



***Integrated Food Security Intervention,  
El Goriesha locality, El Gedaref State,  
Sudan***



---

**Final Draft of Final Evaluation Report**

November 2017

**Mahmoud Hussein Ali Numan**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

*The consultant and his team would like to thank Ms Nagat Malik and Ms Hwaida Elkhair, PMER Department for provision of documents pertaining to final evaluation and preparation for meeting Dr. Antony Gnanamuthu, Project Coordinator/GRC and Mr. Emad Abdelrahim, Programme Coordinator /SRCS in Khartoum who shared their valuable and constructive comments on the project implementation*

*Special thanks and gratitude is due to Dr . Antony Gnanamuthu, GRC Program Coordinator for his briefing on the project activities and support and explanations he offered on the intervention in addition to facilitate the work of the team in the field.*

*Many thanks and gratitude is due to Mr. Tajeldin Ahmed, Project Coordinator and Mr. Musa, Project Field Officer, in preparation of field visits schedule and participation in the meetings with the Project Management Committees at state and locality in addition to meetings with PCCs and facilitation of the beneficiaries questionnaire at village level .*

*Thanks are also due to Mr. Sharafeldin Ahmed, SRCS Gedaref Branch Manager government counterparts' officials, members of the SPMC and LPMC, who attended the briefing and debriefing sessions and shared their valuable opinions and comments on the interventions and project implementation*

*Thanks are also extended to SRCS volunteers and Community Mobilizes for the efforts they exerted in communities' interviews and filling of questionnaires. The local leaders, members of PCCs, who facilitated the meetings with the community and attending FGD with understanding and patient.*

### List of Abbreviations/ Acronyms)

ARS	Agricultural Research Station
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CB	Capacity Building
EU	European Union
FFS	Farmers Field Schools
FG	Focus Group
FSN	Food Security and Nutrition
GOS	Government of Sudan
GRC	German Red Cross
HFG	Hunger Fighting Group
HH	Household
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude and Practice
LCG	Land Care Group
LFA	Log Frame Analysis
LPMC	Locality Project Management Committee
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
PC	Project Coordinator
PCCs	Project Community Committees
PMCs	Project Management Committees
PMER	Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting
RWH	Rain Water Harvest
SMOA	State Ministry of Agriculture
SMOARF	State Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries
SMOH	State Ministry of Health
SPMC	State Project Management Committee
SRCS	Sudanese Red Crescent Society
ToR	Terms of Reference
TTEA	Technology Transfer and Extension Administration/ SMOA
ToT	Training of Trainers

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS (ACRONYMS)</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>PROJECT DATA</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>13</b>
1.1 The intervention.....	13
1.2 Rationale and Scope of Evaluation.....	14
<b>2. STUDY METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>3. STUDY FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
3.1 The project monitoring system.....	15
3.2 Production of Manuals.....	15
3.3 Achievements of the project.....	16
3.4 Activities Implemented.....	17
<b>4. FINAL EVALUATION CRITERIA</b> .....	<b>23</b>
4.1 Relevance of the intervention .....	23
4.2 Effectiveness of the intervention .....	23
4.3 Efficiency of Intervention .....	24
4.4 Impact of the Intervention.....	24
4.5 Project Sustainability and Exit Strategy.....	27
<b>5. VISIBILITY</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>6. LESSONS LEARNT</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b> .....	<b>30</b>

### List of Tables

Table (1): Villages targeted, Total Beneficiaries and samples drawn

Table (2): Manuals Produced under each Project Result

### List of Figures

Fig (1): Planned vs Actual Implementation of Activities

Figure (2): Organic Manure

Figure (3): Saneen Type buck

Figure (4): Distribution of Tree Seedling of Neem

Figure (5): Home garden at Areida Village

Figure (6): RWH store near home garden

Fig (7): Project Monitoring Committees

Fig (8): Crop productivity Before and After Intervention

Fig (9): Reasons for increase in Production

Fig (10): Beneficiaries Knowledge increased

Fig (11):Vegetable consumption by HHs

Fig (12):Change in Attitude of HHs

Fig (13): % of HHs Keeping of RWH store after project and reasons for sustaining activity

Fig (14):Comments on the benefits gained by beneficiaries from Project activities

