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Executive Summary

In September 2013, Tearfund launched the ‘Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Initiatives for Farmers’ program, also referred to as The Food Security and Livelihoods Project, in Tando Mohammad Khan (TMK) district of Sindh province, Pakistan with financial support from the Scottish Government. The intervention was designed to improve the food and livelihood security of 2,650 poor and vulnerable farming households (19,300 individuals) in 50 communities across TMK district. The project will culminate on March 31, 2016.

The project also supports the advancement of two Millennium Development Goals, including: #1 Eradication of extreme poverty and hunger and #3 Promotion of gender equality and empower women. Additionally, the project supports the achievement of Pakistan’s Initial National Communication on Climate Change (2003).

Hypothesis and Methodology

In February 2015, Tearfund commissioned Causal Design, a United States based consulting firm, to conduct a performance evaluation of the Food Security and Livelihoods Project. This evaluation examined multiple dimensions of Tearfund’s intervention to assess its quality and performance, including:

- Progress made against the project’s logframe, including the impact, outcome and output levels as measured by Scottish Government and Tearfund indicators; and
- Achievement of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s - Development Assistance Criteria (OECD-DAC) based on a numeric scale ranging from 0-4, based on project relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability

This study leverages a mixed-methods approach to evaluate the project. A quantitative survey was administered to 329 beneficiaries from 34 project communities, and key informant interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with numerous stakeholders.¹ In addition to the interview results, this report includes information from the evaluation team’s review of project documents and direct observations made while conducting fieldwork.

Key Findings

The midterm evaluation suggests that target households will benefit greatly from their participation in Tearfund’s Food Security and Livelihoods Project. The results imply that target communities will experience positive gains in food security and livelihoods at the household and village levels as a result of project activities. While, limited baseline data, or a non-beneficiary comparison group, prevent this report from quantifying the direct causal effect of the project, it was observed that the major targets for activities and outputs are being met, indicating a strong likelihood that the impact goals are being achieved.

¹ See Appendix F.3 for a comprehensive list of qualitative interviews conducted.
Based on the various dimensions considered in this evaluation, the project received the highest marks available in each development assistance criteria, as seen in Figure 1 below. The evaluation assessed every project activity using the OECD-DAC matrix, and made a final determinations based on the average scores from each criterion.

Figure 1. OECD-DAC Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC Rating (4 is High; 0 is Low)</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevance**

Analysis suggests that the project is well suited to the policies and priorities of beneficiaries and the wider stakeholder community. This intervention is appropriate for the farming and pastoral communities of UC Lakhat, and takes into consideration their relevant needs, skills, traditions, and community dynamics. Additionally, the project is relevant to other key stakeholder’s policies and practices including government line departments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Despite some modifications to project activities, including the shift away from the disbursement of fruit trees to non-fruit trees under Activity 4.1, the project remains in line with observed stakeholder needs.

**Effectiveness**

The implemented activities effectively address and are reaching the targeted outputs. Inputs provided to beneficiaries are effective modalities to impact sustainable livelihood strengthening and resilience in target communities. Furthermore, the flexibility of project inputs address a wide range of beneficiary needs, from food consumption to income generation and asset development, allowing household to manage outputs and determine how they are utilized.

It was observed that while deliberate efforts are made to establish relationships with relevant stakeholders, opportunities to strengthen these relationships might be missed. Informal and formal partnerships with actors, including NGO and government entities, may be further explored to achieve greater project success.

**Efficiency**

The impact of project outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the project inputs appears to demonstrate efficiency in terms of cost, timeliness and general project advancement. However, this assessment is unable to determine exact efficiency rates due to insufficient data and project infancy.

**Impact**

The intervention has produced a positive and visible impact in target communities. At midpoint, the sum of the project’s outputs has demonstrated sufficient progress in line with the project’s goal. Although precise project effects cannot be captured without a non-beneficiary comparison group established at project baseline, the analysis implies that target communities are experiencing improvements to household food security.
and livelihoods. Furthermore, holistic benefits were observed among the beneficiary communities, including gender equality and female empowerment, social cohesion and mobilization.

**Sustainability**

Evidence is strong that the intervention meets sustainability standards and project activities demonstrate contribution to cross cutting issues, including gender equality and female empowerment, environmental sustainability, and community resilience. Both indirect and direct beneficiaries report that project activities had benefits for entire communities, not just individual beneficiaries. Direct observation indicates that VDCs are strong community structures that ensure centralization, ownership and transference of project benefits and women are assuming leadership roles in the VDCs with little to no village resistance.

Leveraging government capacity building efforts to enhance service delivery to farming communities remains a challenging aspect of the project. It is important to note that Tearfund has met the related output set forth in the project logframe thus, the noted challenge rests outside of the project’s scope of work. Nonetheless, it is important to note that while government line departments report an increase in knowledge as a result of Tearfund’s capacity building activities, it is unclear how knowledge attained is utilized to provide improved and sustainable service delivery to farmers. Training alone is not sufficient to improve service delivery, thus the utility and application of government training remains an important factor to consider. The Implementation of measures that enable effective and sustainable service-oriented relationships between government line departments and project beneficiaries is an important factor to consider.

**Recommendations**

The results of this study shed light on both the potential and the limitations of food and livelihood security programs in economically, politically and environmentally affected contexts. The insights generated have important implications for improving the effectiveness of investments in food and income generating activities in Pakistan.

**For Tearfund:**

*Replicate activities that demonstrate positive impact*

- Cash grants are relevant to communities and recipients demonstrate livelihood improvements as a result of this activity. This activity could be replicated in the same project communities to achieve greater impact (Cross-Reference: Key Findings: Relevance)

*Consider frameworks and put measures in place that improve government service delivery*

- Consider frameworks that improve effective and sustainable relationships between government officials and project beneficiaries, including government extension programs or partnerships between VDC members and government officials (Cross-Reference: Key Findings: Impact and Sustainability and the Evaluation Action Plan)
- Select indicators that measure improved service delivery for example, the increased number of agricultural extension workers assigned to a given target zone and number of visits/trainings conducted by officials in a target
community (Cross-Reference: Key Findings: Impact and Sustainability and the Evaluation Action Plan)

**Strengthen partnerships with stakeholder community**
- Leverage knowledge and resources of wider stakeholder community and form informal/formal partnerships to maximize impact, particularly for farming equipment and water management (i.e. replicate Qatar Charity partnership) (Cross-Reference: Key Findings: Effectiveness & Efficiency section)

**Invest in strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems**
- Collect a counterfactual at project baseline for future projects in order to adequately measure impact (Cross Reference: Key Findings: Efficiency and Key Insights: Monitoring and Evaluation)
- Ensure indicators outlined in the project logframe adequately capture what they are intended to measure (Cross-Reference: Key Insights: Monitoring and Evaluation)
- Milestone dates and collection activities should align with key monitoring and evaluation outputs, including midterm and final evaluations (Cross-Reference: Key Findings: Impact and Sustainability and the Evaluation Action Plan)

**Improve project management tools**
- **Output 5: Project Quality and Impact** may be thoroughly integrated throughout the log frame and project, not as a separate output (All Cross-Referenced: Key Insights: Project Management)
- Shift Activity 3.1 from Output 3 to Output 2 in next log frame amendment
- Shift Activity 3.2 from Output 3 to Output 2 in next log frame amendment
Introduction

In 2010, floods ravaged Pakistan leaving more than 18 million people across the country affected and approximately 14 million in need of humanitarian assistance. The Tando Mohammad Khan (TMK) district in Sindh Province, an area whose economy is based on agricultural and pastoral practices, was one of the worst hit areas; 7.27 million people were affected, including 411 deaths, 1,198 injuries, and 876,249 damaged homes. Gardens, farmlands and livestock were destroyed, including approximately 367,710 acres of cultivated land and 40% to 50% of poultry and livestock.

