



Supporting the work of NGOs

**An assessment of two NGO projects in Malawi and Mozambique
and ICEIDA's collaboration with the Icelandic Church Aid
in supporting them**

by Gudrun Haraldsdottir

**Report prepared for
The Icelandic International Development Agency
Cambridge, July 2007**

Supporting the work of NGOs

**An assessment of two NGO projects in Malawi and Mozambique
and ICEIDA's collaboration with the Icelandic Church Aid
in supporting them**

by Gudrun Haraldsdottir

**Report prepared for
The Icelandic International Development Agency
Cambridge, July 2007**

CONTENTS

PHOTOS	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Context of the Study	1
1.2 Methodology and Data Collection	1
1.3 Structure of the Report	2
2. NGOs AND BILATERAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	3
2.1 The Expanding Role of NGOs in International Development	3
2.2 ICEIDA's Collaboration with NGOs	4
3. THE WATER RESOURCE USE AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT, MALAWI	5
3.1 Introduction	5
3.2 History and Description of the Project	5
3.3 Relevance: Policies and Development Priorities	8
3.4 Effectiveness: Objectives, Activities and Outputs	10
3.5 Efficiency: Resources and Management	19
3.6 Impact of Project Activities	26
3.7 Sustainability of Impact and Activities	29
3.8 Conclusion	31
4. TETE INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, MOZAMBIQUE	33
4.1 Introduction	33
4.2 History and Description of the Project	33
4.3 Relevance: Policies and Development Priorities	35
4.4 Effectiveness: Objectives, Activities and Outputs	37
4.5 Efficiency: Resources and Management	42
4.6 Impact of Project Activities	47
4.7 Sustainability of Impact and Activities	49
4.8 Conclusion	50
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	52
5.1 General conclusions	52
5.2 Recommendations	54
ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MALAWI	56
ANNEX B: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MOZAMBIQUE	59
ANNEX C: FIELDWORK ITENERARY IN MALAWI	62
ANNEX D: FIELDWORK ITERNARY IN MOZAMBIQUE	64
ANNEX E: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AND CONSULTED	65
ANNEX F: LITERATURE AND DOCUMENTATION	67

PHOTOGRAPHS

Front cover: Women in Massambilio village in Tsangano District, Mozambique fetch water from a shallow well constructed in the village with the support from the Tete Project

Photo 1: Small scale irrigation field in Thonje village, Chikwawa, Malawi	11
Photo 2: A man poses with a hybrid boer in Jani village, Chikwawa, Malawi	14
Photo 3: Consultation in Mlooka village, Chikwawa, Malawi	15
Photo 4: Flood damaged well in Chikadayenda village, Chikwawa, Malawi	17
Photo 5: A water point in Kalipale village, Tsangano District, Mozambique	35
Photo 6: Consultation in Massambilio Village, Tsangano District, Mozambique	38
Photo 7: Consultation in Nyamanzi village, Maravia District, Mozambique	39
Photo 8: A village initiative in Sangulukani village, Maravia District, Moz	48

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADC	Area Development Committee
CBPT	Capacity Building Project for Transition
CSO	Country Strategy Outline
CDA	Community Development Assistant
CDC	Community Development Committee
CDO	Community Development Officer
DDC	District Development Committee
DDP	District Development Plan
DEC	District Executive Committee
DF	Development Facilitator
DPO	District Planning Office
DWS	Department of World Service
ELCM	Evangelical Lutheran Church of Malawi
ELDP	Evangelical Lutheran Development Program
ELDS	Evangelical Lutheran Development Services
ICA	Icelandic Church Aid
ICDP	Integrated Community Development Project
ICEIDA	Icelandic International Development Agency
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEO	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
MGDS	Malawi Growth and Development Strategy
NGO	Non-government organization
PARPA	Mozambique Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PC	Project Coordinator
PD	Project Document
PO	Project Officer
SMC	Section Monitoring Committee
UN	United Nations
VDC	Village Development Committee
VMC	Village Monitoring Committee
VNRC	Village Natural Resource Committee
WCC	World Council of Churches
ZPC	Zonal Projects Coordinator

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ngos and Bilateral Development Assistance

Non-government organizations have since the colonial period played an important role in socio-economic development in Africa. This role has increased in the post-independence period, especially from the 1980s with a paradigmatic shift in the attitudes of donors and development policy-makers away from the state centred development model towards more participatory ‘bottom-up’ approaches. The failure of African governments to provide basic services to the rural and urban poor in the post-independence era may also have played a part in the expanding role of NGOs in international development. In most African countries NGOs have now emerged as major players in the design and implementation of development projects. Although they are individually engaged in diverse activities, most NGOs concentrate their activities in the social sector, including education, health, as well as water and sanitation. Most NGOs in Africa are largely dependent on donor funding and over the last decade many Western bilateral development agencies have steadily increased their support to international and local NGOs. The form this takes varies but funding is often channelled through western NGOs.

Until the late 1990s, ICEIDA’s support to NGOs was on a small-scale and was mainly directed to local NGOs in those African countries in which the agency implemented its own projects. In 1997, an evaluation of the Icelandic bilateral development work recommended increased collaboration with Icelandic NGOs and from that time ICEIDA has steadily increased its funding to NGOs, both in Iceland and its partner countries. The growing support to NGOs is seen as a part of ICEIDA’s increasing support to civil society and democratic development, and is intended to enhance public interest and support for international development and cooperation in Iceland.

Water Resource Use and Management in Malawi

Relevance

The evaluation study in Malawi is based on a fieldwork that was carried out in Lilongwe and Chikwawa District in Southern Malawi over a period of six days and based mainly on focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews with different groups of stakeholders. The Water Resource Use and Management Project was found to be highly relevant on all levels: in terms of the policies and approaches of the donors and the implementing organization; the development priorities of the Government of Malawi; and the local situation and stated needs in Chikwawa District.

Effectiveness

The Project has been largely effective in terms of implementing the activities and outputs planned to accomplish the six project objectives for the period 2004-2006. In some instances, the Project produced more outputs than originally planned. This was the case, for instance, with the establishment of treadle pump gardens and the goat rearing scheme. Both schemes have had an important impact on food security among

the targeted households. However, despite implementing the activities and producing most of the outputs, the Project has met many challenges which have made it difficult to achieve the six objectives fully. Many of these challenges have been external and beyond the Project's control, such as an outbreak of livestock diseases and the recurrent pattern of drought and flood in Chikwawa. The draft of the new PD made available to the evaluation team shows that the Project management is prepared to draw lessons from these challenges and build on the successes during the new project period of 2007-2010. One of the things that the Project should look more closely at is its endeavour to promote women's empowerment and rights to water resources, which was one of the Project's objectives during the 2004-2006 period. Due to lack of baseline data and precise indicators to measure progress against it is difficult to assess whether the Project has had much impact in its promotion of gender equality despite active participation of women in the Project's activities.

Efficiency

Overall the human resources and management structure of the ELDS seems to be efficient. In the past, high turnover of staff was a problem for the organization. However, during the transition process from a LWF country programme to a local NGO, a significant effort has, reportedly, been put into staff capacity building within the organization. The recruitment of a highly qualified, professional staff, both in management posts and in the project implementation in Chikwawa District, has served the purpose of increasing the independence of ELDS and of ensuring efficient and effective implementation of projects. Key players in the implementation of the Project are the participating communities and local leaders. Most of the groups and committees established in the villages for the implementation and monitoring of the Project function well and show great enthusiasm for the Project.

The budget of the Project is relatively small and the ELDS has in place a prudent system of monitoring and maintaining a transparent internal control of its finances. However, because of its centralized nature the system appears to be somewhat slow and bureaucratic, which at times delays project activities and impacts negatively on the implementation plan. After ELDS became an independent, local NGO it has more or less been on its own in terms of raising funds for its projects. This has meant loss of some of its external funding which has caused the organization considerable difficulties. However, this has not impacted the ICA/ICEIDA funded activities in any significant way. The Project has stayed within the planned budgets all three years (2004-2006) and the donors have dispatched the funds in a timely manner.

While the implementation and monitoring of the Project in Chikwawa appears to be efficient the ELDS management may want to look into establishing a more formal management and monitoring procedures. There were some indications of ineffective communication between the Head Office in Lilongwe and the Chikwawa Office, which could be solved through more controlled monitoring structures. To ensure continuous efficient and democratic implementation, the ELDS may want to consider spelling out in more detail in the Project Document (PD) the roles and responsibilities of each staff member. A formal schedule of regular management/monitoring meetings should be included in the PD, as well as who is expected to attend these meetings and how the meetings procedures and decisions are to be documented. This will make a systematic evaluation of the Project's efficiency more feasible.

The collaboration between ELDS and government offices in Chikwawa has in some respect been going well while there are also considerable weaknesses in this area. The district authorities in Chikwawa consider the ELDS to be well organized NGO capable to deliver valuable outputs, submit regular reports and work according to district plans. At the same time, the collaboration with some individual government offices has not been efficient, mainly due to chronic lack of resources and capacity within the government. Although difficult at times, collaboration with government is important in terms of long-term impact and sustainability of the Project's impact and the ELDS should continue to build up its working relationship and communication with local government offices, as well as to facilitate effective links between the local communities and the government development structure.