### **Annexes**

Annex (1): Terms of Reference (ToR) for the final Evaluation

Annex (2): Beneficiary Questionnaire

Annex (3): Focus Group Discussion check list

Annex (4): Stories

Annex (5): Statistical results

Annex (6): List of meetings held

Annex (7): List of respondents

## PROJECT DATA

<b>Grant Contract No</b>	<i>DCI FOOD, 2014 / 352785 Food Security Gedaref</i>
<b>Implementing agency</b>	<i>German Red Cross and Sudanese Red Crescent Society</i>
<b>Project title</b>	<i>Integrated Food Security Intervention, El Goriesha locality, El Gedaref State, Sudan.</i>
<b>Project location</b>	<i>El Goriesha locality, El Gedaref State</i>
<b>Project duration</b>	<i>01.01.2015 to 31.12.2017 – 36 months</i>
<b>Project start date</b>	<i>01/01/2015</i>
<b>Original contract end date</b>	<i>31/12/2017</i>
<b>Project extension (months)</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Project suspension (months)</b>	<i>No</i>
<b>Actual contract end date</b>	<i>31/12/2017</i>
<b>Names of Evaluator(s)</b>	<i>Mahmoud Husein Ali Numan</i>
<b>Evaluation firm/organization</b>	<i>Mesec Consultancy</i>
<b>Date of Evaluation</b>	<i>21/10/2017</i>
<b>Date of Evaluation report</b>	<i>12/11/2017</i>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### *Project Description*

Al Goreisha, Locality is one of the 46 localities of Gedaref state. 90% of population in Gedaref state are farmers while 10% are engaged as semi-nomadic pastoralists. Most of the population depends on small scale subsistence farming with little surplus to sell in local markets. Degradation of soils and pest and weed infections contribute to the decline in yields and production that resulted in short food availability thus increasing risk of food insecurity. Vegetables are grown in small areas around the house during raining season and production is not enough to guarantee well balanced diets. Livestock and small ruminants play an important role in small farmers' livelihood. However productivity is low due to inferior breed, poor condition of pasture and lack of veterinary services. Al Goriesha Locality of the project area is classified as one of the most vulnerable localities in Gedaref state..

### *The intervention*

The intervention is implemented by GRC in collaboration with SRCS Gedaref Branch and in partnership with the local technical institutions in Goreisha locality, Gedaref State, Sudan. The intervention is designed to address food insecurity among 800 poor households in 12 villages in El Goreisha Locality to increase food production and to enhance food diversification and increased nutrition knowledge and practices. The four main results stated for the intervention to achieve during its life cycle are:

- *Result 1: Food production according to specific needs of the target groups, is improved*
- *Result 2: Knowledge on nutrition, production and utilization of vegetables are enhanced*
- *Result 3: Resilience of the target HH groups are increased in "Rain Water Harvesting",*
- *Result 4: SRCS and other stakeholders have increased their capacity and competencies to implement and monitor food security interventions*

The project monitoring system is bottom top approach where the Project Community Committees are responsible of implementation of activities in coordination with SRCS/GRC team and community mobilizers embedded at village level. The second lower level is the technical back up of activities by Locality Project Management Committee where technical guidelines support is provided for beneficiaries to implement the activity. The State Level Monitoring Committee is responsible for follow up of project implementation and to support the project technically in production of manuals for the various activities. At Khartoum, the Project Management Committee is formed from SRCS and GRC to facilitate the financial flow and monitoring of activities of the project.

### *Final Evaluation Approach*

The main objective of the final evaluation to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of project implementation and its preliminary impacts and sustainability and exit strategy of the intervention. In addition to highlight on the best practices and success and derive feasible recommendations to be replicated in future interventions.

The Final Evaluation started with informative debriefing from the GRC Program Coordinator and SRCS Project Coordinator at Khartoum. The project provided a lot of documents that are essential for the final evaluation such as Baseline report, Inception reports, Mid Term Evaluation, End Line Survey, KAP Survey, Monthly and Annual reports an addition to updated Log Frame and Narrative and financial reports.

The final evaluation team designed the beneficiaries HH questionnaire and a checklist used to guide the focus group discussion with the Project Community Committees (PCCs). The field work carried out during the period 23 - 26/10/2017 in Goresisha Locality,. The field work started with Focus Group Discussion with PCCs in each of the 12 village and interviewed 204 HHs drawn randomly from the 12 villages targeted by the project, in addition to observations taken at activities sites. The final evaluation applied SPSS in analysis of the data collected from the beneficiaries.

#### *Achievements of the project*

The rate of implementation of activities is considered very high (100% or more) compared to indicators target in the updated baseline of the project which attributed as stated above to involvement of beneficiaries in implementing of the activities and close monitoring and provision of inputs at the right time.

