International Relief & Development
Improving Lives. Building Livelihoods.

REDUCTION OF DROUGHT VULNERABILITY IN SOUTHERN SWAZILAND

End of Project Evaluation

By

CENTRE FOR TRAINING & CONSULTANCY
UNIVERSITY OF SWAZILAND
PRIVATE BAG KWALUSENI
SWAZILAND

September, 2012

The evaluation was conducted through a collaborative effort between Dr. Dube (madube@uniswa.sz), and Dr. Qandelihle G. Simelane (qandelihle@gmail.com). All field interviews were conducted by Dr. Dube.

Disclaimer:

This report was prepared by independent consultants. Responsibility for the contents and presentation of findings and recommendations rests with the assessment team. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed here are those of the consulting team and do not necessarily represent the views of the CTC, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent.

#

Table of Contents

Acronyms vi
Executive Summary vii
1. Introduction 1
1.1 Background to the Review 1
2 Methodology 2
3 Reduction of Drought Vulnerabilities in Southern Swaziland Key Evaluation Findings 3
3.0 The Project Priories 3
3.1 Priority sector 1-Food Security and Agriculture 3
3.5 Unintended Outcomes 9
4 Priority sector 2-Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) 9
4.1 Water Supply 9
4.1.1 Pump Repair and Replacement 9
5 Illustrative Evaluation Questions 12
5.1 Project Strategy and Design 12
5.2 Beneficiary Capacity Building 13
5.3 Unintended Outcomes 13
6 Conclusions 14
6.1 Coordination and coherence 14
6.2 Relevance 14
6.3 Effectiveness 15
6.4 Efficiency 15
6.5 Impact 15
6.6 Sustainability 16
6.7 Lessons Learned 16
7 Recommendations for the Next Project 16
8 Appendices 18
8.1 Terms of Reference 18
8.2 Areas in which Interviews were Conducted and Persons Interviewed 24
8.3 Interview Schedule/ 25
8.4 End IRD Project Evaluation Interview Questions Guide For beneficiaries 26
9 Bibliography of Project Documents 28

#

List of Figures

Figure1: Crop residues for mulching retained in the field as a method of conservation agriculture 4
Figure2: A keyhole garden growing a variety of vegetable crops 5
Figure3: Collecting water for domestic use within a community garden (CG).....7
Figure4.: A fenced pasture of distinctly better condition than the surrounding degraded land 8
Figure5: Students washing hands from buckets (left) and Zondle Feeding Scheme (right) for school children which benefits from clean water.at Ngcina Primary School 10

#

List of Tables

Table 1. A matrix analysis of the RDV Project.....2
Table 2. Details of visited project areas and individuals interviewed.....24
Table 3. End IRD Project Evaluation Interview Questions Guide For Stakeholders.....25

#

Acronyms

ACAT	Africa Cooperative Action Trust
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CG	Community Garden
COSPE	Co-operation for the Development of Emerging Countries
EO	Extension Officer
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIS	Geographic Information System
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IRD	International Relief and Development
KG	Keyhole Garden
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MoAC	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
NAMBoard	National Agriculture Marketing Board
NDS	National Development Strategy
OFDA	Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance
RDV	Reduction and Drought Vulnerabilities
RWH	Rainwater Harvesting
RWHS	Rooftop Water Harvesting System
SWADE	Swaziland Water and Agricultural Development Enterprise
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	United Nations World Food Program
WV-S	World Vision-Swaziland

#

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Much of Southern Africa is caught in cycles of extreme weather conditions: severe droughts and flooding. Swaziland has not been spared. The citizens of Swaziland often have to depend on food aid. Between 2009 and 2012, International Relief and Development (IRD) engaged in various activities which sought to mitigate the effects of droughts in twelve constituencies in the Lubombo and Shiselweni regions. The project's aim was to enhance food security by building capacity of farmers through training and minimum input support. Provision of water supply, promotion of sanitation and hygiene in schools and communities, as well as improving community based management of services were important components of the program.

IRD commissioned an end of project evaluation in order to ensure that the outcome of this project was verifiable with high accountability and accuracy as well as to account and share learning from achievements and failures and ascertain views of the beneficiaries on the impact of the project. The methodology used in the evaluation was inclusive and participatory, involving IRD partners, schools, government officials and beneficiaries. Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analysed. The approaches used and activities carried out included review of IRD project documents, formal interviews with partners, stakeholders, and representatives and focus group discussions with beneficiaries, school head masters, and school committee members.

Important Findings from the Evaluation:
The first objective of the project was to improve agricultural practices under drought conditions. This objective was a major focus of the IRD program. Achievements included:

a) Seed Systems and Agricultural Inputs

- Conservation Agriculture (CA) was introduced by IRD at a very critical time and its yield advantages were noted and appreciated by the subsistence farmers. However, there was spatial variability in the uptake of conservation agriculture activities in the various Tinkhundla.
- Gardens with electric pumps that are producing for the commercial market are able to produce various vegetables in large quantities that are being sold mainly to NAMBoard as well as retail outlets and the neighbouring communities.
- The earnings from the vegetable sales are helping to increase disposable income which is helping farmers to cover for other household needs such as school fees and other food needs.
- Keyhole gardens present a convenient and simple method of vegetable production and are suitable for adults as there is no need to bend over. They also require very little water.

b) *Livestock Development*

- Livestock was recognised as a potentially viable enterprise *if properly managed*, however, due to the drought spells and lack of grazing areas as land was mostly used for sugarcane production, targets for cattle sales weren't met.
- The numbers of livestock benefiting from project activities increased over the course of 3 years and the benefits were appreciated by the farmers. However, the project achieved below set targets in terms of cattle sales. This was attributed to farmers being caught up in a culture prestige syndrome of keeping large numbers of cattle.

#

The second objective for the project was to improve hygiene practices and expand access to safe water for multiple uses. Achievements included:

a. *Sub-Sector Name: Water Supply*
   - The RWH and water supply activities were another resounding success. They helped to attract and retain good teachers in the schools and reduced costs of acquiring water providing relief to school budgets so that savings could be directed to other school needs.

b. Sanitation and Hygiene
   - Communities have been able to set up management systems and are now making monthly financial contributions to a maintenance fund.
   - Teachers have been trained on sanitation and hygiene and are now able to properly look after the RWH systems

Lessons Learned and Recommendations:

Among the key lessons that also form the recommendations for future programs, with regard to IRD's implementation of the project, include:

- There is need to install gauges on the RC cisterns to monitor water levels;
- There is need to expend more resources on the HIV and AIDS messages in the project, which should be an integral part of projects in Swaziland.
- There is need for innovation in the livestock program with demonstrable benefits, which farmers will adopt.
- There is need to understand why farmers will not sell their cattle.