A good working relationship appears to have developed between ELDS and ICA over the last three years. The emphasis within the Project and ELDS' approach to development resonates well with ICA and the ELDS appreciates the reliability and flexibility that ICA and ICEIDA have shown in their collaboration. So far, the relationship with ICEIDA is mainly through ICA but the ELDS has expressed interest in strengthening the relationship with the ICEIDA office in Lilongwe.

Impact

Although the impact of the Project in Chikwawa may be small-scale, the consultation in the villages gave strong impression that it is having an important impact on the targeted households. This is particularly evident in the impact the goat-scheme appears to have had on food security and income level of those households. Other initiatives such as the construction of wells, where they have lasted, have clearly had positive impact in the wider communities. The Project staff appears to have facilitated a considerable enthusiasm for the Project in the targeted communities and among the beneficiaries in particular. The participatory approach seems to have worked well in that it seems to have created a sense of ownership among those involved and most of the project committees are said to be working well.

In regard to impact assessment, the challenge to the Project now is to collect baseline data which makes it possible to measure the impact and also to consider carefully what can be done to promote the sustainability of the positive impact. The new PD gives indications that the Project management is adjusting its approach to take on board lessons learned from the 2004-2006 period and build on the positive impact and strength of the Project.

Sustainability

The participatory approach used in the Project has been an important tool in promoting correct identification of needs on community level and a sense of ownership in the villages. This is an important strength in the Project in regard to sustainability. However, inadequate technical knowledge in the communities to sustain some of the outputs is a threat to the sustainability and it is a problem that the Project needs to address during the new project period. Inadequate extension services and collaboration with local government offices is another threat to the sustainability of the Project accomplishments. While the chronic lack of resources and capacity

within the government is largely to blame, the Project should look for ways to collaborate with the District Authorities and other NGOs to improve the situation. The promotion of a strong linkage between the communities and the local government development structure is also vitally important for sustainability but this is an area where, according to the new PD, the Project is going to focus extensively on during the new period.

Conclusion

The relevance of the Water Resource Use and Management Project can hardly be doubted, anchored as it is in the development priorities of the Malawi Government, the Millennium Development Goals and carefully assessed local needs. The analysis in this report shows that the Project has put a considerable effort into achieving the original objectives and more or less followed activity plan and plans on physical inputs. Although the conclusion of the assessment of the Project is thus largely positive, there is certainly a room for improvement and some are already planned by ELDS for the next project period. To promote a long-term impact and sustainability, a much more emphasis need to be put on capacity building in the communities, as well as to develop linkages with government services and decentralized development structure. The Project also needs to look into its plans to promote awareness of gender issues, women's rights and the wellbeing of households affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. While stated as important cross-cutting issues in the new PD, no clear indicators on these issues have been developed in the Project's logical framework¹. In absence of such indicators and baseline data it will be impossible to systematically measure impact in this area and statements on improving the situation of these groups run the risk of becoming empty rhetoric.

Tete Integrated Rural Development Project, Mozambique

Relevance

With the overall objective to reduce poverty and promote sustainable development, the Tete Project has emphasized capacity building in its targeted communities, as well as sought to empower households through the promotion of food security, access to potable water and sanitation facilities, and access to health and education. It has been implemented in geographically marginalized areas of Tete Province, with the aim of reaching the most vulnerable groups. These priorities and approach in the Project are consistent with the development policies and priorities of both the donor agencies and the Mozambique government. With the emphasis on participatory approach and ability to adjust to changing local needs, the Project appears to be both consistent with and relevant to the local context in which it is being implemented.

Effectiveness

Although the specific objectives of the Tete Project have changed somewhat through time, the main emphasis has largely remained the same over the last seven years. Activities planned to achieve the objectives of the Project appear to have been

¹ The reference here is to the draft PD made available to the evaluation team.

consistently implemented and outputs produced. One of the main objectives in all the PDs throughout this seven years period has been to empower households and communities through the promotion of food security, sustainable agriculture, income generating activities and access to clean water, health and education facilities. This is the component to which the ICA/ICEIDA funding contributed in 2001-2003. LWF internal monitoring documents indicate improvement in agricultural practises, environmental awareness and access to basic facilities through the years and the consultation in the villages in Maravia and Tsangano districts during the fieldwork of this assessment indicated that the continuous construction and rehabilitation of water sources has made an important impact in the targeted villages, which most had no source of clean water before the LWF initiative. This has among other things made an important positive impact on health in the communities and on the work load of women.

Efficiency

In 2002 an external evaluation of the Tete Project raised concerns about the ability of the Project's staff to effectively switch from emergency relief work to implementing long-term development. This has been responded to by putting in place a system of staff capacity development which is based on training-need assessments and mainly internal training opportunities. Staff capacity building is now a part of the LWF Mozambique strategic priorities. It is an area within the Mozambique Programme that is currently being developed and while the staff clearly appreciates the effort many indicated that they think more systematic staff capacity building needs to be put in place. High turn-over of staff has been, in the past, a challenge to the Tete Project but this has reportedly stabilized in recent years. Overall the human resources management within the Tete Project appears to be efficient. Community members in the targeted villages and areas of the Project are an important human resource in the Tete Project. In areas such as Maravia district, where the Project has been implemented over a long period, many of the CDCs have developed into highly motivated and independent groups which initiate development projects in the communities.

The LWF has a firm system of internal financial control in the Tete Project. The finances are controlled centrally which makes procedures and transactions slow but secure. There were some indications that the slowness and the bureaucratic nature of the financial system sometimes affect the implementation of project activities negatively and this is something the LWF may want to look into.

The management and monitoring of the Tete Project is based on regular planning and implementation meetings, submissions of progress reports and field visits by the Project management. Many factors influence the efficiency of this system, including difficult communication with the remote areas of the Project and illiteracy on local level. As a result, reporting is frequently delayed. The LWF Mozambique is reportedly in the process of improving its monitoring and reporting system, to make it more efficient and result-based. This is indeed an area where the Tete Project needs to improve, to include more analysis of the actual impact of the Project and as much concrete verifications of it as possible. Statements of felt impact are insufficient. The emphasis on community participation is one of the main strengths of the Project and an important part of the management and monitoring procedures. The CDCs and other

project committees such as water committees, play an important role in implementing and monitoring the Project in the communities and the strengths and independence of these community groups are key to the Project's long-term impact and sustainability.

The management and staff of the Tete Project seem to have developed a smooth relationship with relevant government authorities in Tete town and Maravia district. Unlike many other NGOs and development agencies, the LWF has been willing to work in remote areas. The organization is said to keep government authorities well informed about the Project and its ability to respond quickly to emergencies is appreciated by the government. At the same time, shortage of government resources and capacity in Tete inevitably creates frustration and is indeed a threat to the sustainability of the Project's outputs and impact.

While the Tete Office has little direct communications with its donors, the reliability of the ICA funding is highly appreciated both in the LWF Tete and Maputo offices. The approach and priorities of LWF resonates well with the policies of ICA and ICEIDA while delays in implementation and submission of progress reports has sometimes caused concern. While ICEIDA's relationship with LWF is mainly through ICA it would indeed seem important that the ICEIDA Office in Maputo would be kept better informed about the Tete Project than it has so far. This could be done through some formal relationship between the offices in Maputo but the ICEIDA office in Reykjavik should also make sure that its Maputo office receives all relevant documentation about the Project

Impact

There is no doubt that the Tete Project has made a positive immediate impact in the communities in which it has been implemented in Tete Province. In the communities visited during the fieldwork for this assessment, villagers asserted that the construction of wells and boreholes has made a greatly valued impact in terms of access to clean water, improved general health and decreasing workload of women. At the same time, the number of the constructed water sources is said to be nowhere near to be enough for the population they serve. One of the main strengths of the Tete Project is its ability to reach out to and work closely and directly with the communities it serves – the grassroots. This has important implications for the impact of the Project and could potentially turn immediate impact into a long-term impact. However, how long the communities will be able to sustain the impact of the Tete Project after the LWF pulls out is difficult to say. Perhaps the biggest threat to the long-term impact of the Project is the remoteness of many of the districts in which it is being implemented, and the poor infrastructure there. This factor is largely beyond the control of the Project but it may make the impact of some of the Project's components difficult to sustain.

Sustainability

The assessment of the Tete Project showed that the Project has invested a great deal in building technical and leadership capacity within the communities where LWF works, including the technical training of water committees which are responsible for the necessary repair and the day-to-day maintenance of the wells and boreholes that have been established largely with funding from ICA and ICEIDA. The Project uses an

integrated participatory approach which is designed to maximize the participation and contribution of the Project's beneficiaries in order to facilitate sustainability and a sense of ownership. Locally available material is used when possible to support the local economy and a major emphasis has been put on offering a variety of training in the communities. In addition, the establishment of linkages between the communities and service providers, including the government, is important to sustainability. However, like in Malawi, lack of capacity and resources within the local government and the poor infrastructure is a challenge to the sustainability of the Tete Project in Mozambique.