One year later, in 2011, Sindh Province was struck by monsoons that left five million people in a state of emergency. Sindh, the second most populated province in the country, already suffered from the highest levels of food insecurity, with 72% of households classified as food insecure.

Project Overview

To address the outstanding food and livelihood needs of farming households in Sindh Province, Tearfund launched the ‘Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Initiatives for Vulnerable Farmers’ project in September 2013. This three year project was designed to increase household food and income, improve livelihood security and assets, and strengthen human capacity among 2,650 farming households, or 19,300 individuals, in Union Council (UC) Lakhat in Tando Mohammed Khan district of Sindh Province.

Outcome Map

Figure 2 illustrates the project’s outcome map, or logframe, and demonstrates how project inputs and intended outcomes should affect general levels of food security and livelihoods. In order to better understand potential impacts of the programme, the midline evaluation seeks to assess the project’s effectiveness and measure progress toward meeting targets."
Midterm Evaluation Objective

Key objectives of this midterm evaluation include the measurement of progress made against key indicators and the project’s alignment with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Development Assistance Criteria (OECD-DAC), as outlined in the project’s ToR. The OECD-DAC is a system of evaluating and benchmarking development interventions based on a numeric scale (0-4) in five key areas, including relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The numeric scale, criteria definition, and the final numeric score for the midterm evaluation can be found in figures 3 and 4 below. Detailed evaluation findings, including based on the OECD-DAC and performance indicator results can be found in the Key Findings section of this report.

Figure 3. OECD- DAC Rating System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD-DAC Grading System:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low or no visible contribution to this criteria</td>
<td>Some evidence of contribution to this criteria but significant improvement required</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory contribution to this criteria but requirement for continued improvement</td>
<td>Evidence of good contribution to this criteria but with some areas for improvement remaining</td>
<td>Evidence that the contribution is strong and/or exceeding that which was expected of the intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. OECD-DAC Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD-DAC Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong>: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the interventions are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong>: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The longer term or sustainable changes (positive and negative) as a result of the project interventions. These can be direct and indirect and take into account wider social, economic, environmental and other development considerations. The evaluation should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong>: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which the project reaches its objectives. Stakeholder coordination and coherence may also be addressed here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong>: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. An efficient outcome is one that achieves the outcomes at a low cost (i.e. of inputs, economic or otherwise).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong>: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining to what extent the benefits of a project activity are likely to continue after the donor funding has finished. Projects should be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluation Questions**

The following evaluation questions informed the evaluation data collection and analysis:

1) **What difference does the livelihood intervention make on household income?**

Studies suggest that interventions that improve household “asset position” are likely to increase participation in particular income-generating activities and thus “a particular path for improving household welfare.” Grounded in academic evidence, this evaluation question examines the causal link between livelihood opportunity, household productivity, security, and resilience. It specifically explores how disbursement of cash grants and livestock to female beneficiaries affect household income, assets and overall livelihood security.

In order to adequately assess the impact of the livelihood intervention, records of crop cultivation (kg/acre), cash grants, agricultural and livestock distribution, training and knowledge sharing were reviewed.

2) **What difference does the food security intervention make on household food security?**

This evaluation question explores how food security related activities, including agricultural and livestock farming, effect household food consumption and overall food security. A quantitative survey was utilized to benchmark the project beneficiaries on food security and coping strategies indices. This work will help subsequent studies to estimate progress around these indicators.

3) **What difference does the establishment of sustainable VDCs make?**

The project aims to support self-supporting and financially independent VDCs in target communities. This evaluation question explores how community capacity development, as well as relevant government line departments, ensures sustainable food security and livelihoods. This question went beyond simply counting the number of VDCs established, but explored how VDCs influence sustainability, social mobilization and cohesion in their respective communities.

**Methodology**

**Data Collection & Analysis**

Data collection and analysis protocol was determined based on the evaluation objectives. The team used several compatible and complementary data collection and analytical techniques to address the differential set of objectives, including historical comparison, triangulation of responses to similar questions by participants at different stages, and analysis of project indicators.

Data was collected from various information points, including:

- A comprehensive review of project documents (Tearfund Midline Evaluation ToR, strategies, performance data and reports, and donor reports) to provide the basis
for conducting a historical development perspective and measurement of change indicators;

- Semi-structured interviews with Tearfund staff and enumerators to gain a more complete understanding of the approach, issues and objectives not included in the formal project reports;

- Semi-structured, in-depth interviews with stakeholders involved in leadership roles in the various government and VDCs;

- In depth, semi-structured interviews with indirect and direct beneficiaries, including female beneficiaries;

- Gross margin crop budget analysis to assess potential food and livelihood gains from adopting project supported technology practices to increase household food security and livelihoods; and a

- A household survey of a sample of 374 project beneficiaries.

**Qualitative Methods**

For the qualitative component of the evaluation, key informant and focus groups interviews were conducted with key stakeholders (see Appendix F.3 for a comprehensive list of qualitative interviews conducted). A common set of questions was asked across the range of stakeholders to better understand and aggregate the opinions and views of various project participants. Additionally, unique questions were included based on the participant’s role in the project. For example, women were asked questions pertaining to decision-making and leadership while, government departments and VDC members were asked a set of questions relating to capacity building and their role in providing technical assistance and training to target communities. The qualitative questionnaires can be found in Appendix F.

**Quantitative Methods**

This midterm evaluation leveraged quantitative data collection to complement the qualitative data collected and observed. A household survey was conducted with a sample of the project’s direct beneficiaries. In sum, 329 beneficiaries completed a standardized interview that included modules on income sources, food security, and coping strategies. A team of ten enumerators administered the survey. In addition to complementing the midterm evaluation, this data will provide a clear benchmark to measure the progress of the intervention at project endline.

**Sampling**

A random sampling process was used to select minimally sufficient representation of direct and indirect beneficiaries, Tearfund project officers, government departments, VDCs, and NGOs.

The sampling methodology utilized for the quantitative survey was a two-stage clustered sample. This methodology allows for a representative sample, while ensuring time and cost-effectiveness by limiting the geographical spread of the surveys. In the first stage, a probability proportional to size (PPS) methodology was used to randomly select 34 (of 50) beneficiary communities. The PPS methodology randomly selects
communities while balancing for the population (or in this case, beneficiary households) per community (see Appendix F.2 for the List of Villages Surveyed).