The immediate outcomes of the activities have shown positive effects that attracted the interest of the beneficiaries, such as the increase in the production of crops and vegetables, attributed to adoption of learned extension practices such as use of improved seeds, organic fertilizer and pesticide and establishment of RWH system and home gardens, which, in addition to the FSN awareness sessions enhanced food availability and improved nutrition status of the beneficiaries. The role of the PCCs to undertake the responsibilities of monitoring of the activities implementation and trickling down the training to the beneficiaries by trained community mobilizers contributed to the capacity building of the beneficiaries that resulted in conformity of the implemented activities with specifications set such as seed production, production of organic manure and RWH units.

#### *Findings of the Final Evaluation*

The FGD with PCCs revealed the followings:

- The Project Community Committee for each village consisted of 10 members selected by the village community, then PCCs selected four Community Mobilizes from the residents in the village . The PCC selected the beneficiaries of the project based on poverty status and interest and capability of HH to carry out the project activities.
- The PCC is the focus of the project activities from the beginning as training targeted the members of the PCC and community mobilizes in all aspects of the project activities for communicating the content of the trainings and technical practices to the beneficiaries on individual basis at village level.
- In nut shell the success of the intervention is attributed to the high involvement of the beneficiaries in implementation of the project activities; the effective role of the community mobilizers and PCC in communicating the extension message to beneficiaries; the project team in designing the manuals with the



relevant technical departments in the state ministries; the provision of inputs at village level for the beneficiaries at the right time and close supervision and monitoring of PCCs, LPMC, SPMC and PMC

#### *Relevance of the intervention*

The intervention responded to the EU, GRC and SRCS food security strategies and objectives, which are recognized as a priority for developing countries by the international community. At field level, the preparatory measures, the baseline and the inception phase geared the intervention at best to the local context and beneficiaries needs and resulted in the introduction of feasible adaptable new techniques in farming that improved production of food and cash crops. The home gardens and RWH increased the consumption of vegetables among the beneficiaries hence improved FSN situation of the target communities

#### *Effectiveness of the intervention*

The cumulative sum of the results associated with the implemented activities will most likely exceed the sum of the individual activities results. This is attributed integration of the activities, where, each activity is linked and contribute to the other activities result. The quality of inputs and activities is ensured by adoption of specifications set by the respective line ministry and endorsement of accountability agreements with partners including community members. A positive non planned result that emerged is expressed by the large number of non beneficiaries who become direct beneficiaries, who learned from their peers and implemented the activities on their own when they saw the benefits gained by the beneficiaries.

#### *Efficiency of Intervention*

The staff is in place within the first 6 months and maintained their positions. At field level, volunteer heads are assigned to assist the project field officer based in Al Goreisha, in addition to volunteers in each of the villages. The pre-activity training of beneficiaries strategy adopted by the project in implementation of all activities, has also contributed to the project efficiency, where, beneficiaries implemented the project activities that resulted in reduction of costs and boosted progress.

Inputs are procured and activities are smoothly planned and timely implemented, though, some activities are late, but this is mainly attributed to the seasonality of the local inputs such *Neem* tree fruits needed for the organic pesticide

#### *Impact of the intervention*

The beneficiaries questionnaire revealed the following for each result:

*Result 1:* The productivity of the crops increased for sorghum from 3.62 to 5.88 bags of 90 kg; for groundnut from 8.03 to 11.75 bags of 45 kg while the productivity for sesame also increased from 2.0 to 3.99 bags of 90 kgs which is attributed to increase in knowledge specially information gained from Farmer Field Schools (61%)and agricultural extension (14%) while 25% attributed the increase to good rain distribution. The beneficiaries gained knowledge in production of organic manure, improved seed production, organic pesticides and RWH. Application of organic manure to crops was very high (96% of beneficiaries) while

100% of beneficiaries confirmed that they will continue produce organic fertilizers after phasing out of the project

*Result 2:* The intervention enhance the production of vegetable in the home gardens and consumption among beneficiaries which reflected in diversification of meals while the nutrition sessions resulted in (96%) change of mothers attitude towards child nutrition and raising awareness among 67.8% of mothers in issues related with health nutrition resulting in decrease of mortality and diseases infection of rate among children

*Result 3:* RWH is introduce by the project to sustain growing of vegetable in the home garden to enhance vegetable production and increase vegetable consumption among beneficiaries. The beneficiaries gained other benefits beside availability of water for vegetable production such as other domestic use and increasing their income through selling vegetables in the village market which will be the pushing factor for 98.5% of the beneficiaries to maintain and keep the RWH store after project phasing out.