Conclusion

The LWF Mozambique takes pride in its reputation of being 'close to the grassroots'. The priorities in the Project and the approach used are consistent with the development policies and priorities of the Mozambique government and the donor agencies, and there is little doubt that the objectives of the Tete Project are relevant to the marginalized and neglected districts in which LWF works. Community participation in the planning, implementing and monitoring of its development initiatives is one of the main strengths of the Tete Project. With sustainability in mind the Project has emphasized capacity building on community level and in many of the communities where the Project has been implemented over a long period of time the communities, through the leadership of Community Development Committees appear to have motivation and capacity to sustain at least some of the outputs and impact of the Project. Nevertheless, the long term impact of the project is difficult to predict as it depends on a variety of factors which many are beyond the LWF's scope to influence. The LWF will hopefully continue its ongoing self-assessment and use regular external evaluations to improve its operation and built on its strengths. One of the things that needs to continue to improve is the reporting of the Tete Project, which needs to include more analysis of the actual impact of the Project based on precise and verifiable indicators.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Focus on the alleviation of poverty has been consistent in both the ELDS Project in Malawi and the Tete Project in Mozambique which, along with their approach and other priorities make both projects correspond well with the priorities of the Icelandic donors. An effective and trusting partnership appears to have been established between ICA and the NGOs which the reliability of the funding from ICEIDA and ICA has contributed to. Both projects are based on community participation and close relationship with the grassroots and while some tension was detected in the collaboration with government both projects appear to be actively working on facilitating cooperation and the linkage between government structures and the targeted communities.

Documentation in both projects is strong on description of goals, objectives and plans of implementation but weaker on contextual analysis, baseline data and, in some cases, precise and measurable indicators are lacking. The Tete Project has progressed further in this regard than the ELDS Project but this kind of data and analysis give projects a framework against which to assess both their progress and impact. Both

projects are also in the process of improving their monitoring and reporting systems and it is the conclusion of this assessment that both organizations need to emphasize more reporting on actual, verifiable impact alongside the reporting of implementation of activities and outputs. Finally, while it is questionable whether a small NGO such as the ELDS, for example, can be expected to deliver long-term changes and secure the sustainability of its intervention, the long-term impact should be a matter of concern if the overall development goal is the alleviation of poverty. Community participation and a close collaboration with other implementers of development programmes are important factors to consider in this context.

Based on the assessment of the two projects and the general conclusion, this study recommends that ICEIDA continues its collaboration with ICA in supporting the work of the ELDS and LWF Mozambique. A list of specific recommendations has been developed and is presented on pages 54-55.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who assisted with this assessment in one way or another during the evaluation process. First and foremost, thanks are due to all those consulted, who provided valuable information and gave generously of their time. This includes local leaders and the many women and men who participated in the group discussions and individual interviews in the villages in Malawi and Mozambique; the ELDS staff in Malawi and the LWF staff in Mozambique; various government officials in both countries; and representatives from ICEIDA and ICA. A special thanks goes to Prince Kapondamgaga who conducted the evaluation of the ELDS project in Malawi with me and throughout contributed important insights, shared local knowledge and showed commitment to the success of the exercise.

Cambridge, UK, July 2007
Gudrun Haraldsdottir

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context of the study

This report presents an assessment of two development projects supported by the Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) through the Icelandic Church Aid (ICA), an Icelandic NGO. The Water Resource Use and Management Project¹ is implemented in Malawi by the Evangelical Lutheran Development Services (ELDS), which is a local NGO in Malawi, while the Tete Integrated Rural Development Project is implemented in the Tete Province in Mozambique by an international NGO, the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). The formal collaboration between ICEIDA and ICA started in 2001 with a joint financial support to the Tete Project and in 2004 they started their combined support to the Water Resource Project in Malawi. This collaboration between ICEIDA and ICA represents a growing trend in overseas development assistance, the channelling of official bilateral aid through NGOs. The objective of the present study was to collect information about the two projects, assess their relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact, and to provide input into the continuing collaboration between ICEIDA and ICA, as well as ICEIDA general partnership with NGOs.

1.2 Methodology and data collection

The assessment was carried out in April and May 2007. It is based on desk study of project documents; fieldwork at the project sites in Malawi and Mozambique; and consultation with ICEIDA and ICA.

The fieldwork in Malawi was carried out in Lilongwe, where key members of the ELDS management were interviewed, and in Chikwawa, which is one of the districts in Malawi where the ICA/ICEIDA sponsored project has been implemented since 2004. In Chikwawa, focus group discussions were carried out with project beneficiaries, local leaders, and relevant government extension staff in the district. Semi-structured individual interviews were, furthermore, conducted with a small sample of project beneficiaries, as well as with key staff members of ELDS and heads of relevant government offices in Chikwawa. In Malawi, the fieldwork was carried out over a six days period by a team of two consultants, one appointed by ICEIDA and one by ELDS. Both have a post-graduate degree in social science and rural development, and an extended experience in project planning, management and evaluation.

The assessment of the project in Mozambique is based on a fieldwork carried out in the Tete Province and consultation with management in the LWF Headquarters in Maputo. Focus group discussions were held with project beneficiaries in two villages in Tsangano district and two villages in Maravia district, which are two of the Project targeted districts in the Tete Province. Semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with key LWF staff members in Tete town, where the management of the Tete Project is based. Interviews were also conducted with government officials in Tete town and in Maravia district. The fieldwork in Mozambique was carried out over

¹ The project is now called the Sustainable Water Livelihood Project.

a four day period by an external consultant appointed by ICEIDA who was assisted by local LWF staff members.

In addition to the fieldwork in Malawi and Mozambique, consultation took place with representatives from ICA and ICEIDA through interviewing and questionnaires. The assessment is furthermore based on a review of a variety of project documents made available to the consultant by the ELDS, the LWF Mozambique, ICEIDA and ICA.

1.3 Structure of the report

Following the introduction which covers the context and the methodology of the assessment, chapter two provides an overview of the expanding role of NGOs in international development, the relationship between NGOs and official bilateral development organizations, and ICEIDA's partnership with Icelandic NGOs. The assessment of the projects in Malawi and Mozambique is presented in chapter three and four. Chapter five contains the consultancy's overall conclusion and recommendations. At the end, several annexes provide further information about the context and the approach of the assessment.

2 NGOs AND BILATERAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

2.1 The expanding role of NGOs in international development – an overview

Non-government organizations have since the colonial period played an important role in socio-economic development in Africa. This role has increased in the post-independence period, especially from the 1980s. To many, this development followed the failure of African governments to be a credible provider of basic services to the poor both in rural and urban areas in the post-independence era. Over the last decades there has been a paradigmatic shift in the attitudes of donors and development policy-makers, away from the state centred development models towards more participatory ‘bottom-up’ approaches. As a result, the role of NGOs in international development cooperation, and not only in Africa, has grown sharply. Instead of channelling development assistance only through the state, many donor agencies have during the last two decades or so, opted to channel growing share of their funding through non-state actors. In the later 1990s it was estimated that close to 30,000 international NGOs were working in developing countries (Thomas and Allen 2000). These numbers are likely to have grown considerably since and a large percentage of these NGOs operate in Africa.

In principle, NGOs are all independent, non-profit institutions, but in other respects they are very different. They range from small membership-based organisations and large umbrella organisation with broad grassroots support to foundations that are organized more along the lines of a company. There are three main categories of development assistance in which NGOs are involved: 1) humanitarian aid, which involves protection of and support to people affected by natural and human-made disasters with both short-term and longer-term time frames (e.g. refugees); 2) transitional assistance, including peace-building after conflict and reconstruction after disasters; and 3) long-term development assistance including support for democratisation and efforts to ensure popular participation and respect for human rights.

Experience in most African countries has shown that the NGO sector has since the 1980s emerged as a major player in the design and implementation of development projects, as well as in the actual provision of basic needs services to disadvantaged groups. Although they are individually engaged in diverse activities, most NGOs concentrate their activities in the social sector (education, health, water and sanitation, and general wellbeing). While African governments generally appreciate the role NGOs continue to play in development, their tendency to bypass state machinery in the performance of their roles has tended to attract suspicion from governments. The lack of co-ordination of NGOs activities, which often leads to duplications, have also frustrated governments. Generally, governments take the view that whatever assistance NGOs might want to offer ought to be channelled through the relevant government ministries and/or departments and in recent years many governments in Africa have set up a particular agency with the role to monitor and coordinate NGO activities. Frictions between governments and NGOs appear to happen especially when the activities of a given NGO are perceived to be of political nature, such as those NGOs who work in the area of human rights and advocacy. In many African countries NGOs and other players within the civil society have in recent years played

an important role in pushing governments towards democratization and political accountability.