In the second stage, once communities were selected, a random sample of 11 beneficiaries per community was taken from the total list of beneficiaries using Stata. The final sample drawn included 374 beneficiaries from 34 communities from which 329 successful interviews were conducted. The primary reason for non-response from 45 beneficiaries was due to unavailability (traveling or away for work); no one refused to participate in the survey.

**Key Findings**

As per ToR guidance, the key findings of the evaluation are structured in two main components, including the five OECD-DAC and project performance indicators.

**Relevance**

The Tearfund's Agriculture and Livelihood Project is well suited to the priorities and policies of beneficiaries and the wider stakeholder community. This intervention is appropriate for communities of UC Lakhat, because it takes into consideration their relevant needs, skills, and traditions, which include farming and pastoral practices. The project is relevant to other key stakeholder’s policies and practices, including government line departments and NGOs.

Tearfund’s project is based in a district reliant on an agrarian-based economy where food insecurity rates are among the highest in the country and income-generating opportunities are minimal. At the start of the project, approximately 80% of beneficiaries reported a single source of income, predominately agricultural labor, rendering target households susceptible to external shocks in the event of uncontrollable events, including economic shock and natural disasters. Figure 5 depicts the various income sources of direct beneficiaries (from all intervention modalities) at project midline. In the evaluation survey, just 35% of beneficiaries reported having one source of income, while over 50% of beneficiaries reported having two or more sources.

*Figure 5. Income Sources Reported by Respondents*
In the project target area, there is limited access to and availability of advanced farming, business technology, expertise, and a heavy reliance on monocropping. Susceptibility to economic shock, combined with the threat of natural disasters, leaves communities in a perpetual state of vulnerability. Furthermore, a vast majority of land is owned by landlords who rent to rural farmers through a sharecropping system, where farmers often give a sizeable portion of their crop share to pay for tenancy, reinforcing a perpetual state of obligation.

Every observed community reported and demonstrated high adoption rates of project activities. It was observed that knowledge attained from trainings and resources provided by Tearfund are readily shared in target communities. Knowledge application and replication indicates strong project demand and relevance among recipient communities. For example, at project midline, 62.8% of respondents involved in agriculture reported growing more than one crop, exhibiting a trend away from monocropping and diversification of agricultural outputs. The primary crops grown by respondents can be seen in Figure 6 below. Note that the crop totals sum to more than 100% due to farmers growing more than one crop.

*Figure 6. Crops Grown by Respondents*

![Crop Bar Chart]

Kitchen gardening is particularly relevant to this agricultural based economy. Prior to the intervention most households engaged in monocropping of staple crops (rice or wheat) and purchased cash crops (fruits and vegetables) at the market with any extra earnings. The midline evaluation observed that project beneficiaries are no longer going to the market to buy vegetables but now grow vegetables themselves, saving money that would have otherwise been spent. Additionally, during village visits, community members who had not received agricultural inputs revealed going to the market at their own expense to purchase seeds and replicate Tearfund’s kitchen garden model. Additionally, some villages reported developing community kitchen gardens. Villages also reported a community-level shift away from chemical fertilizers and complete adoption of bio-fertilizer. According to the midline survey, 83% of respondents use bio fertilizer. High adoption rates of project activities indicate that

---

2Bio fertilizer production was observed in all visited communities. Some farmers reported using it lieu of some or all other chemical fertilizers. Others expressed that this was the first season using it, and would likely permanently adopt if this seasons crops were successful.
Tearfund activities meet the primary development needs of beneficiaries at the household and community levels.

Target communities are situated in environmentally volatile environments and uniquely susceptible to natural disasters. Diversification of activities, perhaps through increased direct cash transfers applied outside of the agricultural sector, could help mitigate these threats and build household resilience. Qualitative analysis suggests that Tearfund’s cash grants, when applied outside of the agricultural sector, are also beneficial to recipients in terms of income generation and diversification. Focus group interviews, especially with female beneficiaries, indicate that shops and tailors were in demand and additional cash grants could finance further development of those types of businesses. Tearfund may consider increasing the disbursement of cash grants to beneficiaries as analysis suggests grants are well received and an efficient modality to improve livelihoods. Further discussion on the impact cash grants have on improving livelihoods of project beneficiaries can be found in the Key Findings: Impact section.

Despite the positive environmental and livelihood impacts of tree planting, Tearfund staff and beneficiaries report unsuitability of fruit tree planting, a project activity aimed to enhance livelihood opportunities and protect livelihood assets. Beneficiaries reported that fruit trees did not survive and produce as well as anticipated while, the Tearfund Pakistan Project Manager cited that approximately 30% of fruit trees survived in year one and 50% survived in year two. As a result, the input was amended to the provision of non-fruit trees, including 50,000 plants that were distributed to 3,568 beneficiaries, or approximately 14 saplings per beneficiary, in years one and two. Despite the activity amendment, the relevance of this project activity is uncertain and the environmental and community response to this shift in plant disbursement remains to be seen. It is recommended that Tearfund consider using the remaining budget for this activity and fold it into another activity that has more visible relevance and impact such as, Project Activity 4.2: provision of vegetable seeds for kitchen gardening to additional beneficiaries in the same farming communities.

Given that Tearfund’s project is concentrated in an agrarian-based economy where food insecurity rates are among the highest in the country and income-generating opportunities are low, the food and security and livelihoods interventions closely align with beneficiary needs. It was determined that the interventions are relevant to beneficiaries and harmonize with community practice, foster stakeholder ownership and sustainability.

Local Best Practices Observed:
Amendment of project activities to better address beneficiary needs (shift away fruit trees to non-fruit trees);
Innovative small-scale practices replicated to achieve scale (i.e. the use of village gardens)

Effectiveness

At midpoint, all planned project activities and their objectives have been met or are likely to be met. The implemented activities effectively address and are reaching the targeted outputs and are effective modalities to achieve the project’s goal of household food security and livelihoods.
TMK is a remote and rural area where access to human and physical capital can be challenging. The local agrarian communities of TMK can be insular with limited exposure to shifting regional, state and global dynamics and technological advances. Poor regional infrastructure, including paved roads and telecommunications connectivity, for example, adds a challenge to project implementation. Meanwhile, slow progress on land rights reform, social division, and religious and political discrimination perpetuates a cycle of volatility and conflict unique to this region of Pakistan.

Despite social, political, and economic limitations, project beneficiaries report improvements in income, reduction in food insecurity, and diversified livelihoods. In terms of food security improvement, beneficiaries report advances in food production and personal savings opportunity. Evaluation findings suggest that goat distribution to female beneficiaries contributes to overall household milk availability. Only 33% of goat recipients reported the need to purchase milk with cash.

Analysis suggests that income-generating activities improve household economics and overall household welfare. Kitchen gardens are well received and adopted in communities as a result of household and village benefits. Kitchen garden households report consumption of similar fruits and vegetables prior to the Tearfund project but the added advantage of their participation in the activity is livelihoods improvement from a cost savings perspective. While kitchen gardens may not drastically diversify household food consumption, 47% of households reported growing their own vegetables instead of purchasing vegetable items at the market.

