
3. The project has established a good working relationship with the MoA at the zoba and sub zoba level, stimulating the roles and responsibilities of extension works and build trust among farmers.
4. The project has been less successful in developing the small business components of the program and creating long term marketing opportunities for beneficiaries, but this was an unrealistic expectation given the nature of the project and the time frame.

Finally, it is important to note that most of the projects were relief project, a rapid response to a crisis situation (Hail damage, Displacement and drought conditions). As such they have surpassed their limited relief objective mitigating the impact of the crises.

VII. Recommendations

The recommendations derived from the above observations and conclusions include the following:

1. Shift from Relief to Development Thinking: while the programs were designed in Response to alleviating the immediate need of vulnerable households, i.e. purely relief-oriented, the evaluation has shown a need for initiating a longer-term developmental perspective of capacity building and furthering community initiatives.
2. Training and follow-up of MoA extension workers: more attention should be paid to the systematic and focused training of extension workers and the project team needs to spend more time monitoring and assessing their work. The relationship of extension workers and farmers needs to be strengthened.
3. The projects have also laid a foundation for development projects; in cases of restocking, small business, small scale irrigation and improved seed varieties, the potentials are enormous. Therefore, future interventions should now be built on the good foundations that have been established by these projects.

VIII. Challenges

As indicated in the preceding sections of this report, Oxfam reasonable achieved its program targets despite a variety of operational challenges. The introduction of new working policy by the MoA in September 2006 has placed a range of new scenarios on Oxfam operations. According to the new working policy imposed by the MoA, NGOs are not allowed to implement projects but only through the MoA. In addition, in October 2006 Oxfam was ordered to change all its operation from Mamine to Areza sub zone without allowing enough time to make program adjustment and complete pending activities. In addition, inconsistent travel permit issuance, changing government attitudes towards community mobilization, the taxation of humanitarian imports, chronic fuel shortages, and shortages of project inputs (fertilizers) also complicated the operational environment.

The communities in the program areas have been seriously affected by the recurrent drought conditions and the consequence of the boarder war with Ethiopia. Thus, the project has created a very high community expectation for more assistance and all expect the project would expand to meet the demand.

Annex I Evaluation Questionnaire

Debub Emergency Seed Distribution Impact Assessment Questionnaire

1. General Information

Date of the interview: _____ Interviewer/s: _____

Sub Zone: _____ Village/ Kebabi/ administration: _____

Satellite village: _____

Number of beneficiary: M _____ F: _____ Total: _____

2. Seed Distribution

A. How did you benefit from the project? _____

B. Did you receive any training? _____

C. Recommendations for the project? _____

Table 1. Seed Distribution

S.No	A. Type of seed received	B. Quantity received	C. Variety wanted?	D. Quality of seed? Good, Fair,	E Experience in use of this seed? Yes/No	F. How did you use the seed?	G. How will you get seed for
------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------

		(Kg)	Yes/ No	Bad		Plant, sell, consume	next year?
1							
2							
3							

Table 2. Production from Seed Distributed

S.No	Seed Type	Harvest Good, Average, Bad?	Yield per hectare	Production Quintals	Use of Harvest	%	Problems encountered
1							

ERIA 44 Integrated Sustainable Livelihoods
Impact Assessment Questionnaire

I. General Information

Date of the interview: _____ Interviewer/s: _____

Sub Zone: _____ Village/ Kebabi/ administration: _____

Satellite village: _____

Number of beneficiary: M _____ F: _____ Total: _____

II. Benefit from the Project

How did you benefit from the project? _____

How can the project be improved? _____

What kind of follow-up support do you recommend? _____

III Impact of Each Activity

1. Seed Multiplication

Planned Project Outcomes:

- Sustainable supply system for quality seed within the 7 target villages
- 2,250 farmers within the target villages will have access to quality seed
- Increased agricultural production within the target villages benefiting 11,250 people

How many farmers participated? _____

How many hectares planted by village? _____

How much foundation seed distributed by village? _____

What was the production and yield of the improved seed by village? _____

How was the production distributed? _____

How many people have access to the improved seed (seed kept by participating farmers and plan for

distribution of multiplied seed)? _____

How was production compared to last year for the same size of land: _____

Recommendation:

2. Livestock re-stocking project:

Project Outcomes:

- 257 Vulnerable households within the target villages will have small livestock
- Households with livestock to sell will receive a good market price
- The target villages will have more purchasing power

1. How many people received livestock? _____

2. What livestock did they receive? _____

3. What was the criteria for vulnerable? _____

4. How much income did livestock sellers receive? _____

5. How does this compare with the market price at the time? _____

6. How many livestock did you have before the project? _____

7. How did you select your animal? _____

8. How many animals and what type did you buy and why? _____

9. Number of births from the purchased animals: _____

10. Did you buy the animals you want? _____

11. How do you use them? _____

12. Recommendations? _____

3. Income generation project (includes SSI, nursery and small business):

Project Outcomes:

- 157 families within selected villages will have increased income
- Individuals within selected target villages will have increased knowledge on marketing and small-business development

1. How many people were involved in income generation activities (SSI, small business etc)?

2. What support did you receive from the project (training, materials etc)? _____

3. How did this support help? _____

4. What benefit (income) did you get from the project? _____

5. Recommendations? _____

4. Emergency seed distribution/Hazemo plain/

Project Outcomes:

Planned

- 132 families are able to plant crops in time for the 2006 season (June to December).
- Injection of cash into the local economy.
- Improved food security of the target community.

1. How many families received seed? _____

2. How were they chosen? _____

3. What type of seed did you plant last year? _____

4. Where did this seed come from? _____

5. What seed did you receive through the project? _____

6. How much did you receive (Kg/variety)? _____

5. Who were the sellers (local farmers, grain sellers, church etc)? _____

6. How did you use the seed? _____

7. If you planted the seed, how is the harvest?(quintal/Kg) _____

8. Did you receive the seed on right time? _____

9. What was the quality of the seed? _____

10. Did you receive enough seed? _____

11. What seed will you plant next season? _____

12. Where does this seed come from? _____

13. How did you benefit from the project? _____

14. Recommendations? _____

Beneficiaries

The programme will directly benefit 19,785¹⁰ people living in Debub Zone (details are summarised in the table below).

Village	No. Households (No. of people)	Beneficiaries by Activity (households)				
		Seed Distribution		Animal Re-stocking		Income generation
		Local	Improved	Buyers	Sellers	
Adi Hanse	285 (1152)					
Adi Merho	451 (1667)					
Daero Hara	262 (1194)					
Debre Mariam	723 (2850)					
Adi Ashker	245 (1040)					
Adi Kudada	600 (3812)					
Adi Shipti	132 (660)					
Esoukha	120 (600)					
Mekabir Tsabla	1300 (6,500)					
Mai Mine						
Total	3,998 (18,875)					
Total No. Of Beneficiaries						

¹⁰ The total population for Debub Zone is estimated : 800,000

© Oxfam GB 2007

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email publish@oxfam.org.uk

For further information on the issues raised in this document email phd@oxfam.org.uk

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

www.oxfam.org.uk