Most local NGOs in Africa are largely dependent on donor funding. Many receive most of their funding from large official donors and the UN agencies, while receiving smaller contributions from overseas churches and charities. Over the last decade many Western bilateral development agencies have steadily increased their support to NGOs. The form this takes varies but the funding is often channelled through western NGOs which either have established local offices in the countries they work in or work through cooperation with national organizations in the recipient country.²

2.2 ICEIDA's collaboration with NGOs

ICEIDA has all along had some collaboration with NGOs, mainly local NGOs in those African countries in which it has implemented its own projects. In 1997, an evaluation of the Icelandic bilateral development cooperation recommended that ICEIDA increase its collaboration with Icelandic NGOs and channelled more of its funds through them to local NGOs in developing countries. At that time, the only Icelandic NGO receiving support from ICEIDA was the Icelandic Red Cross. Those NGOs in Iceland which at that time worked in Africa or other developing countries were offered to apply for support from ICEIDA and no conditions about operational strategies were set at that time. Since then, ICEIDA has steadily increased its funding to Icelandic NGOs as well as local NGOs in its partner countries. It started its formal collaboration with the ICA in 2001 with an agreement to jointly support the water component of the Tete Project in Mozambique.

ICEIDA's collaboration with NGOs is based on formal contracts about clearly defined projects, which are expected to be carefully prepared and regularly evaluated. The projects must always be carried out with the full knowledge and acceptance of the government authorities of the country in question and in accordance with their current policies and development strategies. Applications for funding from NGOs need to be approved of by the ICEIDA's Board of Directors before a formal contract can be signed. After the contract is signed it is the responsibility of the NGOs to monitor the implementation and financial performance of the project in question and submit regular monitoring reports to ICEIDA. As a rule, ICEIDA contributes up to 60% of the joint budget while the collaborating NGO contributes 40% towards the budget in addition to handling administration and monitoring.

ICEIDA views its collaboration with Icelandic NGOs as an important part of its domestic public dissemination and a means to increase among the Icelandic public interest in and understanding of international development work. In addition, ICEIDA views its collaboration with NGOs, both in Iceland and its partner countries, as an opportunity to gain experience and knowledge, especially from their work at the grassroots level. In this light, ICEIDA plans to increase its collaboration with NGOs further in the next few years.

² For a more detailed account of the expanding role of NGOs in development, see Waldorff 2006.

3 Water Resource Use and Management in Malawi

Evaluation team in Malawi: Gudrun Haraldsdottir and Prince Kapondamgaga

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an evaluation of the Water Resource Use and Management Project (in the chapter referred to as “the Project”) which is implemented by the Evangelical Lutheran Development Services (ELDS) in Malawi. The evaluation is based on fieldwork carried out in Lilongwe and in one of the Project’s targeted districts, namely Chikwawa district in Southern Malawi, over a period of six days (Annex C). Focus group discussions were conducted with beneficiaries from six villages located in different areas in Chikwawa. Separate focus group discussions were held with community and area leaders, as well as with management bodies of the Project on village level. Due to time restrictions the evaluation team emphasized focus group discussions in its approach. However, in one village the team interviewed three beneficiaries individually, in order to gain some insight into what impact the Project has had on individual households. Semi-structured individual interviews were, furthermore, conducted with key staff members of ELDS and heads of relevant government offices in Chikwawa, and the evaluation team also held a focus group discussion with relevant government extension staff in Chikwawa district. In addition, representatives from ICA and ICEIDA were consulted through interviewing and questionnaires (see Annex E for a list of people interviewed and consulted).

The chapter starts with a brief overview of the history and work of the ELDS as well as a review of the implementation history of the Project. It then assesses the relevance of the Project in the light of the policies and priorities of the donors and the implementing organization, as well as the policy context in Malawi and the local conditions in Chikwawa district. The effectiveness and the efficiency of the Project are evaluated in the chapter, and an assessment is made of the Project’s general impact and potential sustainability. The chapter ends with a concluding remarks and summary.

3.2 History and Description of the Project

This section will give an overview of the organizational and historical context of the Water Resource Use and Management Project in Malawi. It is a brief overview and the aspects of the Project that are introduced will be addressed in more detail in subsequent sections.

The history and work of ELDP/ELDS

The Evangelical Lutheran Development Program (ELDP) was established in Malawi in 1989 as the development arm of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Malawi (ELCM). During the first few years, the ELDP operated as a country programme of the Lutheran World Federation’s Department of World Service (LWF/DWS), with an expatriate director and funding through LWF. Since 2004/05 the organization has been going through a transition process to being an independent local organization with its own board, management and finance department. Now called the Evangelical

Lutheran Development Service (ELDS) the organization is still a LWF associate program but the transition has meant both greater independence and greater responsibilities. Although ELDS still receives support from LWF in regard to staff capacity building and financial management, the organization is now responsible for securing funds from donors for all its projects. In addition to working closely with the LWF, the ELDS collaborates with a number of donors/partners, currently mainly church based sister organizations in Denmark, the USA, Germany and Iceland (LWF 2003).

The operation of ELDP/ELDS has from the beginning been legitimised through a formal agreement with the Government of Malawi (GOMAL). Initially, the role of the ELDP was to provide assistance to Mozambique refugees then based in Malawi. However, it soon started to support vulnerable local populations as well with the launching in the 1990s of projects that focused on food security, water supply, adult literacy and environmental protection. In 2001 the existing ELDP projects were merged under the Integrated Community Development Project (ICDP) which was run parallel with a staff capacity building project (CBPT) aimed at preparing the transition from the LWF ELDP to the local organization ELDS (Nakhumwa et al. 2006).

The ICDP project was based on the first ELDP Country Strategy Outline from 1997 and has from the beginning focused on food security, water and sanitation, adult literacy and environmental rehabilitation. In 2000 the organization developed a strategy to integrate HIV/AIDS prevention in all of its project activities and it has since been an important cross-cutting issue in the ICDP project. Promotion of gender equality has also been a part of the ICDP from the beginning but was strengthened as a cross-cutting issue in the project with the launching of the ELDP gender policy in 2005 (ELDS 2007a).

Brief history of the Project

In 2004 the ICA and ICEIDA started their joint support to the water component of the ICDP in the form of a 'project within a project' which became known as the Water Resource Use and Management Project (hereafter referred to as the Project). The support was based on an application for funding from the ELDP to the ICA in October 2003 and a subsequent application for funding and cooperation from ICA to ICEIDA in December 2003 (ELDP 2003; Hk 2003b). During the period of 2004-2006 the Project was implemented in 30 villages in three districts in Malawi: Dowa district in the Centre Region, and Phalombe and Chikwawa districts in the South Region³. The geographical scope of the project was based on a criteria outlined in the ELDP's Country Strategy Outline (CSO) which commanded that agriculturally marginal areas that are prone to environmental disasters, as well as areas which had suffered environmental degradation due to the influx and settlement of refugees, should be selected for ELDP projects. The Project covered 10 villages in each district and was expected to reach at least 200 households in each of them. The criteria for the selection of households also followed guidelines in the CSO which directed the selection of households living on less than 1 ha of land, with special regard to

³ Unless otherwise indicated, this overview of the history and the original components of the Project is based on the original funding application to the ICA, which served as a Project Document during 2004-2006, as well as on interviews with ELDS staff and consultation with ICA and ICEIDA. The funding application will hereafter be referred to as the Project Document (PD).

female/child headed households and households affected by environmental disaster, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and responsibilities for orphans and other dependents.

The initial justification of the Project was based on the critical water shortage in many areas of Malawi after the drought period between 1999 and 2002. The drought situation and the acute lack of infrastructure made access to potable water a critical challenge in the communities where ELDP worked and poor water sanitation was a chronic source of water borne diseases. Recognizing the relationship between poverty and the lack of access to water, ELDP proposed to improve the livelihoods of the rural communities through provision of safe water and enhanced hygiene practices, and with that promote food security, improved health and the lessening of the labour burden on women and girls who are responsible for fetching water for domestic use.

No quantitative baseline survey was done before the launching of the Project (and none before the launching of the ICDP), which means that systematic and objective evaluation of the ELDP/ELDS activities has so far been difficult to carry out. The Project was based on the ELDP Country Strategy, which had been based on need assessments and shown that issues of water and sanitation were perceived in the communities as second in priority to food security. Qualitative assessments were, furthermore, done in the villages where the Project was established, on which the Project has based its impact assessments alongside measuring the physical outputs of the Project (ELDS 2007b). However, ELDS recognizes the importance of baseline data for monitoring and evaluation purposes and has budgeted for a baseline survey during the new project period 2007-2010 (ELDS 2007a). A monitoring structure on four key levels: the village, project, zonal and programme level, has been in place since the launching of the Project and participatory approach has been used throughout the preparation of the Project and the implementing process.