Tearfund is on track (190 beneficiaries) to meet its end line goal of 300 cash grants to 300 recipients at 27,000 (~ £170) Pakistani Rupees (PKR) per beneficiary. According to Tearfund’s logical framework, of the 190 beneficiaries, 42 recipients (22%) are female. It was observed that cash grants were utilized to finance new and already existing businesses, ranging from tailor and food shops to the purchasing of rickshaws. Analysis suggests that grant recipients are fairly and effectively identified based on need, skill, and business growth potential.

To ensure grants are used for their intended purpose, a staged cash transfer process is utilized, including an initial installment of 10,000 PKR and a second installment of 17,000 PKR. Tearfund milestone two data found in the project logical framework indicates that of the 150 grants were distributed in year two, 75 grants financed already existing businesses and 75 grants were used for business start-ups. Qualitative interviews suggest that cash grants enable household income generation, asset development and improve gender equality and female empowerment. Female cash grant recipients reported changes to household relationship dynamics, particularly with regard to their husbands, as a result of their participation of project activities. Female beneficiaries, in the presence of male village members, report widespread household and village acceptance of their increasing entrepreneurial roles and decision-making opportunities.

The key development actors operating in TMK district and UC Lakhat include ACF, Qatar Charity and various government line departments (agriculture, livestock and water management). Key informant interviews revealed that Tearfund and stakeholders communicate on a frequent basis, either in formal meeting settings or informal field or office visits to ensure organizational coordination and avoid project duplication.
ACF is a health-based NGO focused on malnutrition reduction and sanitation improvement in UC Lakhat. ACF reported making a deliberate effort to work in different farming communities than Tearfund to avoid duplication and increase project reach. ACF occasionally attends Tearfund events and reported high quality training, staff, and content that is relevant to their development agenda. No instances of direct project collaboration, however, were noted.

Qatar Charity works in the areas of emergency response and livelihood restoration in UC Lakhat. Qatar Charity reported funding a footbridge to provide access to Umar Hazheli village, a Tearfund farming community, enabling the transportation of goods and people.

Tearfund has a formal partnership with RTI, a government line department, formalized by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). RTI provides livestock training to project stakeholders, including other government officials, NGO members and direct beneficiaries. Analysis suggests that formal partnerships, as seen like this could be replicated to enhance project impact and build or expand Tearfund’s linkages.

It was observed that while deliberate efforts are made to maintain relationships with relevant stakeholders, opportunities to build further on these relationships might be missed. Informal and formal partnerships with actors, including NGO and government entities, may be established to solve development challenges that achieve greater impact and sustainability. Partnerships can take many forms and are not limited to formal MoUs. For example, collaborative practice, as seen with Tearfund and Qatar Charity, is an informal partnership that could be replicated with other partners. By promoting collaborative links and knowledge sharing among other stakeholders, Tearfund may capitalize on the experiences and networks of other organizations and co-create projects that achieve greater impact with cost-savings advantages.

Project management is successfully delivered on planned activities and project interventions effectively drive the targeted project outputs forward. The multi-faceted approach of project activities has proven to be a formula for enhancing progress on each individual output, while generating a combined positive effect on target outcomes.

Efficiency

The impact of project outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the project inputs appears to demonstrate efficiency in terms of cost, timeliness and general project advancement. However, this assessment is unable to determine exact efficiency rates due to insufficient data and project infancy.

A counterfactual was not established at baseline so this assessment is unable to provide a comparable analysis and accurate measure of project efficiency. Project beneficiaries, however, revealed positive outcomes at the household and village level in response to project inputs and direct observation revealed economic benefits of projects activities.

With the data that is available at this point in time, the midline evaluation can only deduce the input cost per beneficiary as opposed to cost impact. For example, it is known that the cost of purchasing and distributing two goats to a project beneficiary is ~ £122 pounds while, introducing bio-fertilizer to communities costs ~ £2 pounds per beneficiary- both reasonable input costs given the sustainable benefits of both inputs. For a complete list of input costs per beneficiary, please refer to the cost-benefit analysis table located in Appendix E.
In terms of project efficiency, it is important to note that water loss remains a challenge to agricultural production in target communities. It was reported that while Tearfund water management trainings were useful in that they taught beneficiaries how to mitigate water loss and divert water to their farmlands through the use of cement, banks and dams, beneficiaries may lack the financial capital to purchase material, including cement, to apply certain methods. Analysis suggests that project outputs have improved food security and livelihood assets of target beneficiaries. The inability to rate efficiency at this point in time does not indicate project failure.

**Impact**

The intervention appears to have produced a positive, visible impact in target communities. At midpoint, the sum of project outputs demonstrates sufficient progress in line with the project's goal. Additionally, holistic benefits of project assistance were observed among the beneficiary community, including social cohesion and mobilization.

UC Lakhat provides a favorable and sustainable investment environment for Tearfund food and livelihood interventions due to socio-economic challenges unique to farming communities in the region. Project beneficiaries reported an increase in household food availability as a result of direct agricultural and livestock inputs. According to Tearfund baseline data found in the project logical framework, 56%† of households initially faced food and livelihood insecurity, especially during the months of April to June. At project midline of March 2015, however, 35%† of households claimed an increase and/or diversification in food consumption.

In focus group discussions, beneficiaries reported an increase in household income as a result of the project’s income generating activities, namely, direct cash grants, seed delivery, goat distribution, and bio-fertilizer activities. This is corroborated by the midline household survey data, in which 81%‡ of respondents reported that their household income has improved since the program began.

---

**Local Best Practices Observed:**

_Distribution of inputs familiar to communities (rice, wheat and sugarcane);_  
_Partnership formed with a key stakeholder, including a signed MOU with RTI to provide training to project beneficiaries_

---

**“Ali” of Sher Muhammad Langha Village**

Ali is a farmer and a direct beneficiary of the Tearfund project. In 2014, Ali received 40 kg of rice seeds, pesticides and training in agricultural and livestock training. Ali planted the seeds over two seasons on 2 hectares of land. The crop yielded 5600 kg of rice. Ali kept 840 kg for his household and then sold the rest of the crop, making a 96,000 PKR profit. With this profit, he bought and planted sunflower seeds in November 2014, which will yield approximately 2400 kg and be sold for 108,000 RPK.

With this profit from sunflowers, Ali intends to purchase rice seeds and sow rice again in May 2015-started the profitable agricultural cycle over again. Ali is highly regarded in his community as a successful farmer, businessman and teacher. He trains other community members on crop and water management and maintains a village garden with diverse crops, including spinach and potatoes. Ali has maximized the output of Tearfund’s initial seed distribution and is confident that his food and livelihood security has improved for the long term.
Tearfund logical framework data indicates that 190 small business cash grants were disbursed to beneficiaries of which, 50% were disbursed to unemployed beneficiaries with no income source. Consequently, at the completion of milestone 1, grant recipients demonstrated an average income increase of 20%. Additional direct observation indicates that cash grants provide beneficiaries with a cost saving opportunity. Key informant interviews revealed that some seed recipients might plant and sell a portion of their initial Tearfund seed allotment and also save a portion to plant the following season. Assuming the weather is favorable and the crop is of good quality, seed recipients report feeling more food secure as a result of project assistance.

