



**END TERM EVALUATION OF
INTEGRATED DAIRY AND HORTICULTURE
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Submitted To

Sustainable Environmental Development Action

By

**RECOT
Research, Consultancy and Training Institute**

April 2010

**Addis Ababa
Ethiopia**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Integrated Dairy and Horticulture Development Project (IDHDP) being implemented by SEDA is funded by HPI and coordinated in Ethiopia by SAC was launched with the overall objective to addressing chronic food insecurity in an environmentally degraded and drought-prone part of the Central Rift Valley of Ethiopia. IDHDP project targets 5 rural gandaas (smallest administrative units below district) in Adami-tullu Jiddo Kombolcha district. The objectives of the project are to increase household income of project participants' farmers by 50% from the current level by the end of 2010; establish participant-owned, market-led and internally cohesive groups; rehabilitate natural resources and develop organic agriculture practices and enhance nutritional status of project participants and care for chronically ill people. To achieve these objectives the project launched the following core activities: livestock development with the original placement of heifer and subsequent pass-on; development of dairy production; horticulture development; enhancement of groups capacity organized to achieve those objectives; provision of small ruminants to 'chronically ill' people, and backyard development. This end term evaluation is, therefore, aimed at assessing the achievement of these objectives. Thus, the evaluation has come about with important findings that are presented as follows.

Project formulation has exhibited a remarkable degree of institutional learning from the previous works of integration among components albeit some gaps with regards to coherence. As outlined in the main body of the report, the project design has benefited the learning drawn from the previous project that precedes the IDHDP, which was engaged providing heifers with down payment but with lack of integration with zero grazing, non involvement in horticulture development. The current project has effectively identified these gaps in earlier projects and came about with pass-on-gift and zero grazing principle, which was really an important leap. Besides, the current project envisaged a good level of integration between program components especially between livestock development and horticulture in terms of their impact on the productivity enhancing the nutritional status of the participants. Besides, there seem to be an important level of coherence between the project objectives and activities, especially with regards to objective 1 and 3. However, with regards to the rest of the objectives there seem to be a serious lack of clarity between the objective and the corresponding activities.

The project addresses the apparent problems of the area and has shown strong signs of relevance. But as the result of lack of original views of the participants, which could have been availed through need assessment, there seem to be a gap to judge the relevance of the project boldly. It is clear that most of the components of the project are related to the critical problems of the project area while still the study found no evidence of the participation of the community in the identification of the project.

The management and implementation process of the project seems relatively well structured even if it exhibits incongruence between the roles, professional expertise and the required activities. The project has also shown lack of project implementation guideline, staffing strategy (as exhibited, for example in the lack of community based development agents, high staff turnover, etc). Moreover, there was severe staff turnover which obviously affected institutional learning and continuity. The adjustment that was made at the later stage of the project through ICBP was an interesting piece

of institutional flexibility, which bore results albeit some gaps with regards to expertise and activity connectivity.

SEDA seem to have had at the beginning a good sense of important instruments of evaluation and monitoring when it lunched a baselines study at the appropriate time with the inception of the project. However, despite the availability of the project document during the baseline study, little attempt has been made to link the main components of the project with baseline study such that the indicators that were designed to measure changes benefited little from the baseline study. Throughout the project; even if, some revision is undertaken on the project document, the baseline study was never updated which has proved to be a big challenge to this end-term evaluation. Besides, there was no record of household profile accompanied with occasional lack of systematic compilation of reports.

On the other hand, ARM'ing has proved to be an important evaluation tool and learning platform with highly commendable results at institutional and implementation levels. ARM'ing has shown a remarkable degree of participation of partners and made important timely adjustment to project activities and components. However, it fall short of developing strategies for its recommendation, overshadowed the importance of monitoring and put more emphasis on output and activity levels only than higher level results. Hence, institutionalization of the formal Monitoring and Evaluation exercise is yet to be achieved. ARM'ing was envisaged to replace the formal Midterm Monitoring and Evaluation, but that has shown some drawbacks since rigorous lack of monitoring of some of the activities has left timely adjustment unattended.

With regards to partnership, there seem to be an innovative level of engagement between SEDA, SAC, and HPI exemplified, for instance, in the exercise of ARM'ing, initiation of ICBP, a good level of mutual understanding. SEDA has also important working relationship with NGOs, line departments and research centers even if there is still lots of work to be done with regards to conceptualization such that partnership is only understood as instance of resource sharing where common goals, vision, responsibility and accountability is yet to develop. Besides, partnership has not yet achieved a level of institutionalization where memorandum of understanding availed listing responsibilities and roles of partners are enshrined, experience documented, and strategies of partnership envisioned. The partnership with line department and SEDA has not yet fully achieved a concerted planning action and that there was sporadic monitoring and evaluation exercises as well. Last but not the least, SEDA has never conducted stakeholder analysis (or not made it life and systematic) which could have helped it to identify strategic partners, roles, responsibilities of partners and areas of cooperation.