.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Review

Southern Africa is, to a large extent, caught in cycles of extreme weather conditions. There is severe flooding and frequent droughts. Swaziland has experienced the effects of these extreme weather conditions, which cause the people of Swaziland to depend on food aid to survive. International Relief and Development (IRD) has been engaged in various activities for the past three years to mitigate the effects of droughts in the Lubombo and Shiselweni regions.

With the support from USAID/OFDA, IRD implemented a project that aimed at enhancing food security by building the capacity of farmers through training and minimum input support. IRD trained farmers in conservation agriculture (CA) techniques as a response to the drought conditions in the Lowveld, as well as the serious drought that had impacted food production severely in the 2008/2009 season. The second component of the program involved provision of water supply, sanitation and promotion of sanitation and hygiene in primary schools and communities. Improving on community based management of services was also an important component of IRD's program. IRD introduced deep well hand pumps proven to work successfully at depths of 100m to replace broken Afridev pumps which are prevalent in the Lowveld. The pump repair/installation activities were coupled with the construction of cattle troughs within the vicinity of the water point. These troughs allowed cattle to drink from disposed water, which keeps the animals from contaminating the water source.

The main objectives of the project were to improve:

I. Agricultural practices under drought conditions.
II. Hygiene practices and access to safe water for multiple use.

Project activities were implemented in twelve Tinkhundla: Sigwe, Somtongo, Hosea, Matsanjeni, Lubuli, Mpolonjeni, Sithobela, Ngudzeni, Nkilongo, Shiselweni 1, Dvokodvweni and Hlane

1.2 Objectives of the End Of Project Evaluation

The purpose of the end of project evaluation was to assess performance and results against the IRD project objectives as well as determine the impact.
The specific objectives of the end of project evaluation as defined in the evaluation's TOR were:

i. Establish the extent to which original stated objectives of the project were attained;
ii. Examine the appropriateness of the project design;
iii. Determine whether or not improvements and modifications needed to be made to make this IRD project more effective;
iv. Identify factors that may have hindered project effectiveness;
v. Describe benefits that stakeholders in the Shiselweni and Lubombo Regions have achieved from the Reduction and Drought Vulnerabilities intervention by IRD;
vi. Evaluate the sustainability of the project;
vii. Determine the key lessons learned, and
viii. Make recommendations for the next project.

2. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in the evaluation was inclusive and participatory, involving IRD partners, schools, government officials and beneficiaries. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analysed. The approaches used and activities carried out included the following:

i. Review of archival literature which included: (i) Reduction of Drought Vulnerabilities in Swaziland: Project Proposal; and (ii) Reduction of Drought Vulnerabilities in Swaziland: Mid-Term Final Report; (iii) Annual Reports of 2009-2011; (iv) Quarterly Reports of Year 1, 2 & 3, and the (v) Baseline and Vulnerability Assessment. Also, relevant and related literature was included in the review to add value to the final.
ii. Formal interviews with IRD Country Director, Agriculture Program Coordinator, Program Officers and Extension Officers responsible for the targeted Tinkhundla
iii. Formal interviews with partners and stakeholders representatives included: The Director in the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Director in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy, Food and Agriculture Organization, National Agriculture Marketing Board and traditional leaders in the various Tinkhundla.
iv. Focus group discussions with beneficiaries of various components of the programs
v. Field visits to five tinkhundla where the program was being implemented. The purpose of the field visits was to conduct on-site interviews and group discussions and make observations on project work carried out by IRD.

From the review of these documents and related literature, a questionnaire was designed and used to solicit views of the beneficiaries. The survey instrument was used to triangulate the information contained in the various reports. Furthermore, effort was expended to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the project and its design strategy.

A matrix approach was also used to make an in-depth analysis of the End of Project Evaluation (Figure 1) and the findings from this analysis are summarized in succeeding sections. This approach was used to capture what each source said or reflected on (i) project concept, (ii) project design, (iii) project implementation, (iv) project results, and (v) project sustainability.

Source	Project Concept	Project Design	ProjectImplementation	Project Results	Project Sustainability
Monthly Reports					
Quarterly Reports					
Mid-term Review					
Project (IRD) Staff					
Partners & Stakeholders					
Project Stakeholders					
Beneficiaries					

Table 1. A matrix analysis of the RDV Project

#

Evaluation constraints
The end of project evaluation took five field working days. This was a short time for a project that is spread out in most parts of the Lowveld. This short duration limited the breadth and depth of the field visits. Due to the time constraints, the evaluations were somewhat limited and quantitative achievements at beneficiary level could not be fully assessed.

3. KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS:

3.0 The Project Priorities

The Reduction of Drought Vulnerabilities in the Southern Swaziland (RDVSS) project document articulates the priority sectors and objectives set out to be achieved during the project life. The activities of the RDVSS reviewed in this report are based on what was done to achieve the objectives. The sector objectives were to improve:

i. Agricultural practices under drought conditions.
ii. Improve hygiene practices and access to safe water for multiple use

Below, we present our findings on achievements, issues, challenges and lessons learned per each project objective:

3.1 Priority Sector 1-Food Security and Agriculture

3.1.1 Seed Systems and Agricultural inputs

IRD sought to provide minimum input support of drought resistant and soil improving crops, in the form of sorghum, and legumes, distributed through a voucher system. Each year, the set targets were exceeded and the variance increased annually, suggesting that the realisation of results by beneficiaries of the activities stimulated more people to join.

3.1.1.1 Conservation Agriculture (CA)

FAO treats CA in a more holistic manner in terms of integration, soil cover and retention of crop residues (see Figure.1), and hence, partnered with IRD, at institutional and field levels, especially through the formation of a task force, seeking to harmonize CA messages from partners to avoid conflict and to coordinate field visits. Conservation Agriculture (CA) was introduced by IRD at a very critical time; and its advantages were noted and appreciated by the subsistence farmers.

Figure 1: Crop residues for mulching retained in the field as a method of conservation agriculture

.

3.1.1.2 Benefits from CA

- There are many notable benefits from CA, ranging from increased food availability and disposable income at household level to improved planning and management agricultural skills.
- Farmers reported that CA had brought a significant impact on crop yields (up to 43% yield increases); hence, for some there was a surplus of maize harvest available for sale to cover school fees for children, pocket money and to develop family infrastructure.

3.1.1.3 Critical Success Factors

- CA was notably labour intensive during the first year, but on the overall, farmers are satisfied with CA introduced by IRD. Farmers have to have a buy-in and they understand the labour requirements in the basins preparation and the maintenance required every year.
- Group or team work and cooperation noted key ingredients in CA. Considering the labour needs, IRD has to fully utilise the group work or team work in land preparation. The group cohesion that resulted can be an added advantage of the program.
- Improvement in agricultural skills in terms of farmers planning and management. Planning is the key element in the success of CA, any delays in land preparation, weeding and planting can have a negative impact in the success of the project. As was witnessed by some farmers.
- Use of kraal manure to improve soil fertility. Considering the cost of inorganic fertilizers farmers have to fully utilise organic manure as a soil improvement technique
- Involvement of local authorities throughout the life of the project. It is critical to involve traditional authorities at every stage of the program. This helps in the adaptation process, farmers better understand when they are advised by their own as

#

such use of the traditional authorities in some of the trainings will improve the adoption process.