Until 2005, the ELDP Country Director was an expatriate LWF representative. As a part of the transition process towards becoming a local NGO, ELDS hired a local professional for the Director post. The Director is based in Lilongwe and is responsible for the overall operation and financial management of the Project. A Project Coordinator, who is also based in Lilongwe, was until recently responsible for the implementation as well as the monitoring of the Project, in collaboration with Zonal Project Coordinators and Project Officers who are based in the Project areas. ELDS has now hired a Monitoring and Evaluation Office who has taken over the monitoring and evaluation responsibilities, as well as the responsibility of building and managing a data base. The Project finances are managed by a Finance Officer in collaboration with the Country Director and the Project Coordinator. Previously, all donor funds went through the LWF office in Geneva and LWF was closely involved in the fundraising for the ELDP projects. However, after the establishment of ELDS as a local NGO it became responsible for its own fundraising. Since then, it has been up to the donor agencies whether they disburse their funds through the Geneva office or directly to ELDS. While ELDP was still a LWF country programme, an expatriate Regional Finance Control Officer based in Harare was closely involved in the financial control of the organization and came to Malawi 3-4 times a year for that purposes. Since the transition to a local NGO, most of the financial management of ELDS has been transferred on to the locally based Finance Officer and other management staff, while the organization still gets support from the regional office in Harare.

The estimated initial expenditure of the Project was US\$186,000 for a period of three years, or US\$62,000 per year. ICEIDA committed to cover 60% of the project's cost, whereas ICA was expected to cover 40% and take care of administration and the monitoring of the Project on behalf of the donors.

3.3 Relevance: Policies and Development Priorities

In an assessment of the Project relevance, the policies of the donors and their partners, as well as local priorities and needs have to be taken into account (DANIDA 1999: 58). Section 3.3 offers a brief overview of the policies and priorities of the donor agencies, the implementing organization and the Malawi Government, and finishes with an assessment of the local situation and needs in Chikwawa district. The consistency between the priorities and approaches of the different parties is assessed but further evidence of the Project's relevance is also to be found in subsequent sections in this chapter.

ICEIDA's policies and priorities

ICEIDA is a government body, which operates according to an Icelandic Act of Parliament (see *Lög um Þróunarsamvinnustofnun Íslands nr. 43/1981*). It follows the policy of the Icelandic government and the common criteria in international development cooperation which currently is anchored in the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) adopted at the United Nations' 55th General Assembly in 2000 (United Nations 2000). The principal criteria underlying Icelandic development cooperation is support to the poorest sector of society and all projects funded by ICEIDA have to be carried out in accordance with the policies and priorities of the countries in which they are being implemented. In its policy documents, the agency furthermore puts emphasis on the promotion of democracy, human rights, equality and environmental protection (ICEIDA 2004a and b). Although many larger government development agencies have over the last decades turned its funding towards sector-wide support, ICEIDA has continued to use project approach, mainly due to its small size. In recent years ICEIDA has increased its financial allocation to NGOs in Iceland and its partner countries. This is a growing part of ICEIDA's operation, intended to increase support to civil society and democratic development, as well as to enhance public interest and support for international development work in Iceland (ICEIDA 2004b).

ICA priorities and approach

ICA is an independent organization within the National Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland and depends almost entirely on public contribution for its income. It is a member of the LWF and the World Council of Churches (WCC) and receives most of its requests for assistance from abroad through these organizations. The role of ICA is to initiate and coordinate charity and relief work in Iceland and abroad, as well as to fund and engage in development cooperation with sister organizations in developing countries. ICA assists people in need, with a special emphasis on refugees. It prioritizes work with the poorest in society and emphasises participatory approach, capacity building, human rights and environmental protection (Hk 2003a).

ELDS's strategies and emphasis

ELDS was established in 1989, primarily to provide assistance to Mozambique refugees and that remained its focus for the first few years. After the repatriation of the Mozambique refugees, the organization shifted its focus towards development work in the former refugee impacted areas. Until recently the ELDS operated as a LWF/DWS country programme but is now a local organization and an independent LWF associate programme. The overall objective of its work is to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods in Malawi through community-based and integrated rural development approach to development. The target groups are economically vulnerable households in marginalized and disaster-prone areas. ELDS programmatic priorities centre on household food security, domestic sanitation, literacy and natural resource management. The cross cutting issues of human rights, gender equality and HIV/AIDS prevention are an integrated part of all ELDS projects (LWF 2003).

Development priorities in Malawi

The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy 2006-2011 (MGDS) is the current blueprint for development efforts in Malawi (GOMAL 2006). The overall objective in the MGDS is to reduce poverty through economic growth with a focus on six key priority areas, including agriculture and food security; irrigation and water development; integrated rural development; and HIV/AIDS prevention. The key priority areas identified in MGDS are meant to accelerate the attainment of the MDG by recognizing the importance of health, education, gender equality, environment and governance, and thereby maintaining a balance between social and economic sectors. Despite agriculture contributing the bulk of employment opportunities and foreign exchange earnings in Malawi, the country continues to suffer from chronic food shortages due to low agricultural yields and overdependence on rain-fed farming. The Integrated Household Survey 2004/05 showed that 52.4 percent of the population in Malawi, or 6.3 million people, still lives below the poverty line (GOMAL 2005: 138-141). The poverty is most serious in the Southern Region of the country with rural areas generally poorer than urban areas.

The local context and perceptions

The geographical location of Chikwawa district in the Lower Shire Valley makes it prone to annual flooding as well as to periodic drought. The district is commonly among the worst affected areas by famine in Malawi and floods regularly destroy the livelihoods of thousands of farming families by wiping out crop, livestock and infrastructure. For the people in the villages in Chikwawa consulted for this evaluation, lack of access to potable water, coupled with the related problems of water-borne diseases and chronic hunger was listed as the most critical development problem in the area, affecting virtually all areas of life.

Overall assessment of the Project's relevance

The overview above shows that the ELDS Water Use and Management Project is indeed relevant to the policies and priorities of the donors, the implementing

organization, the Malawi Government and the local people in Chikwawa. With the overall objective to reduce poverty, the Project promotes participatory, community based approach and focuses on some of the key priority areas in the MDG and the Malawi MGDS – food security and water/sanitation development. The Project is based in a disaster-prone area of Malawi and emphasizes assistance to and capacity building among the poorest and most vulnerable in society. The integration of the cross-cutting issues of human rights, gender equality, environment protection and HIV/AIDS prevention is intended to be a part of the implementation of all components of the Project. Observations and discussions in the villages in Chikwawa, also showed that the Project is highly relevant to the local context and development problems in the District.

3.4 Effectiveness: Objectives, Activities and Outputs

In the context of a LFA evaluation, the concept of effectiveness relates to the extent to which formally specified objectives have been achieved through the particular outputs produced (Samset 1994; DANIDA 1999). The aim in section 3.4 is, therefore, to do a systematic evaluation of the objectives and activities of the Project, with a particular reference to its implementation in Chikwawa district.

Project goal

A project goal should describe the anticipated long-term overall objective towards which a project is intended to work. Although a progress towards the goal will inevitably depend on a number of factors beyond the control of any individual project, it needs to be clearly defined, formulated in close connection to the project justification and intended target group, in order to provide the main point of reference against which achievements can be assessed (NORAD 1999). The stated goal of the Water Resource Use and Management Project during the period 2004-2006 was “to build sustainable livelihoods for water resource use and management” (ELDP 2003: 18). Although the goal could have been defined more specifically, when combined with the stated purpose of improving access and utilization of water as well as sanitation in the targeted households, it does give a broad idea of what the Project hoped to achieve overall. The justification of the Project is clearly spelled out in the PD (ELDP 2003: 12), with a clear connection to the Project’s goal, purposes and objectives. The primary target group of the Project is also well defined in the PD (ELDP 2003: 9) but identification of how other groups might be affected by the Project would also have been helpful as it could have helped the Project staff to better prepare for the implications of diverse and possibly conflicting interests in the communities.

Objective 1: Water management and crop diversification

The first of the six objectives of the Projects was “to promote water resource use and management through crop diversification”. In terms of activities and outputs, this involved the identification of vulnerable households, community sensitisation and training, and the establishment of micro-irrigation and treadle pump schemes to increase agricultural productivity and reduce over-reliance on rain-fed agriculture – and with that contribute to increased food security.

The planned outputs involved the establishment of 2 micro-irrigation schemes in each of the three districts, with 20 participating households in each scheme (total: 120 households), and the establishment of 3 treadle pump garden clubs in each districts with 30 participating farmers in each club. The Project did establish the planned number of irrigation schemes but distributed a much larger number of treadle pumps than planned. This increase in the number of treadle pump gardens was a response to the critical hunger situation in Malawi in 2005. It was done with an approval from ICA and shows that both the donor and the Project are prepared to adjust to unexpected situations, which is commendable. With this increase in treadle pump gardens and by organizing the farmers in groups, the Project was able to involve almost 300 farmers in the scheme who also benefited from maize seed distribution. The farmers participating in the micro-irrigation scheme also benefited from maize distribution, as well as from fertilizer distribution the first year (after the first year they used organic fertilizer from the livestock component). In areas where it was viable, farmers also benefited from rice seed distribution. The Project has furthermore provided technical training to farmers and managerial and leadership training to committees⁴.