With regards to project components the evaluation has come about with the following major findings in accordance with the main project objectives. Income of the project participants showed clear improvement as the result of livestock and backyard development while there is little evidence that could help to link this change to horticulture development in the irrigation development with regard to inputs provided. The qualitative and the quantitative study has shown that there are changes in the life of the participants with respect to improvement in income compared with the beginning of the project time, good proportion of participants managed to change their houses from thatched to corrugated iron sheets, send their children to school,

improved food availability and nutritional status, etc. Yet, change in income has been more easily linked to the livestock development and backyard than the irrigation participants since many of the changes seen in this area are directly linked, by the participants obviously, to the provision of water pump which is out of the realm of this project.

In the areas of group development as one form of social development and carrier of change there is lots of work to be done, change of approach and strategies. The groups exercised a good level of few of the cornerstone values such as passing on gift in terms of heifers, much less in tools and seeds, and rarely grasped the byelaws and cornerstone values. But, groups scored a remarkable achievement in dairy marketing and market linkage in milk sell. Groups exhibit meager achievement in terms of vegetable marketing, low bargaining power, irregular saving, insufficient linkage to credit facilities, poor management and leadership quality. In general, even if there is some level of group awareness, some works remains to be done to from a market led and internally cohesive groups.

The project has attained a remarkable degree of achievement in terms of the skill and knowledge in organic agricultural practices while there remains a lot to be done in the areas of natural resource rehabilitation. The evaluation has found out that the participants have reached a commendable level of practicing crop rotation, intercropping, while they achieved an excellent level of behavioral and practical changes in the making and use of organic fertilizer namely compost. Compost making, albeit some challenges, has fitted to the local needs of fertilizers with respect to environmental rationality and enhancement of productivity. Many irrigation groups participants and the majority of the backyard sample households have applauded the training provided in this regard, and evaluators has observed a practical change in its use among the participants. However, agro-forestry has achieved short of the desired goal due to lack of personal motivation among the participants, shortage of water supply, ineffective follow up, and mainly weakness of group formation as carries of social change. Thus, it is questionable that the intended agro-forestry practice met its goal with regards to natural resource conservation.

When we come to the gender dimension of the project there is a big point of departure. From the outset, the project has targeted a good proportion of women as a project strategy, which has given a chance for women participants in general and women headed households (widowed or polygamous) particular to have access to project resources. The project created a forum for women to assume decision-making power at group level, while there remain gaps in enabling women to take full charge of decision-making power due to the existing male dominant tradition, illiteracy, and lack of experience by women. Heifer placement and the subsequent income derived from the milk sell remarkably improved the decision-making power of women, access and control at the household level, while the income derived from vegetable sell in the MHH still remains in the realm of the men. There are also evidences that women access and control of resources and decision-making in monogamous households is less strong than WHH of both widowed ones and polygamous HHs. The project contributed much in meeting practical needs of women than their strategic gender needs. It improved their nutrition, clothing, housing condition and health. The project helped women to have future plan and goal for their life rather than the life they used to lead which was from hand to mouth. The project empowered women both

economically and socially. Now they have their own source of income, whether it is from dairy product, irrigation, backyard or small ruminants. They participate in group meeting and share ideas and experiences. Strategic gender needs of women headed household are also fulfilled at HH level. For instance they got the right of ownership of at least on 0.25 hectare of irrigable land legally, especially in the case of polygamous family. Therefore, considering women in a polygamous family as independent household head has given the neglected senior wife to have a chance to be independent, assume a decision making power, access and control resources while its social dimension of challenging the cohesion of household as a social entity is much desired to be studied further.

With regards to the so-called 'chronically ill' people, this project contributed in improving their access to resources, though it is not in line with the set objective while there is no indication about the improvement of the nutritional status. As will be seen in the main body of the report, the classification of the participants as 'chronically ill' is awkward; since the majority of them are the elderly and few of them are physically disabled. Since need assessment is missing here, we have no data to comment on the relevance of the intervention here. But, it is clear that there is no direct link between the nutritional need of the older people and the provision of goats, since milk from goats are basically meant not for the elderly but for children. Besides, it is really hard to discern the level of change in income of the participants in that short time since the placement of goats took places very late, and at the same time no baseline data specific to them.