- Frequent supervisory visits by IRD field officers. Farmers require regular monitoring and support considering that this is a new concept it will take time for them to fully adopt all the principles

3.1.1.4 Challenges

- Labour for preparing planting holes, further compounded by work for food activities as well as ill health and zero to low youth involvement which was reported to be a concern to adults. IRD reported child involvement in land preparation to occur school children when are on holiday. Participation of children is driven and controlled by parents.
- Competition between livestock and conservation farming for crop residues. Farmers let their animals feed on the residues, yet they are targeted to be kept in the field for mulching and for nutrient cycling.
- There is no demonstrable benefit in sorghum yields, from CA fields yet the crop is promoted by the Ministry of Agriculture in drought prone areas. Introduction of sorghum as an alternative cereal crop is confronted with farmer reluctance to adopt. Sweet varieties attract birds, yet the alternatives are not attractive to millers such as the Swaziland Milling Company who require it for their processing activities.

3.2.1.1 Keyhole Gardens

These gardens, according to beneficiaries, present a convenient and simply method of vegetable production and they are suitable for adults as there is no need to bend and farmers use very little water. IRD managed to support the construction of 166 gardens, the project exceeded targets in both the number of households benefitting from community, keyhole and trench gardens. The Director of Agriculture noted that keyhole gardens need further experimentation in order to popularize initiative. Hence, farmers are creative but still need verification of the initiatives of Extension Officers (EO's).

3.2.1.2 Benefits from Keyhole gardens

Figure 2.A keyhole gardens growing a variety of vegetable crops

- Feedback from focus group discussions indicated that keyhole gardens allow use of indigenous and locally available resources, and help famers meet their basic domestic food needs for vegetables.
- Consistent school attendance has been attributed to improved food security attributed to these gardens in some sites.

3.2.1.3 Critical Success Factors

- For the keyhole garden to be successful, farmers have to understand the water requirement per each garden so as to know the watering frequency.
- Availability of construction material is also critical. It was however discovered that, IRD allowed farmers to use whatever locally available material for the construction, as long as they meet the other requirements in the layers.
- There is need to engage the Ministry Extension Officers as the Director of Agriculture highlighted so as to help popularise the concept
- Though there in low water usage because of the use of grey water (recycled water), there is still need of a water source to be available in the community otherwise priority for water use will always be given to drinking and cooking. Reliable water source and supply achieved through the IRD repaired and installed water pumps are helping program sustenance.
- Support from the chiefdom/ local authority.
- FGDs revealed that IRD extension services are very helpful
- Involvement of beneficiaries in planning of project activities and their evaluation.
- Further exploration of youths and male spouse participation in the CG enterprise should be explored.

3.2.1.4 Challenges

- Low youth involvement
- Availability of stones in some areas required for a sustainable keyhole garden structure
- Availability of manure for the layers, some farmers do not have cattle as such they have to source manure form other farmers which in some cases is taboo
- .Due to the use of dry matter in mulching farmers, reported being faced with the challenge from grass termites.

3.3.1.1 Community Gardens

Community gardens provide a sustainable way of improving food security at household level as well as improving disposable income through earnings from the sales.

#

Figure 3. Collecting water for domestic use within a community garden (CG)

3.3.1.2 Benefits from community gardens

- The expansion of commercial vegetable production through the installation of hand pumps and electric pumps has improved both household food needs and sales to generate income.

3.3.1.3 Critical Success Factors

- Marketing of produce still remains a major challenge especially in terms of setting price. Currently, vegetable crop produce prices are set by NAMBoard, where according to the Marketing Extension Officer, there is concern about the lack of formulae for deciding and setting up prices for vegetables, and they suggested that:
- 'Farmers need to be sensitised to dispel the misconception between a "buyer" and a "market". A buyer is casual whereas a market is sustainable.'

3.3.1.4 Opportunities

- The expansion of commercial vegetable production caters for both household food needs and sales to generate income. Farmers noted that they will need support from the extension service and recommended that support by local authorities (*Indlunkhulu*) should always be encouraged.
- The implication of the poor marketing observation is that of a need for farmer education; to form more functional collaboration with NAMBoard for relevant product standards and market linkages

3.3.1.5 Challenges

- Poor vegetable prices
- According to NAMBoard, farmers tend to produce vegetables without locating a market in order to produce to specification;
- Lack of accurate records of input makes it difficult to set up sale prices;
- There is no price control regime; no price policy;
- No value addition;
- Logistics in vegetable production: Pricing; Collection and Payment (PCP) are critical

3.4.1.1 Livestock development

Livestock is recognized as a potentially viable enterprise if properly managed; however, limited by the infrequent drought spells and sugarcane fields that reduce grazing areas. Assessing the achievements and outcomes versus the targets, it was observed that cumulatively, the numbers of livestock benefiting from project activities increased over the 3 years, benefits were appreciated by the farmers but the project achieved well below set targets in terms of cattle sales.

Figure 4.A fenced pasture of distinctly better condition than the surrounding degraded land

It was because of the low achievements that at the conclusion of the project, there was realisation and concern by IRD that farmers caught up in culture prestige syndrome of keeping large numbers of cattle.

Although the farmers are reported reluctant to sell their animals as was targeted through the project, they highlighted several benefits which imply that the project was no failure. Benefits from Livestock development program

- The farmers noted that with fencing, they can control and improve breeding of cattle; it is easy to bring pregnant cows, old and weak ones to paddocks, so fenced grazing land (see figure 4) provides isolation quarters for livestock.
- It also brings the advantage of being able to cut grass to promote more fodder growth. Some farmers even reported having increased their grazing land and have come to realize advantages of fencing some grazing land.
- There are many other benefits from livestock development as fencing off selected areas also curbs soil erosion and during the rainy season, grass grows uninterrupted; farmers are able to maintain the condition of cattle and rotational grazing is possible upon dividing the grazing pasture into paddocks. These were not the initial targets of the project, yet such benefits may help contribute to the project objective of reducing livestock deaths.

3.4.1.2 Critical Success Factors

- IRD has to work on the culture syndrome among livestock owners who value numbers of animals rather than quality; some Swazi cattle owners have not fully accepted the

value of selling cattle while still highly priced; the impact of large number of cattle on land is not fully recognized.

3.4.1.3 Challenges

- Low cattle sales due the fact that farmers regard cattle as a fixed asset
- There is a continual decline in grazing land due to the increase in livestock numbers

3.5 Unintended outcomes

There are unique spin-offs as well as synergies between IRD activities which need to be recognised in this evaluation:

a. Crop livestock synergies/ linkages: MoA encourages synergy & integration of technologies and also advocates for diversification and commercialization.
b. CA performs better when combined with livestock cattle, goats or chickens in order to get kraal manure/chicken manure.