Photo1: Small scale irrigation field in Thonje village

In Chikwawa, the Project has met challenges in achieving this objective despite producing most of the planned outputs. The difficulties appear to be mainly due to factors beyond the Project's control, including the scarcity of suitable land for irrigation, a critical shortage of water and the vicious circle of drought and floods in the district. Rice is generally unfeasible to grow in the area because of the water shortage and the lack of wetland, and the extreme seasonal variation in the availability of water has proven to be a considerable challenge to the irrigation schemes. Nevertheless, the Project did succeed in establishing irrigation systems in some

⁴ For more detailed description of the outputs see ELDS 2007b.

villages and promoted crop diversification through irrigated winter cropping. In communities where the irrigation schemes have been successful the villagers reported improved food supplies in the community and increased income opportunities, and they would like to see it improved and expanded.

The confusion between the government and traditional leaders about the new land policy in Malawi has made local leaders in Chikwawa District very reluctant to allocate productive wetland and *dambo* areas for irrigation. This has been a considerable challenge to the Project in Chikwawa and is likely to remain a challenge if the matter is not resolved. Consultations with Project staff as well as villagers in Chikwawa furthermore revealed that because of the general shortage of water in the District, the water harvesting schemes sometimes resulted in intra-community conflicts as the increased use of a common water resource in one community sometimes resulted in less water availability for neighbouring communities. The intense competition for land and water in Chikwawa District adds a highly sensitive and political aspect to the Project which to a large degree is beyond, and will remain beyond, its control. Although the irrigation and treadle pump scheme committees received some leadership training from the Project, the conflicts that arise from scares land and water in the District is generally beyond their power to solve.

One of the most common requests made during the consultations in the villages in Chikwawa for this evaluation was a request for more training courses, both technical and leadership training. While the Project provided some leadership and managerial training to committees, as well as technical training to some farmers, it was too brief and incomplete to make the desired impact. Training of this sort is the part and parcel of capacity building in the communities and an essential part of building sustainability. Consultation with the Project staff showed that the Project management is aware of this. The training component of the Project during 2004-2006 was shaped by the limited resources available in the Project and the draft of the new PD (ELDS 2007a) shows that capacity building will be a major emphasis during the new Project period (2007-2010).

Objective 2: Water management, livestock diversification and fish farming

The second objective of the Project during the period 2004-2006 was “to promote water resource use and management through livestock diversification and fish farming.” Outputs related to this objective involved the establishment of livestock kraals in the Project districts, as well as the establishment of fish ponds for fish farming. Farmers were furthermore to receive training in livestock management and fish farming, and the Project planned to facilitate extension services and to supply livestock medicine to farmers. The expected impact of these outputs and activities was increased food security through more reliable sources of food as well as income through selling of livestock.

Many external factors have affected the achievement of this objective and the implementation of the activities involved. In many of the Project areas, notably Chikwawa, the fish farming was the least successful of the planned output, mainly due to the dry spells in 2004 and 2005 which dried up fish ponds and made water in general critically scarce. A total of six ponds (out of 12 planned) were nevertheless established and 800 kg of fingerlings distributed to stock the ponds, although none in

Chikwawa. While ELDS plans to continue with fish farming activities in other areas of the country, it will not be a part of the Project in Chikwawa as the current situation of chronic water scarcity in most of Chikwawa District makes fish farming unviable.

Livestock diseases were a challenge to the plan of establishing pig and poultry kraals in the Project areas. There was an outbreak of African Swine Fever in all three districts and while the Project did establish 12 pig kraals (out of 30 planned) it was advised by the government veterinary services to discontinue with the activity, to help control the disease. The rearing of chicken was also less successful than expected due to a high death rate from New Castle disease. The Project had intended to establish 30 communal chicken kraals, 10 in each district. However, due to the additional cost of veterinary services and drugs to control the New Castle disease the Project could only establish 15 kraals and distributed about half the planned number of chicken but a part of them was wiped out by the disease. Guinea fowl proved to be more disease resistant and 39 guinea fowl kraals were established in the Project areas, 9 more than planned. Almost twice the planned number of farmers were supplied with guinea fowl during the project period even though the scarcity of guinea fowl stock created some challenge. Guinea fowl only lie on their eggs to hatch them part of the year and leave their eggs at other times wherever they lay them. Villagers in Chikwawa collect the eggs the guinea fowl leave around and put them under chicken for hatching, and in that way increased the productivity of the scheme.

Goat rearing became the most successful activity related to the second objective of the Project and was notably successful in Chikwawa District. The Project had planned to establish 10 communal goat kraals and community groups in each of the project area but did establish 15 in each district over the three years period. While it procured goats through middle men initially, the Project eventually started to obtain the animals directly from local farmers at a lower price, which was a part of what enabled it to establish more kraals. More than three times more households were reached through the goat rearing scheme of the Project than initially planned, and well over the double the planned number of goats was distributed to farmers' groups. This addition in the number of goats distributed was made possible through an additional funding from ICA during the hunger period in Malawi.

In both the goat rearing scheme and the poultry rearing scheme the Project has promoted the so-called 'pass-on a livestock' approach, which means that each target household which receives a goat or a guinea fowl is required to pass on to another household the first female offspring. As reproduction rate for goats is high, this has proven to be a highly successful approach. Within the ELDS Project the Village Monitoring Committees (VMCs)⁵ in collaboration with the government's Village Development Committees (VDCs) have monitored the pass-on scheme and it appears to be working well in Chikwawa. Through the goat and the poultry schemes, the Project has promoted the cross-breeding of local livestock with hybrid livestock (boers and cocks) to improve local productivity.

⁵ The role of the VMCs and other local management bodies within the Project will be discussed further in 3.5



Photo 2: A man poses with a hybrid boer in Jani village

Consultation with local farmers and the Project committees during the evaluation fieldwork in Chikwawa revealed a high level of satisfaction with the goat and the poultry schemes of the Project in the District. This appears to have been a highly successful part of the Project in the area, contributing significantly to food security among vulnerable households, diversifying their income opportunities, and providing quality manure for gardening activities. People consulted in the Project villages expressed a great deal of interest in the cross-breeding initiative and reasoned that the Project should supply more hybrid he-goats to make the cross-breeding more efficient. The demand for the hybrid he-goats is very high and people feel the waiting period is too long. According to the villagers in Chikwawa, the she-goats supplied by the Project have sometimes been too young when delivered and as a result some have not survived. Middle men sometimes procure the goats in other areas, including highland areas, which has made it difficult for them to adjust to the tropical climate in Chikwawa and this has also taken its toll on the stocks supplied. This is clearly something that the Project should take into account in the future. In order to ensure that a suitable stock of goats is supplied to the villages, project field staff may need to be more closely involved in the procurement process.

Objective 3: Conservation of water through community based management

To “promote protection and conservation of water sources through community based natural resource management” was the third objective of the Project. Deforestation and related environmental degradation is a large problem in the target areas of the

Project and the focus in achieving this objective has been on agroforestry activities. Planned outputs and activities included environmental awareness-raising in target villages, the establishment and training of monitoring committees, training in tree nursery management, the establishment of tree nurseries and facilitation of extension services. With this the Project hoped to help communities conserve and protect their water sources and counteract soil erosion.

In total, the Project established a total of 30 tree nurseries in the targeted district, which is more than the set target of 27. The Project had planned to involve 675 households in the tree nursery scheme. However, good rains in 2006 created a favourable condition for tree planting and 1500 households did eventually participate in the scheme. The Project also by far exceed its planned target of planting 135,000 tree seedlings on 27 hectares of land by managing to plant 300,000 tree seedlings on 35 hectares.



Photo 3: Consultation in a village forest in Mlooka village

Despite the overall success in implementing the activities related to the third objective of the Project, the water scarcity and recurrent floods in Chikwawa district have affected the achievement of this objective. Villages in Chikwawa that do not have reliable water source have experienced considerable difficulties in preserving the planted trees through the dry season while communities with a functioning well or a stream nearby have generally been able to sustain their tree nurseries. Goats have also caused some trouble as they generally roam free in the villages and are drawn to eating the young plants. The Project has sought to tackle this problem by encouraging the communities to construct fences around the nurseries, which some communities have done. During the field consultation in Chikwawa, one informant suggested that the Project could also experiment with tree species which goats do not eat. In some communities in the district seedlings were also lost through termite attacks.

In communities where tree nurseries were established in Chikwawa, the Project facilitated the election of VMCs, whose role is to provide leadership and monitor the activities around the communal tree nurseries. It also facilitated the establishment of Village Natural Resource Committees (VNRC) which are expected to coordinate and monitor all natural resource management activities in the communities. Through the establishment of these committees and the sensitizations in the villages, the Project has introduced government regulation on environmental issues in the villages and started to increase awareness of the impact of environmental degradation and its role in the cycle of poverty. The participants in the nursery schemes received training in tree nursery and the members of the VMC have received leadership training. Consultation with ELDS staff revealed that the agroforestry component is regarded as an important component in the Project and will continue to be a main emphasis in the Project during the new project period (ELDS 2007a).

Objective 4: Shallow wells and community capacity building

The fourth objective of the Project during the period 2004-2006 was to “protect shallow wells and build capacity of communities in shallow well maintenance”. Activities and outputs included community sensitisation, construction of shallow wells, establishment of well committees, training in the maintenance, repair and general management of the well, and the promotion of extension services. With this the Project hoped to increase communities’ access to potable water and improve the sanitation and health situation in the villages.