In the midline household survey, respondents were asked to imagine a nine-step ladder, with the poorest members of their community on the first step of the ladder, and the richest on the ninth step. They were then asked what step they are on today, and what step they were on before the Tearfund programme. This question is helpful in understanding how the beneficiaries feel the program has affected their economic standing in the community. Figure 7 below shows the results disaggregated by beneficiary gender.

Figure 7. Measure of Wealth

![Nine Step Ladder: Measure of Wealth](image)

In total, 89% of respondents reported being on higher levels of the ladder today compared to before their involvement in the programme, while 10% reported being on the same rung of the ladder, and 1% reported moving down to a lower rung. While this ranking is subjective, it does indicate that on average the beneficiaries feel that they have made significant progress as a result of the programme.
Beneficiaries also reported unintended benefits of the Tearfund project, including social cohesion, community mobilization, and conflict mitigation, indicating contribution to sustainable and holistic community resilience. Direct and indirect beneficiaries reported a decrease in household and inter-household conflict and attributed this benefit to the establishment of VDCs, a meeting forum where community members must sit together and collaborate on village related issues. It was observed that many VDCs offer services outside of Tearfund’s scope, including a learning place to share the benefits of Tearfund training as well as a place for households to save money and store agricultural products.

Government line department officials report that Tearfund’s capacity building activities, including training, effectively increase knowledge and skills. Direct beneficiaries, however, revealed that improved service delivery of government departments to their respective communities is low. It is important to note that Tearfund has met its targets set forth in the logframe to enhance government capacity, but this type of intervention is unlikely to fuel the “motivation” of extension officers to provide improved service delivery to rural communities. How the related capacity development inputs are utilized to improve livelihood and food security of beneficiaries remains to be seen.

Tearfund may consider the implementation of activities and the utilization of indicators that reinforce and measure effective and sustainable relationship dynamics between government officials and project beneficiaries. One framework might include a project activity with indicators that track improved service delivery such as: increased number of agricultural extension workers assigned to a given target zone and/or the number of visits/trainings conducted by officials in a target community. To capture the increased “motivation” it would be important to observe if an increase in extension activities was occurring in non-program communities as well. Consequently, it was observed that communities are relatively self-supporting and do not rely heavily on government services to guarantee food security and livelihoods. Independent of government support, beneficiaries have made demonstrable strides in livelihood improvement, rendering the utility of government resources negligible. Thus, beneficiary training and infrastructural scheme development plays a critical role in project impact.

Key informant and focus group discussions did not reveal substantial benefits as a result of animal breeding, fodder and animal health trainings (activity 2.4 on the project activity worksheet). While it is recognized that animal breeding and health technique training is important for remote farming communities, observation suggests that beneficiaries lack the resources to leverage animal health training. Following Tearfund training, beneficiaries know the signs and symptoms of animal sickness but still require the assistance of external resources (RTI or veterinary services) to treat animals. Additional measures, including resource input or capacity development could enhance the effect of animal health trainings. Some resource or capacity development measures may include: the designation of an animal breeding, fodder, and health point contact in the VDCs that works closely with veterinary services; establishment of a related village-based informal veterinary certification programme to motivate beneficiaries participate and apply what they have learned in their communities; and/or the integration of a relevant component or association in the VDC to support knowledge sharing and sustainability.

Because a counterfactual was not established at project baseline, the midterm evaluation is unable to measure the impact of agricultural and livestock subsidies on
household income. It was observed, however, that households experienced a cost savings benefit as a result of project activities, contributing to overall improved income generation. In alignment with the logframe, it is evident the project is likely to make a significant impact on food security and livelihood strengthening in the target communities. While unintended benefits, including social cohesion and mobilization, contribute to the overall project impact.

**Local Best Practices Observed:**
Community sharing of agricultural inputs (seeds);
Social cohesion and mobilizing effects of VDCs

### Sustainability

Evidence is strong that the intervention meets sustainability standards, while meeting the needs of beneficiaries and incorporating crosscutting themes, including gender equality and female empowerment, environmental protection, and innovative business approaches. Project activities are very likely to continue following project completion.

Community ownership, income diversification and community resilience play an important role in the sustainability of this project. Project beneficiaries demonstrate adoption and replication of technology and widespread sharing of knowledge attained through Tearfund training opportunities, including bio-fertilizer use, kitchen gardening, community savings, and VDC establishment. Meanwhile, major infrastructural and environmental development aspects of the project, including rural infrastructure schemes, tree planting and kitchen gardening, provide financially viable, environmentally conscious, and long-term development solutions.

Direct observation indicates strong community structures (VDCs) that ensure centralization, ownership and transference of project benefits and long-term survival of project outcomes. According to Tearfund Pakistan’s Project Manager, 50 VDCs were established and include 678 members (417 men; 261 women). Beneficiaries report that women have assumed leadership roles in VDCs with little to no village resistance, indicating a slow but gradual improvement in gender equality and female empowerment in target communities.

Project beneficiaries report increased livelihood and food security despite decreased use of certain agricultural products (chemical fertilizers and hybrid seeds) that may maximize production and yield. Although open pollination (OP) seeds may result in lower yields but provide a sustainable alternative to hybrid seeds. Additionally, on seed delivery, direct beneficiaries receive a substantial enough allotment to save a portion of seeds for the following year, reducing the cost they incur to buy agricultural inputs in the future. Village-wide acceptance and adoption of bio-fertilizer indicates long-term benefits for farming communities. According to the Tearfund Pakistan Program Manger, 49 households use bio-fertilizer. Furthermore, despite a lack of quantifiable

---

“Yasmeen,” VDC Treasurer and Direct Tearfund Beneficiary

Community members in her village elected Yasmeen as VDC Treasurer in 2013. Yasmeen reported that the VDC increased gender equality and female empowerment at the household and village levels in her community. “Now men and women sit side by side, and discuss community issues together,” Yasmeen stated. She reported widespread community acceptance of her leadership role in the VDC as well as improved decision-making power in her home.
data, direct observation indicates that beneficiaries who attended the bio-fertilizer training returned to their community and taught other community members how to make bio-fertilizer, contributing to the sustainable use of this environmental practice. In one case, bio-fertilizer production has been reported in a neighboring, non-beneficiary, community due to the positive leakage of the Tearfund training.

Utilizing government capacity building efforts to enhance service delivery, however, remains a challenging aspect of the project. As mentioned previously, it is unclear how enhanced capacity development of government officials translates to continued service delivery to target communities. Tearfund is, however, meeting its obligations outlined in the project contract and project logframe. Tearfund may consider putting measures in place to strengthen service delivery. Some measures may include: extension programme strengthening and formalization as well as the establishment of partnerships between government officials and designated VDC members. Partnerships between government departments and VDCs may facilitate measurement of the change in relationship between government officials and communities.

The midline report is unable to make an accurate assessment on the impact cost and long-term effects of OP seeds. It is known that previously used hybrid seeds typically produce higher yields and demonstrate shock (flood or drought) resistant characteristics as opposed to OP seeds. Additionally, OP seeds may react unfavorably to the harsh natural environment found in Pakistan and consequently, produce smaller yields. Over the course of time, however, the impact of these new seeds can be assessed.