Issues and challenges on the agriculture and food security sector:

- Realizing the value of the CA technologies, farmers adopted the technologies as a full package, which was not the case with livestock development. Farmers noted the returns from livestock development activities, but the set objectives of IRD were not met due to limitations noted elsewhere in this report.
- FAO has funding to demonstrate and validate CA, based on the appreciation that CA adheres to scientific and technical technology. CA is part of FAO's policy of rural development and capacity building of small holder farmers. The MoAC helped to coordinate CA through a Task Team and also offered joint training of farmers and Extension Officers which IRD has participated and is member of.
- Officers at NAMBoard maintained the team/collegiate spirit with IRD EO's and assisted when invited at harvesting of produce. NAMBoard found the IRD EO's open to work with.

4 Priority sector 2-Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)

4.1 Water Supply

The baseline study highlighted that 61.9% experienced problems with their main water source. These problems related to water quality, insufficient quality, long time to get drinking water, especially walking to get water. There were also health issues, especially diarrhoeal problems.

4.1.1 Pump Repair and Replacement

A major component of the WASH intervention is the replacement of broken Afridev pumps with new Blue pumps and also pump repair. From the IRD it was noted that in all the sites the Blue pumps had been installed there were reports of breakdown and that the pumps were suited for deep. In sites where the Blue pump was installed the removed non-functioning Afridev pumps were repaired/ reassembled and installed in shallower aquifers.

4.1.1.1 Benefits from Pump Repair and Replacement

- Visits to the field and FGDs revealed that installation of new pump solved the shortage of water and there were considerations to expand areas under cultivation in some CGs were prompted by this initiative.
- In some sites, IRD pump replacement and repair activities had helped resuscitate old vegetable gardens. In other sites, members who had withdrawn from CG schemes had come back again, due to the solution of the water problems.
- IRD project activities, through Pump Repair and Replacement, are reported to have improved the food base; trigged yield improvement and diversity of vegetables produced by farmers had helped farmers secure income.
- There is a greater frequency of breakdown with the Afridev pumps than the Blue pumps, associated with a higher level of willingness to raise maintenance funds for the latter pumps amongst user communities
- Increased water availability overtime and area. In places where Afridev pumps were repaired/ reassembled beneficiaries requested the Blue pumps because of the its advantages they had experienced or seen in other areas

4.1.1.2 Critical Success Factors

- There was therefore consensus amongst discussants at Nkilongo/Lubuli and Intamakuphila that the supply of adequate water is a pre-requisite to project sustainability.
- The success of the contributions for maintenance is critical to the sustainability of hand pumps as there will be money for repairs as well as commitment to ensure the pumps are in working order.

4.1.1.3 Challenges

- At Somtongo, there were issues with the water pump:

'Our pump is too hard/stiff to operate…it is not bringing up adequate water and we think it is the location of pump that is problematic'

- Some of the repaired Afridev pumps are continuously breaking downs thereby defeating the whole purpose of repairing them

4.2.1.1 Rooftop Water Harvesting Systems

Figure 5. Students washing hands from buckets (left) and Zondle Feeding Scheme (right) for school children which benefits from clean water.at Ngcina Primary School

#

The project surpassed targets in terms of the number of students with access to RWH systems (16-32%), but fell short with regards to the number of people with access to rehabilitated/ established water wells.

4.2.1.2 Benefits from Rooftop Water Harvesting Systems

- At Hluti, Ndzevane, Ngcina, and Qomintaba Primary Schools, discussants were unanimous of their valuation of the IRD intervention in through roof water harvesting which 'has improved the school in terms of students' cleanliness, quality of toilets, hygiene as students clean (wash) their hand coming out from the toilet, and reduced incidence of diarrhoea among pupils.'
  - Beneficiaries appreciated and applauded frequent supervisory visits by field officers and reported that RWH systems had reduced expenditure on purchasing water for the school.
  - Project activities in benefitting schools had improved health conditions with proper pit toilets.
  - In Hluthi, the availability of RWH has prompted the school administration to add more tanks from school funds to start a school garden at Ngcina and Ndzevane Primary Schools. Buckets are filled with water for students' use instead of opening water taps from the tanks (Fig.5). The school head indicated that RWH had provided relief to the school budget.
  - 'Installation of gutters and tanks reduced school expenditures; the availability of potable water, good sanitation & hygiene of the school attracts good teachers.' According to Ngcina Primary School Head teacher.

4.2.1.3 Critical Success Factors

- Active participation of parents at the inception stage nurtures continued support from parents
- Maintenance of the water tanks by the school administration is key. The involvement of both the parents Teachers Association (PTA) and the School committee in the management of the water system is critical. As observed in Hluti Central Primary and Secondary Schools, the involvement of the school committee chairperson with the support from parents and PTA has ensured that minor breakage of water & toilet facilities are attended to and that there is efficient use of potable water so as to last them a longer time
- Establishment of water control committees to monitor and regulate water. Quarterly reports indicating plans to install gauges in RC cisterns to monitor water levels, but there is no record of this. These remained plans, without records that the gauges had been installed. The gauges are a crucial element of project monitoring and evaluation, which could provide useful information for the replication of the project.
- Training of water committees by IRD enhanced the monitoring and control of water uses from the RWHS aspect.

4.2.1.4 Challenges

- Poor management of the water in some schools
- Poor collaboration by partners to the extent that the schools are using water for gardening activities without due consideration of the crop water requirement and water requirement for human consumption.

#

Other Issues and challenges on Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene sector

- The Director of the WASH unit thought that cooperation with IRD activities was very amicable, promoted collaborating spirit, and hence reduced duplication. He expressed highest satisfaction with collaborative spirit of IRD and further opined that: '*IRD is the best NGO when it comes to collaborative endeavour and efforts*.'
- In cooperation with WASH, IRD participated in the WASH Forum, which involved monthly meetings where every stakeholder shares experiences (successes and challenges encountered) to ensure that the standard (or quality) of potable water is maintained. The forum enabled technology sharing with IRD, and the establishment of committees led to increased accountability & project sustainability.

5 Illustrative Evaluation Questions

5.1 Project Strategy and Design

IRD has been applauded by stakeholders for its strategic approach to rural development with the Director of Agriculture noting that: '*IRD is the best NGO when it comes to collaborative endeavour and efforts*.'

The FAO CA Coordinator recognised the value of IRD rapid approach to intervention (i.e. engaging local officers) which produced quick results. In their view, the IRD project had demonstrated the importance of the configuration of technologies like CA to fit the farmers' environment, as well as knowing where a technology best fits in terms of relevance and suitability.
In the view of the NAMBoard, IRD's entry design and strategy being holistic, elicited the involvement of local leadership, which in turn promoted excellent support of all IRD activities by the Chiefs.