As is the case with the Project as a whole, the approach to achieving this objective was participatory and community based. Motivated communities were required to submit a request for a shallow well to the Project and during the construction process villagers provided most of the labour and some of the material for the well. In total the Project constructed 30 shallow wells in the targeted districts which initially benefited 3500 households.

While the Project implemented all activities planned to achieve this objective and accomplished many of the outputs, the cycle of drought and flood in Chikwawa created, again, a major challenge. In some communities in the district the shallow wells lasted only few months before they dried up and ceased to be of use to the people in the community. The drought situation in 2004-2005 made the ground-water table unusually low and the wells, which were hand-dug by the villagers, were dug too shallow to begin with. Although the Project advised the communities how deep they needed to dig the wells, people were weak because of the hunger situation in the villages during this period and the wells were often made shallower than they should have. Floods also caused considerable damage to the shallow wells in many communities in Chikwawa district and made them non-functional. This experience has shown that shallow wells may not be suitable solution to the water scarcity in many areas of Chikwawa, especially in the southern part of the district which most of the project villagers are. Consultation with the ELDS staff showed that the project management and staff are aware of this and during the new project period the intention is to switch to the construction of boreholes as a way to facilitate an access to safe water supply to villagers in Chikwawa district (see ELDS 2007a).



Photo 4: Flood damaged shallow well in Chikadayenda village

Although the Project provided managerial and technical training in the communities where wells were established in 2004-2006, the consultations in the villages and with ELDS staff showed that this training was too limited to create a sustainable technical knowledge in the communities and enable them to be self-sufficient in maintaining the wells and repair them if they break down. Interest and motivation to maintain a reliable source of water is very high in the communities in Chikwawa and this situation is therefore unfortunate indeed. The limited training provided with the construction of the shallow wells during the 2004-2006 period was shaped by limited funding available for such activities and it is important for the Project to allocate sufficient funding to provide more comprehensive training courses alongside borehole construction during the new project period. Consultation with the ELDS management team made clear that the management and staff is aware of the limited impact of the training offered with the shallow well construction in 2004-2006 and that awareness will hopefully translate into a bigger emphasis on technical capacity building in the communities during the new project period.

Objective 5: Household sanitation and san plat toilets

To “promote household sanitation through construction of san plat toilets” was the Project’s fifth objective. Over the three year period, the Project outputs and activities related to the achievement of the objective was awareness building and sensitisation, moulding of doom slabs and san plats, construction of toilets, community courses on hygiene and toilet maintenance and the facilitation of extension services.

The Project was less successful with the achievement of this objective than might be expected and a mid-term evaluation of the Project in 2006 identifies a lack of funding as the main reason behind that (Nakhumwa et al 2006). However, an ELDS end-of-project report indicates that the Project experienced difficulties in motivating villagers (ELDS 2007b: 40-41) and an earlier report indicated that the hunger situation in 2005 had made it difficult for people to engage in physical labour (ELDS 2006). Out of the

450 san plat toilet that were planned for the period 2004-2006, only 200 were built and 70 community volunteers (down from the planned 135) went through a course on toilet construction.

In the communities visited in Chikwawa during the consultation process for this evaluation, the attitudes towards san plat toilets appeared positive and the ELDS staff working in that areas were not familiar with any cultural beliefs against toilets. Construction of toilets and other sanitary facilities is an important part of the fight against infectious diseases and environmental hazards, which negatively affects the welfare and productivity of households. The Project plans to continue promoting hygiene and sanitation through toilet construction and awareness-raising in the communities in Chikwawa during the new project period (ELDS 2007b). During that period more emphasis than before may have to be put on mobilization, training and other support from the Project, to promote a further awareness of the link between sanitation and diseases. In order to ensure sustainability as much as possible, the Project should try to involve staff from the Ministries of Health and Water Development in Chikwawa in the implementation of activities related to the hygiene and sanitation component in the Project.

Objective 6: Promotion of women in water resource management

The sixth and last objective of the Project during the 2004-2006 implementation period was “to promote the role of women in water resource use and management.” The planned activities included meetings and training course in the communities where the different roles and responsibilities of women and men in relation to access to and management of water resources were to be tackled. With this, the Project intended to enhance women’s roles in the management of water resources and promote gender equality in decision making and access to water resources.

Over the three year period, the Project did implement all activities planned towards achieving this objective. It established 90 women sanitation groups in 30 villages in the targeted districts; trained 270 women in water sanitation; provided training opportunities for 9 women in the relation between gender roles and access to water resources; and offered 9 community training sessions on water, sanitation and gender.

Endeavour to enhance the power and direct involvement of women in management activities and decision-making in rural communities in Malawi is obviously a long-term goal. A progress towards that goal and/or the impact of the courses that the Project has offered so far cannot be meaningfully assessed during short visits to the communities, especially not if no baseline data exist to compare the current state of affairs against. Women in Chikwawa District, just like women anywhere else in Malawi, are responsible for supplying their households with water and the access to and management of water resources, therefore, obviously affects them significantly. Some of the Project’s outputs have, obviously, benefited women in particular. The construction of wells and boreholes in the communities, which decreases women’s labour and the time they have to spend on fetching water long distances, is an example of that. The appreciation of the shallow wells – and the frustration over the broken wells – was clearly stated by women during the consultation for this evaluation in Chikwawa. The Project has also tried to facilitate the equal participation of women in decision-making processes in the communities in relation to the

implementation of the Project. This has been a more challenging task but the Project's effort to involve women on community committees and, perhaps, the courses that aim at raising women's awareness of power relations may well pay off in the long run. After only three years of implementation it is difficult to say anything about the impact the Project has had in this area. However, if the Project intends to continue to mainstream awareness of gender in its activities and promote gender equality on community level it may need to develop more systematic steps towards achieving that, and, even more importantly, means to measure the progress. The Project staff also needs to be watchful of the demands it makes on people's time in general and women's time in particular, in the implementation of its activities. Experience has shown, that participatory development projects in particular tend to demand more time and input from women than men, often with a very limited benefit to women at the end of the day.

3.5 Efficiency: Resources and Management

In a LFA evaluation of a project's efficiency the basic questions to be asked concern the inputs and whether they have provided the outputs planned (Samset 1993; DANIDA 1999). The previous chapter covered the material inputs provided by the Project and the resulting outputs. In this chapter the focus will be on two broad input areas of the Project – the efficiency of the resources used, including both human and financial resources, and the efficiency of the management structure and style. The discussion of resource use and management structure in the chapter will be in general terms but with a special reference to how it operates in Chikwawa district and affects the implementation of the Project there.

Human resources

The overall responsibility for the implementation of the Project lies within the mandate of the ELDS National Director who is based in Lilongwe. While ELDP was a LWF country program, the Director was an expatriate. However, during the transition process towards becoming an independent organization and an associate LWF program in 2005, the ELDS recruited a local professional as a Country Director, through a competitive recruitment process. The Director is not involved in the day-to-day implementation of the Project but works closely with the Project Coordinator and the Finance Manager in the planning and overall monitoring. The National Director is furthermore the main liaison between ELDS and the donors.

The technical implementation of the Project is the responsibility of the ELDS Project Coordinator (PC) who is also based in Lilongwe but travels frequently to the ELDS project areas. In close cooperation with the National Director, the Finance Manager, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the Zonal Projects Coordinator South (ZPC), the PC is directly responsible for the planning, effective implementation and monitoring of the Project, and is therefore a key person on the Project team. The PC and the ZPC are instrumental in the procurement process of the Project's physical inputs and the timely delivery to the Project's sites. Writing of quarterly reports for submission to donors is mainly the responsibility of the PC and he therefore plays an important role in ELDS collaboration with donors. The PC has the responsibility of the technical implementation and monitoring of all ELDS activities in Malawi while

the ZPC (South) has the overall responsible for the technical implementation and monitoring of the ELDS activities in the Southern Region. The implementation and monitoring of the Project is, therefore, only a part of their responsibilities.

In 2006, the ELDS recruited a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (MEO) who is based in Lilongwe but travels regularly to the ELDS project areas. This is a new post within the organization with the monitoring responsibility formerly being in the hands of the Project Coordinator. The new MEO is responsible for ensuring that a systematic monitoring structure is in place and operating. Through this structure he monitors the progress of the Project in Chikwawa as well as the progress of other ELDS projects. The MEO is furthermore responsible for planning, organizing and supporting the evaluation process of ELDS projects. An important part of the MEO's responsibilities is to establish a baseline for the Project so that its progress and impact can be evaluated in the future in as objective and systematic way as possible.

The ELDS Project Officer (PO) in Chikwawa is directly involved and responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the Project in the district, together with three ELDS Development Facilitators. The PO is currently based in Nchalo town (trading centre) which is located roughly midway between the Project's sites. The PO is the bona fide team leader at the Project's office in Chikwawa. He supervises the work of the Development Facilitators and is responsible for preparing monthly work plans for the day-to-day implementation of the Project in Chikwawa district. An important part of the PO's responsibilities is the compiling of monthly progress- and financial reports which are submitted to the ELDS management before the Project's operational funds for the following month is released. The PO is a key liaison person in the Project's collaboration with other development partners in Chikwawa.