Analysis suggests that the Tearfund project has contributed to sustainable livelihood and food security at the household level in target communities. Despite concerns surrounding improved government service delivery and the unknowns of newly introduced agricultural products, the combined integration of self-supporting structures, sustainable inputs and environmental practices provide a successful framework for ensuring long term impact in target communities.

Local Best Practices Observed:

* Election of female VDC leaders to improve decision-making and female empowerment; Sustainability of environmentally sound practices (the use of bio-fertilizer, water management trainings and positive implications of OP seeds)*

**Project Indicator Performance**

Performance data suggests the project is on track to meet the Scottish Government programme-level indicators at project midline. Performance indicator data, provided by the Tearfund Pakistan quality assurance or program staff, can be found in various formats, including the project logical framework, the Scottish Government Indicator Worksheet (included in the ToR and Appendix D), and/or by email. The midline survey conducted for this evaluation was supplements project indicator data and serves as a secondary source of information regarding project performance.
**Figure 8. Donor’s Project Indicators & Midline Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Indicator</th>
<th>Results at Midterm Evaluation (Feb. 2015)</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government Programme Level Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of indirect beneficiaries</td>
<td>14,982 (7,341 men, 7,640 women) $</td>
<td>2,650 Households (19,300 beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of direct beneficiaries</td>
<td>3,568 (2,421 men, 1,147 women) $</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased promotion of gender equality and the active empowerment of women</td>
<td>678 (417 men, 261 women) $</td>
<td>750 (500 men, 250 women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of new business start-ups</td>
<td>101 beneficiaries initiated new business (77 men, 24 women) ‡</td>
<td>300 (200 men, 100 women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of training opportunities in relevant skills and business related areas</td>
<td>2,209 participants (1,510 men, 699 women) $</td>
<td>1,750 farmers (1,250 men, 500 women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of training opportunities in relevant skills and business related areas</td>
<td>165 male government officials trained $</td>
<td>250 government officials will be trained in improved service delivery to local farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased use of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices</td>
<td>50,000 tree saplings distributed; 11 training workshops completed ‡</td>
<td>70,000 fruit tree saplings distributed to project communities, and 50 training workshops $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the donor’s programme level indicator worksheet, gender equality and the active empowerment of women in UC Lakhat in related programme areas was nonexistent prior to project implementation. Based on data provided in the project logframe and activity worksheet, women have assumed leadership positions, including 261 $ women VDC members. Direct observation suggests that women are more engaged in household and village-level decision-making processes.

The donor programme level indicator worksheet cites that prior to project implementation, 80% ‡ of local farmers in TMK had no alternative income-generating source other than day labor and/farming. Project activities developed alternative livelihoods and income-generating opportunities, including livestock rearing, fruit trees cultivation, small business development, and kitchen gardening for project beneficiaries. The donor programme level data worksheet indicates that 101 project beneficiaries initiated new business start-ups, including 24 women, increasing gender equality and active empowerment of women in target communities. ‡

At project baseline, there were limited training opportunities for both local farmers and government line departments. As illustrated in Figure 8 above, Tearfund has successfully trained 2,209 beneficiaries $ in relevant skills and business related areas, surpassing its endline indicator target. However, the project has yet to accomplish government training and skills development targets (11 out of 50 sustainable resource management trainings conducted) as the remainder of activities will be conducted in 2015. ‡ Tearfund maintains that sustainable resource management trainings contribute to the increased use of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices.
### Figure 9. Tearfund High-Level Project Indicators & Midline Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Indicator</strong></td>
<td>32% (15% men 17% women)</td>
<td>35% (17% men and 18% women)</td>
<td>35% (21% men, 14% women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 1</strong></td>
<td>Increased food security and increased numbers of sources of income by March 2016</td>
<td>(1.2% men, 12% women)</td>
<td>32% (17% men, 15% women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Indicator 2</strong></td>
<td>50% of target households have increased/diversified food consumption by the end of March 2016.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35% (25% men, 10% women)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project impact indicator data outlined in Figure 9 and provided by the Tearfund Pakistan Program Manager, cites that the second milestone target of 35%§ has been successfully achieved, indicating a strong likelihood that the endline target will be met. Furthermore, direct observation corroborates that the project has produced a positive impact on food security and livelihoods in target communities.

There is concern with the evaluation strategy of the impact and two outcome indicators, however, as the milestone targets are not statistically feasible. For example, “increasing food security for 17% of men and 18% of women” does not increase overall food security by 35% as seen in the target for Outcome Indicator 1. Assuming balance between genders, with 17% men and 18% women, the greatest statistically feasible percentage possible is 35.5%.

The project is slightly underperforming in Outcome Indicator 1 (percent of target households with increased food security and sources of income), specifically in reaching targets established for female beneficiaries. The Tearfund Pakistan Program Manager provided this data and was determined based on records of crop cultivation (kg/ha), records of livestock distribution to women, and beneficiary monitoring surveys.

Outcome Indicator 2 data, drawn from the project logical framework, indicates the project is underperforming in meeting midline gender targets. Data for this indicator was compiled based on beneficiary monitoring surveys conducted by Tearfund staff. Although the project has not met its midline target for these indicators, female focus groups and key informant interviews with female beneficiaries indicate positive improvements to food security and income generation at the household level. Despite slight underperformance in meeting gender targets, the project’s outcomes demonstrate sufficient progress in line with the project’s impact. However, increased measures to ensure the accomplishment of gender targets outlined in the project logframe will support further advancement of inclusivity and overall project success.
As seen in Figure 10, the Tearfund project has met its milestone two target of distributing agricultural inputs to 600 HHs by project midline. No data was reported for milestone one because no agricultural inputs were distributed at that point in time and target households did not receive assistance from any other source. This data was included in the project’s logframe and was calculated based on beneficiary distribution lists and asset receipts.†

The project has sufficiently met its milestone two target of distributing goats to 500 female beneficiaries. This performance data was included in the project’s logframe and was measured based on beneficiary distribution lists and receipts.† Direct observation indicates agricultural and livestock inputs were relevant to target communities and align with beneficiary needs, knowledge, and community practice. Meanwhile, beneficiaries reported that goat distribution increased household milk available and provided a cost-savings opportunity.

While the project is exceeding targets in some Output 2 indicators, it is underperforming in others. Indicator 2.1 is intended to measure the percentage of farmers with increased knowledge of water and crop management however; midterm data included in the project logframe provides the number of trainings conducted and
participant composition based on gender, rather than the percentage of farmers with increased knowledge. While no assessment was conducted to measure increased knowledge among farmers, key informant interviews revealed substantial increase in water and crop management skills among project beneficiaries and the sharing of knowledge through farmer led trainings in target communities.

Data for indicator 2.2 does not track the percentage of farmers who use bio-fertilizer but rather, includes the number of household trained in bio-fertilizer, indicating a miscalculation in data collection and analysis. Further assessment should be conducted to ensure that the correct indicator data, in this case, the percentage of farmers who use bio-fertilizer is reflected. Direct observation indicates widespread household use and community-level adoption of bio-fertilizer. The project has successfully met its project midterm goal to establish seven rural infrastructures schemes in target communities for output indicator 2.3. Additionally, the project has successfully met and even exceeded milestone two targets for indicators 2.4 and 2.5.