The Director of Agriculture in the MoA also commended the 'involvement of local authorities/leadership in IRD activities.The Directorwas impressed with IRD's approach to community through Indlunkhulu (local authority). IRD's unique openness prior to the start of the project to introduce themselves to MoA was praised by the director. The MoA noted that IRD has rekindledneeded motivation and enthusiasm among farmers in the participating areas, hence recommenced the promotion of IRD's unique needs assessment which seems to be very efficient. There was however a proposal to conduct demonstrations on CA as well as conducting a comparative study of MoA's CA strategy of shallow plant stations against IRD's CA strategy of deep hole plant stations, which is especially on point considering the labour limitations noted by IRD.

Evidence presented in the reviewed reports as well as visits to the field, and feedback from beneficiaries suggests that the project design did achieve its objectives, and often exceeded set targets. Greater achievements have been realised with CA.

There was nonethelessa general failure to design the project with integration between livestock and crop production activities. For this reason, there is frequent reference to competition without efforts to harness the synergies.

The RWH and water supply activities were another resounding success. The program has ensuredan increase in water availability at schools overtime and reduced the expenditure on water for the schools and parents.

5.2 Capacity Building of Beneficiaries

The project activities involved training of beneficiaries on hygiene as well the operational and financial management, in the use of hand pumps for community gardens and communities at large.

Local personnel was sought and trained as Extension Officers for IRD programming, which will be invaluable for the sustenance of the project activities beyond the life cycle of IRD activities. Training for the EOs were not limited to agricultural skills but also included health and hygiene training.

Feedback from FGDs indicated that the project had been useful in developing the capacity of beneficiaries who reported they would proceed with the CA activities, as they have realised the benefits of the RWH systems in schools and noted the value of returns from CCG and keyhole gardens.

IRD provided training through Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation (PHAST) to school representatives, community watering points and community gardens which were acknowledged and appreciated by participants in FGDs.

FGDs indicated that IRD field staff have conducted farmer training to a great extent such that farmers have gained valuable knowledge on planning & managing the CA.

Knowledge and use of CA and CGs has had an impact on food availability at HH level.

Community garden members and water point committees were helped to set up zero charge bank accounts at the Standard Bank to provide anchorage for groups and members mentioned in the constitutions, which was developed as a key tool to guide group members.

5.3 Unintended Outcomes

According to the Director of the DWA, IRD's program is part of the WASH policy because it enhances the WASH mandate especially in its alignment with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the NDS 2022 (meeting the peoples' need for clean water). The DWA Director further appreciated that the WASH unit, through GIS, was now able to have a Water Point Mapping and made reference to the August 2nd launching of Water Mapping through GIS. This was one of the developments emerging from IRD project activities. This is borne of the IRD borehole mapping exercise conducted in 2009 which was to lay a foundation for national database. Hence, the MNRE has already launched a national water point mapping with a budget of E2 million approved by parliament.

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Coordination and Coherence

IRD collaborated with various partners to implement its program.These are: the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), NAMBoard, the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) as well as Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Unit of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy. FAO perceives itself as an enabling institution that aligns its strategies with that of the Government's on rural development. IRD's cooperation with partners and sharing of information on CA and joint visits to participating farmers' fields is widely reported and appreciated by FAO and MoA. The WASH unit instituted the WASH Forum, a monthly meeting where every stakeholder, including IRD, share experiences, successes as well as challenges encountered.

Feedback indicates functional coordination between IRD and the respective stakeholders, and this helped avoid duplication of activities. There were linkages with the MoA and the WASH unit in the Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy in setting up priorities. Awareness of WV, WFP, and SFDF activities in the respective project areas made IRD activities coherent with interventions by development partners in the respective communities.

6.2 Relevance

In planning for the economic development of a developing country's agriculture, it is important to understand the decision making processes of the farmers who will become the agents of change. Farmers have many competing demands on their resources and do not merely strive for maximum profit. The sale of cattle to commercial buyers constitutes only one, and often the least attractive, of several economic choices normally available to Swazi owners. There are reports about the productive use of cattle for ploughing and transport, and as suppliers of milk and manure. The design was therefore not appropriate to stimulate farmers to sell off their cattle and commercialise. The project period of 3 years was too short, given the life cycle of cattle as well as considering the factors that may influence farmers to sell off their animals. Animal factors are often centred on the sex and age of the animal, so that farmers tend to sell mature male and older animals and consider other uses of younger and female ones.

In order to have a successful inclusion of leguminous crops in the cropping cycle, it is important to consider the amounts of nitrogen the individual legume crops can fix, on a per hectare basis, for the benefit of companion or successive crops.

The reports reflect no efforts to form or support the formation of associations whereas the baseline report showed that 'being part of an association improved household wealth.' This is an important social capital which farmers may need for financial capital necessary for input acquisition as well as labour which has been recorded as a limiting resource especially land preparation.

With zero breakdowns in Blue pumps and more preparedness by user communities to contribute to maintenance funds, there is evidence of the relevance of the technology to the communities.

The RWH systems installed in project area schools have also lent their value to reducing school expenditure on water supplies and hence spared funds for other school necessities. WASH activities improved student hygiene and health, and improved student attendances which have been attributed to better incomes and food supply from CGs.

6.3 Effectiveness

The feedback from visits to the field, the FGDs and the report suggest that the project was effective in producing higher crop yields and contributing positively to livelihoods; in the provision of water to schools as well as improving hygiene amongst children in benefitting schools.

Although the object set was to reduce livestock deaths, commercialise cattle and ultimately encourage off-take, farmers reported several benefits from the livestock development activities which were not missed by the respective evaluations. These benefits were not however appropriately attributed to the livestock project, e.g. the increase in numbers and proportions of farmers using kraal manure. The increases in yield attributed to CA may also be a factor of the animal manures, where they were used because of the wider benefits from animal manure application in crop production. All these benefits indicate the effectiveness of the project design and its implementation.

Increases in numbers and proportions of farmers using kraal manure in crop production and increased milk yields are benefits that have not been attributed to livestock development activities yet they are derivatives which were not anticipated during the design of the project.

The re-ignition of such practices as *Lilima* (co-operative labour), for cooperative labour, cannot be separated from IRD activities, and may be expected to benefit other local as well as community activities in the future.

There has been little focus on the HIV and AIDS messages in the project, which was an essential part of the project. The IRD health trainer was meant to work with PEPFAR partners to include information on the promotion of HIV/AIDS helpline and HIV/AIDS awareness messages.

6.4 Efficiency

IRD staff was efficient in the delivery of the activities however there was a feeling of work overload on the part of Extension Officers. A higher level of training could help them make more critical observations and evaluations in the field, extending the resource efficiency of the project. All activities were delivered as per design in the proposal document.

6.5 Impact

The training of water committees by IRD enhanced the monitoring and control of water uses from the RWHS aspect. At Ngcina, it was reported that the RWHS's aspect also enhanced school administration's appreciation of potable water and ensuring its efficient use.