*Result 4:* The SRCS staff received on job training during the implementation of project where the staff meet regularly with the Programme Coordinator/ GRC during the project implementation. In all phases of the project , the staff benefitted from experience and knowledge of the PC/ GRC on planning, implementation of activities and EU restrictions on fund utilization beside punctuality in reporting on project activities

The intervention has succeeded in establishment of a large base of community based trainers composed of the volunteers and members of the PCCs. The TOT trainers constitute continuous presence at village level to train the beneficiaries and provide prompt field support. Beneficiaries indicated that training session were useful but the time is short. The main comments of beneficiaries on project activities in general are increase of income of 35.1% of the beneficiaries and capacity building of community increased by 30.3% while 34.6% of beneficiaries indicated that the intervention used local material in implementation of activities

#### *Sustainability of intervention and Exit Strategy*

Sustainability of the project is taken care of from the beginning through establishment of monitoring system starting from the village level to locality level and state level paved the road for the flow of information on project activities from village to state smoothly. PCCs establishment and presence of community mobilizes at village level to mobilizing and learning beneficiaries by doing enabled the beneficiaries to apply techniques properly. The early involvement of the beneficiaries in taking the responsibility of participation in implementing the activities, has paved the way for early handover of the intervention. The material for the activities selected are available at village level that enable the beneficiaries to replicate by themselves especially those activities they have witnessed the benefits from the project activities.

Involvement of technical staff at state and locality level in the production of the manual materials and training of community is another level of sustainability. Delivering ToT for community mobilizes and members of the PCCs to

trickle down training to beneficiaries resulted in spread of knowledge among beneficiaries. The manuals are produced on permanent flip over plastic covered sheets that can be used for further training after project phasing out. As exit strategy, the project agreed with the Cooperative Unit in the State Ministry of Social Affairs to visit all villages to start formation of cooperatives to take over from PCCs which considered as major step in handing over of the project to community. The outcomes of these visits is the registration of four cooperatives, another four under process and the remaining four are waiting for the Cooperative to visit the villages again to form the cooperatives.

Moreover, the establishment of the community center is another asset for supporting the community activities in El Goreisha Locality is opened by the state minister of Social Affairs, the commissioner of El Goreisha, SRCS and GRC. The center is well equipped with LCD monitor and projector in addition furniture

#### Lessons learnt

- The main and most important lesson learnt is the involvement of the beneficiaries from the beginning in implementing the project activities that reduced the costs of the activities and offered savings for increase the number of beneficiaries, update the log frame reflected in increasing the baseline indicators, procurement of tricycle motors and establishment of community center at El Goreisha town.
- The project introduced and trained beneficiaries on activities that have tangible income such as improved seed production, production of organic manure and production of vegetables in home gardens.
- Materials required for implementing of activities are available in the village and production can be replicate without much effort from the beneficiaries and there is demand on such products

#### Visibility

The visibility of the EU as donor and other implementing organizations is very important. Names and logos of EU, GRC and SRCS are printed in posters, manuals, head cap, jackets and T-shirts distributed to community mobilizers and beneficiaries. Stickers with the EU and implementing partners name and logo are posted on the computers, furniture and other work facilities in the project office. Sign boards with EU, SRCS and GRC logos are fixed in the entrance of each of the 12 village targeted by the project. The project released some press materials and produced videos on activities

#### Conclusion and recommendations

The intervention is considered a successful example of integrated food security as the project reached the beneficiaries at village level, trained and enhance them to produce food to improve their livelihoods. A unique characteristic of this intervention is the implementation of the activities by the beneficiaries themselves and making use of local material available at village level. The following are the main recommendations:

1. *The success of the SRCS/GRC intervention should be a pushing factor for the continuation of the intervention with the same communities and to add infra structures for storage and training of PCCs on entrepreneurship and business planning to achieve the maximum benefits from their activities such as*

*establishment of seed banks and marketing their products under one umbrella as well as purchasing their inputs collectively to benefit from whole sale.*

- 2. The intervention is replicable and SRCS/ GRC are encouraged to seek funds to replicate the intervention in another locality with similar mode of livelihood and socioeconomic conditions to improve food security and nutrition*
- 3. The cooperatives have to attract additional membership from the community and explore added value options for the beneficiaries' products, such as processing of oil and packing of organic manure in smaller packets for vegetable producer and home gardening.*
- 4. Translation of essential reports such as MTE and Final Evaluation reports into Arabic to increase the benefit of staff from the reports and its recommendation for future intervention*

DRAFT