**Figure 12. Tearfund Output 3 Indicators & Midline Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1: 50 VDCs established</td>
<td>30 VDCs</td>
<td>50 VDCs</td>
<td>50 VDCs†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2: 200 farmers apply practical knowledge received on modern farming methods</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50 farmers</td>
<td>141 female farmers§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3: 20 trained government officials disseminate knowledge to farmers</td>
<td>97 male government officials trained</td>
<td>165 male government officials trained</td>
<td>165 male government officials trained§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4: 2,650 HHs have access to local government departments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1000 households</td>
<td>N/A†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance data demonstrates the project is on target to meet Output 3 goals. By milestone two, 50 VDCs† have been formed in 50 communities, establishing a strong foundation in community capacity development and providing channels for government service delivery. Direct observation indicates a number of positive unintended benefits, including community savings programs and community cohesion and mobilization. No data was reported for milestone one for indicator 3.2 because activities were not conducted until 2015.† According to the Tearfund Pakistan Project Manager and UK-based Programme Officer, 170 farmers were trained in modern farming methods and of that total number, 141 included women who applied the practical knowledge received in modern farming methods.§ Key informant and focus group interviews also indicate that farmers apply modern farming methods learned in Tearfund trainings, including water management, crop cultivation, and fertilizer and pesticide application. The milestone two target for indicator 3.3 is on track is exceeds the initial expectation set at project baseline.

Qualitative analysis suggests that although government line departments have attended Tearfund sponsored trainings, government service delivery to farming communities remains weak. The milestone two target for 3.4 is 1000 households however, indicator data was not provided. According to the project logframe, the activity related to this indicator took place around the same time this evaluation was conducted, in February 2015, and there was no performance data available at that
point in time. The Tearfund Project Manager, however, cites that target households experience indirect benefits of government service delivery, including the improvement of goat survival rates, as a result of government provided vaccination services. More specifically, the Tearfund Project Manager claims that the goat survival rate increased from 95% to 97% in year one and two after vaccinations were conducted. To adequately measure improvements in household access to government departments however, additional indicators, including the number of goats vaccinated and the number of government extension workers appointed to provide vaccination services should be measured. It is important to note that without an experimental evaluation design, an increase in goat survival rates cannot be directly attributed to improved access to government services.

**Figure 13. Tearfund Output 4 Indicators & Midline Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1: 40% of farmers are able to reduce the number months or days that they experience food insecurity by the end of March 2016.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25% of farmers</td>
<td>N/A†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2: 90% of 300 grant recipients demonstrate increased household assets and/or income by 31 March 2016.</td>
<td>40 beneficiaries: 34 men, 6 women</td>
<td>150 beneficiaries</td>
<td>190 beneficiaries: 148 men, 42 women‡; 81% of grant recipients report increased income‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A lack of performance data for Output Indicator 4 makes an assessment of project performance in this output area challenging. The misalignment of scheduled performance data gathering activities for milestone two and the midterm evaluation hinder adequate measurement of progress made against project indicators. For example, no data was provided in the project logframe for milestone one indicator 4.1.† According to the logframe, at project baseline, 56%† HH’s face food insecurity from April to July. Key informant interviews revealed that agricultural inputs provide beneficiaries with either an additional source of income or a cost savings opportunity, resulting in an increased general feeling of food security. The analysis also suggests that income-generating activities improve household economics and overall household welfare. The Quality Assurance Manager intends to measure achievement made towards indicator 4.1 in March 2015, following the completion of the midterm evaluation.

According to the logframe, the project exceeded its milestone two target in that it provided grants to 40 more beneficiaries than anticipated. Of the respondents in the midline survey who received a cash grant, 81%‡ reported an increase in income since the project start date.
At project midterm, the project demonstrates sufficient progress toward achieving the milestone two targets for Output Indicator 5. Monthly case studies are collected and compiled in a project “learning log” and learning events are conducted to facilitate community learning and communication. Midterm performance results for these data points are compiled based on project case studies, meeting minutes, and monthly, quarterly, and annual Tearfund reports.

The evaluation suggests that significant improvements to the project’s monitoring and evaluation systems can be made. Project performance activities could be thoroughly integrated throughout the project to better monitor underperformance in project activities and to ensure learning is distilled along each level of the project logframe. Key quantitative indicators that are readily observable should be identified for each major output to benchmark progress and a centralized data-monitoring repository can be utilized to track project performance. Furthermore, monitoring and evaluation activities should be aligned to ensure project performance data is readily available for evaluation purposes. Performance data for milestone three for example, should be collected and adequately assessed prior to the project’s final evaluation that will be conducted in 2016. Further observation of the project’s monitoring and evaluation systems can be found in the Key Insights section below.

**Key Insights**

**Gender Equality and Female Empowerment**

- There is strong indication of improved gender equality and female empowerment in target communities as a result of the Tearfund project. Prior to the project, female beneficiaries reported experiencing little to few decision-making and leadership opportunities. In single gender and mixed gender focus groups, as well as in key informant interviews with female VDC leaders, beneficiaries stated that women and men now sit next to one another in the VDC and discuss community issues together, a recent phenomenon. In the midline household survey, 97%‡ of respondents stated that women were involved in their VDC, and 90%‡ reported that women were allowed in leadership roles. Women also reported being elected by the community for VDC positions, indicating both male and female support for their increased and active participation in decision-making bodies. Additionally, female cash grant
recipients reported increased equality at the household level as a result of their participation in the project. Women in a focus group settings reported that they feel “honored” and “respected” now by their husbands.

**Social Cohesion and Mobilization**

- Qualitative interviews and direct observation indicate a community mobilizing effect of project activities in beneficiary communities. Both indirect and direct beneficiaries reported holistic and community-wide benefits of project participation, including increased food security and livelihoods, community cohesion, and overall resilience. Beneficiaries also reported that inter household and village discord decreased. For example, one focus group recounted that “collective benefits” of the project include “collective development” of their village and increased “inter-faith harmony” between Hindus and Muslims in surrounding villages.

**Project Management**

- Observation indicates that project management and quality assurance changes may improve overall project efficiency and effectiveness. Specific amendments to the project logframe can ensure better alignment of with project activities and indicators. For example, Activity 3.1 in the logframe may be relocated from Output 3 and nested under Output 2; Activity 3.2 may be moved from Output 3 to Output 2. Additionally Activity 4.1 is better aligned under Output 1 because the activity increases household income and food production.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

- A thorough review of project management and performance documents suggest needed improvements to project monitoring and evaluations systems. Indicators outlined in the project logframe are not adequately tracked and assumptions are often made. For example, Output indicator 2.1 (60% of farmers have increased knowledge of water and crop management) is intended to measure the percentage of farmers with increased knowledge, however, the midline data provided for this indicator reflects the number of beneficiaries and trainings conducted rather than the percentage of farmers with increased knowledge. Additionally, key milestone targets are not statistically feasible. For Outcome Indicator 1 for example, “increased food security for 17% of men and 18% of women” does not equate to the overall food security of 35% of beneficiaries.

- Milestone dates and collection activities should align with key monitoring and evaluation outputs, including midterm and final evaluations. For example, the second milestone date and data collection activities should align with key monitoring and evaluation outputs, including this midline evaluation. In this case, the midline milestone target date (March 2015) falls one month after the midline evaluation was conducted (February 2015).