The findings presented in preceding sections clearly indicated project impacts in terms of the increase in crop yields due to CA; a diversified food base and higher incomes from CGs.

Farmers also reported improvements in livestock due to IRD's livestock development activities that increase fodder availability and reduce livestock deaths.

The installation of Blue pumps, and the replacement and repair of Afridev pumps has also reduced the frequency of pump break downs.

The review of the reports and submissions from FGDs highlighted an opportunity to promote synchrony between livestock and crop enterprises, so that they can mutually benefit from each other. Livestock manures bring more benefits than just the plant nutrients.

6.6 Sustainability

There is no clear indication of an exit strategy, but beneficiaries suggest that they will continue with learned practices after the project period.

The EOs are local, they originate from their area of operation, which may ensure the sustainability of the project beyond its active life cycle since they will continue living there after the completion of the project.

Pump selection has been shown to consider changes in the depth of the water table, which may fluctuate under the influence of climate change.

To enhance sustainability of the community gardens, there is need to improve on record keeping of the farmers which can be a challenge.

6.7 Lessons Learned

The livestock development activities sought to stimulate the commercialisation of cattle farming and increase off-take. This objective was not realised, and the conclusion was that farmers are interested in the cattle quantity rather than their quality.

Farmers in the IRD project areas were also reluctant to fully take up sorghum in spite of prevailing demand.

Farmers are not irrational. Any new technology is appropriately and often suspiciously evaluated before adoption. Meeting with farmers in the field, they indicated that they realised benefits in their livestock that accrued from fencing and dividing the pasture. Increased milk yields and kraal manure outputs were mentioned.

7 Recommendations for the Next Project

i. When targeting changes in the farming system, engage farmers in various components that may be expected to change the farming system over time, and not in 3 years. This applies directly to the livestock development activities.

ii. The project strategy should allow for dynamism and fluidity, which would have seen encouragement of farmers to use animal manures in their fields to increase crop yields (rather than the concerns about competition between livestock and CA for crop residues) as well as recognise the value of fenced of pastures in improving milk yields and providing isolation quarters for sick animals or those in poor condition.

iii. Installation of gauges on the RC cisterns to monitor water levels was mentioned throughout the project period without reports of execution. These gauges are important not only for monitoring, but they would also be useful in guiding similar projects in the future, as well as improving the efficiency of installed water supply systems to meet the water requirement/usage standards of WHO (of 3l of water per child per day).

iv. Damage to water taps attached to tanks may be avoided by installing stand pipes anchored in concrete.

v. Conventional fields are shown to have produced 5% better yields (0.38T ha^{-1}vs0.36 T ha^{-1}) than those of CA. Factors responsible for if not contributing to this trend need to be investigated.

vi. Aphid control on cowpeas is important to stimulate greater uptake, realise better yields and contribute to soil fertility improvement.

vii. Livestock Farming: there is need for innovation to be introduced with demonstrable benefits, and the farmers will adopt. There is need to understand why farmers will not sell their cattle, and refuse to be induced so. The frequently cited factor of culture may need to be investigated for its significance to the modern day farmer.

viii. What changes in resource allocation, if any, could help farmers make fuller use of livestock to achieve their goals?

With the realised positive impacts from fencing pastures comes the challenge of the maintenance of these fences. Future activities should include cooperative activities, and their activities should also target sustainability beyond the life cycle of IRD activities in the project areas. Future activities should include those done by cooperatives to ensure sustainability beyond IRD's lifecycle.

#

8 Appendices

8.1 Terms of Reference

Consultancy Terms of Reference
End of Project Evaluation

Project Name	Reduction of drought vulnerabilities in southern Swaziland
Project Code	09020
Project Duration	April 2009-June 2012
Donor	USAID/OFDA

CONTEXT

Project Background. Swaziland has been historically a net importer of food, rarely achieving production of more than 49% of annual consumption. Up until 2000, Swaziland was routinely harvesting 100.000 MT of maize, Swaziland main staple food. Production during the last 5 years dropped to an average of 61.000 MT. Southern Swaziland is confronted with recurrent droughts, high prevalence of HIV and high food prices. The United Nations World Food Program (WFP) is forced to reduce the numbers of its beneficiaries under its General Food Distribution activity, while production from subsistence farmers is dropping.

1.3 The objectives of the project were (1) To improve agricultural practices under drought conditions and (2) To improve hygiene practices and expand access to safe water for multiple uses. To realize these objectives IRD helped communities to mitigate drought in two provinces— Shiselweni and Lubombo, through a project funded by USAID/OFDA. The project aimed to enhance food security by building capacity of farmers, through training (Conservation Agriculture (CA) and Livestock development) and minimum input support (drought resistant and soil improving crops). A total of 4845 farmers have been trained, 2,337 farmers from a target of 2,050 are using conservation agriculture techniques where they are producing Maize, Sorghum and Cowpeas. Farmers have established keyhole (backyard) gardens and community gardens where they produced vegetables, such as spinach, tomatoes, beets, onions, lettuce, cabbages, and carrots, for sale and for home consumption. Farmers have been trained on keeping livestock numbers manageable to prevent overgrazing and reduce livestock deaths during drought years. Through this they have established protected grazing fields and are practicing rotational grazing.

1.4 Provision of water supply, promotion of sanitation and hygiene in primary schools, and improving on community based management of services was a big component of the project. IRD replaced broken down Afridev pumps with deep well hand pumps for depths up to 100m. The pump installation/ repair was done in concurrent with construction of cattle troughs within the vicinity of the water point, to feed on the waste water from the borehole, and to keep the animals from contaminating the water source. Seventy two broken Afridev pumps were replaced by Blue pumps. Well heads and cattle troughs were constructed for each replacement sites. Forty two boreholes were drilled for community gardens where 15 electric pumps were installed for the commercialised gardens and 27 blue pumps for the individual gardens. IRD improved water supply, sanitation and hygiene in schools through

#

installation of 28 rooftop water harvesting (RWH) systems and construction of latrines benefitting 12,633 students and teachers. Training was also provided on sanitation, hygiene and management of services for the beneficiaries.

IRD has coordinated the implementation of its activities with various stakeholders such as the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Food security and Nutrition Forum coordinated by WFP and MOAC, NGOs that include Africa Cooperative Action Trust (ACAT), COSPE, World Vision and SWADE. Sharing of information and experiences was done between IRD, FAO and NGOs working in the project area will continue to ensure that there is no duplication of activities and there is proper coordination of CA projects in Swaziland. At the private sector level IRD coordinated the marketing of produce with NAMBoard, In WASH programming, IRD coordinated its activities the Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy, Department of Water Affairs, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health. In addition, IRD is an active member of the WASH Cluster in Swaziland, which is coordinated by UNICEF and all WASH activities in the country. IRD participates in the monthly WASH Cluster meetings and has been sharing successes and challenges with other members of the cluster.

1.5 In order to ensure that the outcome of this project is verifiable with high accountability and accuracy and that recommendations are detailed and useful three evaluative events were planned during the life of project: (i) Baseline Assessment, (ii) Midterm Review, and (iii) End of Project Evaluation. A baseline survey was conducted between December 2009and the Midterm Review in 2011. An internal endline survey will be conducted in May 2012 before this consultancy.

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

To determine project impact, the external consultant will evaluate project accomplishments in terms of its design, implementation and processes established in the project design document. The evaluation will evaluate the extent at which IRD performed against the project objectives within the agreed timeframe.

Areas of Focus and Illustrative Evaluation Questions:

- Project Objective and Strategy Design: Is the project reaching its objectives? Is the project design appropriate? What interventions have been more or less successful in meeting targets? Which interventions are most critical and/or effective in achieving project objectives and intermediate results? What improvements can be made to the design to improve results? What are the factors that hinder/assist the effective integration of interventions? Are there any unexpected but important benefits or impacts of the project that should be documented that is not yet documented? Are there any negative impacts or unintended consequences of the project that need to be addressed, and how?
- Capacity Building of Beneficiaries: Are the training materials appropriate for the participants? If necessary, how can the materials be improved to better meet the objectives of the training? Are the materials consistent with those of the government or other local development agency (including national agricultural research centers)? Is the technical field staff well trained and supervised? What areas, if any, need strengthening? Is the project effectively developing the capacity of counterparts and/or partners? If not, how could the design or implementation be altered to improve capacity strengthening? Is the project effectively enabling, or developing the capacity

of, beneficiaries? If not, how could the design or implementation be altered to improve capacity strengthening?

- Agriculture Activities: Have farmers adopted whole technological packages or just components and why? Are the technologies and practices being promoted well established and well suited to the local agro-ecological environments? Does the use of food for work for participation in agricultural production related activities act as an incentive/disincentive to improving productivity, and how?
- WASH Behaviour Change: Are beneficiaries adopting desired practices or behaviours? What is their primary source of information concerning practices and behaviours? What are other key channels of information? Which practices have beneficiaries been more inclined to adopt, and why? Are there certain groups within the population with lower rates of adoption and why? How can the program be modified to address these constraints to adoption?
- Stakeholders (local and government authorities): What is the added value of IRD cooperation with local and government authorities in achieving the project results? What kind of relationship does the project have with its stakeholders? How do the stakeholders perceive the project? How involved are the stakeholders in the project activities?
- Sustainability: Are the impacts (e.g., improvements in income levels and yields) sustainable? Are the outcomes related to adoption of better practices sustainable, i.e., participants are likely to continue after the project ends? Which outcomes are likely or unlikely to be sustainable, and why? What can be done to increase the sustainability? Has the project effectively collaborated with local administrative bodies such as ministries, local councils, etc?
- Lessons Learned. What are the key lessons learned? How can the project use them to learn? What went well, what did not go well, how can the project be improved?
- Recommendations for the next project. What are the concrete recommendations towards the sustainability of the Food Security and WASH activities in the operating environment? What are the concrete recommendations for improving similar future project strategy?

SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The End of Project evaluation should cover implementation period from April 2009 to June 2012. The geographical scope of the evaluation is IRD area of operation (see map in annex) in Lubombo and Shiselweni regions. The end of project evaluation will primarily be an analysis - and not mere description - of progress, results and sustainability. While the main emphasis should be on measuring results, the evaluation should also cover the project concept and design and implementation. The evaluation should include findings, lessons learned and recommendations.

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 The Evaluation will comprise of a desk review of IRD project document, monthly and quarterly reports, and reviews/studies (baseline assessment, midterm review and end of project survey); key informant interview of project staff, partners and stakeholders; and focus group discussion with beneficiaries.

3.2 The Evaluation is expected to make use of both qualitative and quantitative data in order to assess project performance and solicit lessons learned.

3.3 All fieldwork will be organized in collaboration with IRD staff.

COMPOSITION OF TEAM

4.1 The consultant will be supervised by the IRD/Swaziland Country Office, namely the Country Director as the primary contact within IRD.
4.2 During the Evaluation, the consultant is also expected to be in contact with the HQ/M&E Officer, via email and telephone conference calls when deemed necessary by the Core Team.

4.3 Core Team will consist of the Country Director (Evaluation Team Leader) and Agricultural and Livestock Program Coordinator (Evaluation Manager); Support Team: IRD/Swaziland Field Staff; Chung Lai, HQ Senior M&E Officer.

LEVEL OF EFFORT & EXPERTISE REQURIED

Duration and type of consultancy:
The consultancy team will be offered a fixed contract for four weeks. The consultancy is expected to commence in June 4, 2012.
5.2 The consultant shall perform the tasks described below under the general guidance of IRD/Swaziland Country Director. The consultant will also work closely with the Field Managers and the field staff during the consultancy and shall consult on a daily basis with the Evaluation Manager on questions and matters regarding the evaluation.
5.3 The consultant will present initial findings to relevant IRD/Swaziland staff at the end of the consultancy before finalizing the end of project evaluation report.
5.3 Qualifications and experience. The evaluation consultant should meet the following requirements:

- Postgraduate qualification (Masters or above) in Education or in a discipline relevant to
- this assignment with a minimum of 5 years' experience
- Demonstrated knowledge of current evaluation theory and practice and several years of experience in evaluating development projects, preferably those that are related to the field of Agriculture, Food Security, and/or Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
- Competence and adequate experience in the use of qualitative and/or quantitative methods of data collection and analysis including: sampling, desegregation of data, structured and semi-structured interviewing, focus groups, observation and triangulation research methods.
- Ability to interpret and analyse complex qualitative and quantitative data, and to present findings and recommendations in a clear and concise way
- Excellent inter-personal communication skills including experience of facilitation and presentation
- The ability to communicate in English and SiSwati, the local language, and a good understanding of Swaziland.
- Experience with working with donor agencies, non-governmental organizations and government ministries is essential, i.e. USAID, UN agencies, international NGOs.

#

SPECIFIC TASKS

- Review project materials, such as approved project documents, project monitoring documents, baseline and midterm reports, progress reports, action plans, assessments and other information;
- Develop Evaluation protocol to guide the evaluation process, including a data collection schedule and analysis approach;
- Develop Evaluation qualitative data collection tools to be used in administering the fieldwork and tabulating the results;
- Travel to the field to speak to the beneficiaries, using qualitative data collection tools developed, i.e. focus group discussion question guide;
- Transcribe and aggregate all collected data during interviews and FGDs;
- Process and analyze collected and existing data (project monitoring data and households surveys);
- Present initial findings to the core team before completing the consultancy;
- Prepare final report, incorporating comments from IRD; and
- Finalize the final report.