- It is suggested to remove Output 5: Project Quality and Impact from the logframe as a separate output. Tearfund may consider developing a comprehensive and rigorous project monitoring and evaluation plan that captures the organization’s monitoring and evaluation strategy and systems to better inform monitoring and evaluation activities. The strengthening of
monitoring and evaluation systems can improve overall project management activities, data quality and project performance, especially in areas where the programme is underperforming.

- A centralized data-monitoring repository can promote quality assurance where data can be tracked, stored and accessed.

- Lastly, the establishment of a counterfactual in future projects could improve midterm and final evaluation quality. A control group is one method to establish a counterfactual and could be an appropriate methodology to utilize in future projects. While there are often budgetary constraints, it is recommended that data collection be carried out in non-beneficiary communities as well. Non-beneficiary villages could be surveyed to better demonstrate the overall programme impact. Additionally, key quantitative indicators that are readily observable should be identified for each major output; tracking these indicators throughout the project will provide a more efficient way to benchmark progress.

**Conclusions**

Midline performance indicator data, the OECD-DAC and other crosscutting findings provided valuable insights into farming communities and the wider stakeholder community explored through this evaluation. The report synthesizes the experiences, perceptions, observations and general status of 2,650 vulnerable households across 50 villages in UC Lakhat in Pakistan’s Sindh province and gives additional context to the food and livelihood insecurity experienced by these households.

The midterm analysis suggests that target households will benefit from their participation in Tearfund’s Food Security and Livelihoods project. Although a lack of comparable baseline data\(^3\) prevents the midterm evaluation to adequately measure project impact, it appears that target communities will experience positive improvements to food security and livelihoods at the household and village level as a result of project activities. Based on findings, income-generating inputs are viable and effective modalities to improve household welfare. Findings imply that food security activities contribute to household food and income production and present a cost savings opportunity. Activity inputs are relevant, effective, efficient modalities, ensuring food security and sustainable livelihoods in target communities. While, the flexibility of project inputs address a wide range of beneficiary needs, from food consumption to income generation and asset development, and allow households to independently manage outputs and determine how they are utilized, fostering beneficiary accountability and project sustainability.

At project midline activities demonstrated a positive and holistic contribution to crosscutting issues, including gender equality and female empowerment, interpersonal relationships, environmental sustainability, and community resilience. Indirect and direct beneficiaries claimed that project activities had a direct impact beyond the household level and contributed to community mobilization and cohesion.

---

\(^3\) A baseline was conducted however, the survey tool and the data was not made available to the evaluation team prior to the midterm evaluation.
Given that government capacity development project activities are being conducted but improved government service delivery to target communities remains low, Tearfund should pay attention to the relationship and institutional processes that govern this dynamic. While theories of change may suggest sustainable relationships between government line departments and target communities, they often operate on a wide range of assumptions, including government officials’ time and motivation to provide continued services, both factors outside of Tearfund’s sustainable sphere of influence. Thus proper monitoring of communities covered by the ‘Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Livelihood Initiatives for Farmers’ project will be vital to ensure continued food security and livelihoods.
## Evaluation Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation / Observation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Team Judgment</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due By</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the inclusion of female beneficiaries in project activities to ensure the project meets its endline goal set forth in Outcome Indicators 1 and 2. Opportunities to improve inclusion of women may include, increasing the number of female beneficiaries that receive agricultural and livestock inputs and cash grants</td>
<td>Project Logframe, Direct Observation</td>
<td>Of the recommendation</td>
<td>Give explanation if not agreed in comments column</td>
<td>State what needs to be done to address the recommendation</td>
<td>Who is responsible for making it happen</td>
<td>When the action should be completed by</td>
<td>When the status of the action was last reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve project performance in the donor indicator relating to “increased use of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices” by conducting additional sustainable resource management trainings in a timely manner to ensure attainment of indicator goal</td>
<td>Project Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift remainder of tree inputs budget to another activity such as, 4.2 (cross referenced to Key Findings: Relevance section)</td>
<td>Project Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1 is intended to measure</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the percentage of farmers with increased knowledge of water and crop management however: midterm data includes the number of trainings conducted and participant composition rather than a percentage. Conduct additional assessment to adequately measure increased knowledge among farmers for this indicator.</td>
<td>Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data for indicator 2.2 does not track the percentage of farmers who use bio-fertilizer but rather, includes the number of households trained in bio-fertilizer, indicating a miscalculation in data collection and analysis. Further data collection and analysis should be conducted to ensure that the correct indicator data is captured.</td>
<td>Project Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide gender data for indicator 2.4 if males participated in animal breeding trainings.</td>
<td>Project Logframe and Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put measures in to ensure centralization and sharing of knowledge and resources gained as a result of participating in Activity 2.4 training (cross-referenced to Key Findings: Impact section)</td>
<td>Direct Observation; Focus Group Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure midline indicator data for output indicator 3.2 “200 farmers apply practical knowledge received on modern farming methods” captures not just the number of training participants but the number of participants that actually applied what they learned.</td>
<td>Project Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To adequately measure progress made toward indicator data for output indicator 3.4, “2,650 HHs have access to local government departments,” Tearfund should</td>
<td>Project Logframe and Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure the number of goats vaccinated and the number of government extension workers appointed to provide vaccination services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider frameworks that enable effective and sustainable service delivery oriented relationships between government officials and project beneficiaries in the future (cross-referenced to Key Findings: Impact and Sustainability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Beneficiaries; Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate indicators that measure improved government service delivery to target communities (Key Findings: Impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage knowledge and resources of wider stakeholder community and form informal/formal partnerships to maximize project impact, particularly for farming equipment and water management (i.e. replicate Qatar Charity partnership; cross-referenced to Key Findings: Effectiveness &amp; Efficiency section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Observation; Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect counterfactual for future projects to adequately measure impact (Cross Referenced to Key Findings; Efficiency section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 5 related to project performance and impact could be integrated throughout the project’s strategic planning documents rather than a distinct output in the project logical framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Activity 3.1 from Output 3 to Output 2 in next log frame amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Activity 3.2 from Output 3 to Output 2 in next log frame amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide performance data for output indicator 4.1</td>
<td>Project Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculate the percentage of change for output indicator 4.2 to sufficiently assess the percentage of grant recipients who demonstrate increased household assets and/or income</td>
<td>Project Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide gender disaggregated data for all relevant indicators (cross-referenced to Key Insights: M&amp;E)</td>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider using an improved data-monitoring and analysis repository for better tracking and quality assurance purposes</td>
<td>Direct Observation, Project Logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators outlined in the project logframe could be tracked more frequently and efficiently. To improve quality assurance, ensure performance data captures what the indicator is intends to track (cross-referenced to Key Findings and Key Insights: M&amp;E)</td>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash grants are relevant to communities and recipients demonstrate livelihood improvements. This activity could be replicated in the same beneficiary communities to achieve greater impact (cross-reference: Key Findings: Relevance)</td>
<td>Focus Group Interviews, Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a strong non-Tearfund translator for visitors and M&amp;E activities</td>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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