7. DELIVERABLES

An End of Project Evaluation report that presents results in a specific, user-friendly and direct manner. It should be organized by areas of interest to allow for an easier interpretation by decision makers and managers. The consultant shall provide IRD/Swaziland with a comprehensive draft evaluation report for review and comment. The following are the expected deliverables of the End of Project Evaluation:

a. End of Project Evaluation protocol, a guide to how the End of Project Evaluation will be conducted. This should include an understanding of the task, methodology, a work plan based on the proposed tentative time schedule;
b. PowerPoint of the preliminary findings and recommendations to IRD project staff;
c. Final Evaluation report that follows the suggested report outline, incorporating comments from the Team.
d. The consultant need to provide the additional following documents:
    - One (1) electronic file of the clean (final) transcribed data collected during interviews and FGDs; and
    - One (1) electronic folder of aggregated data developed to organize and analyse the data.

7.2 The report shall include, but not limited to:

a. Executive summary, including main findings outlining the achievement to-date and key recommendations for improvement;
b. Table of contents
c. Acronyms
d. Project Background
e. Project Goals and Objectives
f. Evaluation methodology
g. Data Limitations
h. Key Findings
i. Analysis (based on evaluation questions)

#

j. Lessons learned/
k. Conclusions and recommendations
l. Best practices, if applicable
m. Appendices: evaluation terms of reference, bibliography of project documents consulted, and persons interviewed, villages where FGDs were conducted and any data tables.

SCHEDULE & PAYMENT (TERMS AND CONDITIONS)
A tentative calendar of activities is presented in Table 1. The consultancy will generally begin in June 4, 2012.

Table 1: Tentative Schedule

Activity		Days									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	Desk review of all relevant project documents										
B	Develop end of project evaluation protocol										
C	Develop evaluation instruments (interview guide, FGD question guide, etc.)										
D	Collect qualitative data – office and fieldwork; transcribe interviews & FGDs										
E	Data aggregation, processing and analysis										
F	Analyze data present preliminary findings and write report										

8.2 **Payments**. Daily consulting rate is negotiable, although it must be commensurate with IRD consultancy terms and standards. The Consultant will be contracted on an IRD Consultancy Contract which will be signed by the evaluator upon commencement of the evaluation and will detail additional terms and conditions of service, aspects on inputs and deliverables. IRD will cover accommodation and subsistence costs during the consultancy period. The consultant shall be responsible for his/her income tax and/or insurance during the assignment Payment of the consultancy will be at the end of the consultancy period, upon receipt and acceptance of the final report.

#

8.3 Areas in which Interviews were conducted and persons interviewed

Table 2. Details of visited project areas and individuals interviewed

Area/Site/ Group/ Individual Interviewed	Activity Supported
Nkilongo/Lubuli	CCG, RWH, CA, Livestock, Keyhole, Pump replacement
Hosea/Sigwe (Nyatsini)	CCG
Hluti Central Primary & Secondary	RWH
Sigwe/Ndwandwe	CA, Keyhole
Sigwe/Ndabandaba	Livestock Development and CA
(Intamakuphila)	Pump replacement, CCG
Malevane Mbhamali	Hand-pump, CCG
Somntongo	Repaired + New Pumps; RWH
A. Mbamali	CA, Livestock, Keyhole, Pump replacement
a. Ngcina Primary School b. Matsanjeni Primary School c. Qomintaba Primary School	RWH
MatsanjeniInkhundla: a. E. Hlatshwayo	CA
b. Ncane Dlamini	CA and Keyhole
c. E. Hlatshwayo	Livestock Development
MatsanjeniInkhundla:	Pump replacement

#

8.2 Interview Schedule

Table 3. End IRD Project Evaluation Interview Questions Guide for Stakeholders

Date	**Stakeholder Representation**		
	Institution	**Individual/Officer**	**Position**
Question		**Response**	
1. What is FAO's role regarding CA?			
2. How has IRD involved FAO in its activities in the Lubombo/Shiselweni selected Tinkhundlas?			
3. Describe your level of cooperation with IRD activities.			
4. What did you do to articulate your cooperation with IRD?			
5. Is your involvement part of your institutions' policy			
6. Is your program part of your institution's policy?			
7. What has your institution done to monitor its activities' input into IRD intervention?			
8. What suggestion can you share as lessons from the stakeholder partnership with IRD?			

General Comments made:
……

#

8.3 End IRD Project Evaluation Interview Questions Guide For beneficiaries

Instruction:
Please respond to these questions as honestly as you possibly can. Your honest opinion will be highly appreciated. Do not write your name. Tick your response or write your opinion.

1. How effective has the project been?	1=Not effective ( ) 2=Least effective ( ) 3=Effective ( ) 4=Very Effective ( )
2. Has the project been implemented according to plan?	Yes ( ) No ( )
3. What have been the changes and why?	
4. What could be improved? (In the IRD Activities)	
5. What were the main challenges?	
6. How has the capacity building and awareness-raising for government/community project officials been?	
7. How has the capacity building and awareness-raising for households or individuals on conservation agriculture, vegetable production, sanitation, hygiene been?	
8. Was the implementation of the program to your satisfaction? (Explain)	Yes ( ) No ( )
9. Was the staffing adequate for the project? (Explain)	Yes ( ) No ( )
10. Do the communities own the activities? (Explain)	Yes ( ) No ( )

SWOT ANALYSIS

The SWOT analysis is often used to elicit people's views regarding Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of a particular phenomenon or program. Please complete the SWOT Matrix below:

Item	List	Justification
Strengths		
Weaknesses		
Opportunities		
Threats		

9 Bibliography of Project Documents

- IRD (2009). Reduction of Drought Vulnerabilities in Swaziland: Project Proposal.
- IRD (2009-2011). Annual Reports. Mbabane, Swaziland.
- IRD (2009). Improving Lives, Building Livelihoods. Quarterly Report Year 1. Mbabane, Swaziland, May-June 2009,
- IRD (2010). Reduction of Drought Vulnerabilities in Swaziland, Mid-Term Final Report. December, 2010.
- IRD (2009). Improving Lives, Building Livelihoods. Quarterly Report Year 2. Mbabane, Swaziland, January-March 2011
- IRD (2009). Improving Lives, Building Livelihoods. Quarterly Report Year 3. Mbabane, Swaziland, January-March, 2012.
- IRD (2010). Lowveld Baseline & Vulnerability Assessment: Reduction of Drought Vulnerabilities in Southern Africa, Swaziland. Mbabane, January 2010.
- 7.3 Bibliography of additional literature
- Boyle, P.G. (1981). "A rationale for involvement of people" Planning better programs. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, USA, pp.
- _____ "Program development and instructional design" Planning better programs. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, USA, pp.183-193.
- _____"The concept of educational objectives" Planning better programs. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, USA, pp.194-205
- _____"Planning learning objectives." Planning better programs. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, USA, pp.206-221.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). "Introduction Leadership: Theory and practice." 4thEdn.SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, pp.1-13.