The Development Facilitators (DFs) work directly with the communities in the implementation of the Project and are based in different parts of Chikwawa District where they are responsible for a number of villages (including villages that are not targeted in the Project). The DFs endeavour to make regular visits to the Project villages, if possible once a week to each of them, to monitor the Project activities and assist the communities if problems arise. In a close cooperation with the village committees established through the Project's activities in the communities, the DFs identify monthly targets for the Project to achieve, which are in turn worked into the PO's monthly work plan for the day-to-day implementation of the Project. Because of the close cooperation and regular contact with the communities the DFs play a vitally important role in communicating the situation on the ground and facilitating a successful implementation of the Project.

The Project is a participatory, community based project and the people in the targeted villages in Chikwawa are therefore not only beneficiaries but a very important human resource for the Project. The Project facilitates the formation of committees (VMCs) and user groups in the villages, as well as intra-village committees referred to as Section Monitoring Committees, which then are expected to become the driving force in the planning of activities, as well as the implementation and the monitoring of the Project. Good collaboration between the Project staff and the community members is obviously a basic prerequisite for the achievements of the Projects objectives and outputs. Effective capacity building in the communities is, furthermore, vital for the

achievement of the Project's objectives. This will be discussed further in the section on sustainability below.

In the past, high turnover of staff has been a problem for ELDP and that has been attributed to low salaries, lack of staff capacity building and ineffective human resource management (Nakhumwa et al. 2006). Indeed, at the time of the fieldwork for this evaluation, all the Project staff in Chikwawa, save for one DF, had just been recruited and was, therefore, not able to give the evaluation team much historical insight into the Project. However, the staff involved in the implementation of the Project, both those based at the head-office in Lilongwe and those based in Chikwawa, are clearly highly qualified and motivated staff. All ELDS staff members in a managerial position consulted for this evaluation, including the PO in Chikwawa, have postgraduate degrees in fields appropriate for the focus of the Project, and this is a real asset for the Project. Since the transition from ELDP to ELDS, the organization seemed to have put increasing emphasis on staff capacity building (Nakhumwa et al. 2006) and consultation during the evaluation revealed that staff is generally happy about the current human resource management within ELDS. Successful implementation of the Project depends to a large degree on a team of motivated staff and the ELDS will therefore hopefully continue to give its staff opportunities to develop their professional capacity.

Financial resources and management

The original Project budget for the three year period was US\$186,000 (ELDS 2003), of which ICEIDA committed to pay 60 per cent and ICA 40 per cent. The donors have honoured their commitments and dispatched the funds in a timely manner all three years. In addition, ICA has provided additional funds through special fund raising efforts in Iceland, to enable ELDS to respond to disaster situations in Malawi. This flexibility and the responsiveness that ICA has shown to unexpected needs in the Project area, is highly valued by the ELDS management. While ELDS experienced significant problem in securing funding for the ICDP project as a whole during 2004-2006, this does not appear to have affected the ICA/ICEIDA funded activities in any significant way. According to the financial documents made available to the evaluation team (ICA 2006; ELDS 2005), the Project has staid within the planned budgets all three years, while some minor adjustments have been made on the allocation to individual components.

The responsibility of the Project's financial management is mainly in the hands of the ELDS Finance Officer who is based in Lilongwe and works under the supervision of the National Director. The Financial Officer develops regular financial reports to enable substantiated financial decisions. Through the development of annual activity based work plans and budgets for different project operation, the PC presents the demand for expenditure within the Project. Together the team develops annual budgets which are then submitted to the ELDS Board of Directors for review and approval. Once the budget has been approved the PC's office, as the operational department, is able to make requests for funds for different budget items. The Finance Office verifies that the request is in accordance with the approved budget and the availability of funds, and the funds are released following the Director's approval. The Financial Officer also prepares financial reports for submission to donors and other stakeholders. In the past, these reports have been submitted bi-annually but are

likely to be submitted at least quarterly in the future. Externally audited financial report is submitted to donors annually.

Funds for different ELDS projects are released monthly and transferred electronically from the headquarters in Lilongwe to accounts used by the field offices in their areas. The release of funds depends on submission of financial reports for the previous month which is prepared by each field office. In line with ELDS procurement policy, all procurement of commodities and services is done by the national office in Lilongwe, down to smallest commodities such as stationery. Procurement of expensive items has to be approved by procurement committees. Any item costing US\$2000-7000 has to be approved by the management procurement committee, while items over US\$7000 have to be approved by the board procurement committee before purchase.

As the account above shows, the ELDS has in place a prudent system of monitoring and maintaining a transparent internal control of its finances. Finances, including all procurements are controlled centrally, which ensures separation of project administration and financial management. However, while this makes monitoring easier and ensures accountability, it is somewhat slow and bureaucratic. As the release of operational funds for the field offices depends on the submission of a financial report for the previous month and as transfer between bank accounts takes time the field offices may not receive their monthly allowances until well into the month. This situation, and the central control of all procurements, does at times delay project activities and impacts negatively on the implementation plan.

After ELDS became an independent organization with association status at LWF, the organization has more or less been on its own in terms of raising funds for its projects. It has meant loss of some of the external funding received through LWF and this has caused the organization substantial difficulties in the last few years (Nakhumwa et al. 2006). The ELDS is now in the process of build up its own group of internal and external donors. Even if it is no longer a LWF country programme, ELDS has continued to receive support from LWF with financial management. A representative from the LWF Regional Financial Office in Harare has continued to assist the organization with its financial control through visits to Lilongwe 3-4 times a year. However, while the support from Harare has been important in helping ELDS on its feet as an independent NGO, the frequent external supervision is a substantial financial burden. According to ELDS management, the organization plans to hire an internal auditor in the near future while an external auditing will be commissioned once a year.

When the ELDS was a LWF country programme all donor funds were paid through the LWF Headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. Since it became independent it has been up to its donors whether they pay their funds through Geneva or directly to ELDS. During the consultation in Malawi for this evaluation, the ELDS management stated a clear preference for a direct relationship with donors and direct disbursement of funds. This lessens bureaucracy and makes all procedures more efficient.

Management and monitoring structures

Many significant changes have occurred in ELDS management and organizational structure through its transition from a LWF country programme to a local NGO. A significant effort seems to have been put into staff capacity building over the last few years, to develop the organization's ability to operate independently from LWF. This has been done through short and long term training courses for management, field staff and board members. Among other things, this emphasis on capacity building was intended to improve the ELDS ability to source funding for its projects independently from LWF. The recruitment of a highly qualified, professional staff in management posts within ELDS over the last few years has also served the purpose of increasing its independence and ensuring efficient and effective operation.

The ELDS is headed by a Board of Directors which is chaired by the Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Malawi. Through regular meetings, the Board is involved in reviewing and approving both project implementation plans and budgets of ELDS projects, including the procurement of expensive items and services as indicated above.

While the Board provides a guidance and support, and has the overall responsibility of the organization, the Director in cooperation with the Project Coordinator, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the Finance Officer is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the organization and the successful implementation of the ELDS projects. The catchment areas of ELDS are divided into three zones (north, central and south) which each are managed by a Zonal Project Coordinator in collaboration with the Project Coordinator, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and a number of Project Officers who head the district offices. Although the findings from the evaluation process in Lilongwe and Chikwawa show that the implementation of the Project has been fairly efficient, the ELDS management may want to look into establishing a more formal management structure for the implementation of the Project in Chikwawa, with regular meetings on district level and formal minutes from meeting procedures. There are some indications of ineffective communication between the Chikwawa office and the Head office in Lilongwe which have affected the implementation of the Project but could be resolved through more controlled management structure. The role of key ELDS staff in the implementation of the Project is very broadly defined in both the PD for 2004-2006 and the draft of the new PD, while no formal schedule of management or implementation meetings is presented. In order to ensure continuous efficient and democratic implementation of the Project, the ELDS should consider spelling out in more detail in the PD, the roles and responsibility of each staff member in the implementation and management of the Project. It would also be helpful to include in the PD a planned frequency of regular, formal management meetings on national, zonal and district level, as well as who (staff members and other relevant stakeholders) are expected to attend these meetings and how the meeting procedures will be documented and reported. The PD should also indicate the number of monitoring visits the Project Coordinator, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the Zonal Project Coordinator are expected to make to Chikwawa. Increased formality of the Project management structure will make systematic evaluations of its efficiency easier.

With its emphasis on community participation, a key feature of the Project is the participation of target communities in the management and monitoring of the Project. Various 'work groups', made up of the Project's beneficiaries, were initially formed in the villages through which the Project's activities are implemented. Village Monitoring Committees (VMC), consisting of both representatives from the working groups (direct beneficiaries) and community volunteers, were then formed in each village. Their role is to monitor the implementation of the Project's activities on a day-to-day basis by observing progress on village level and receiving reports from the working groups. In cooperation with the ELDS Development Facilitators, the VMCs manage the implementation plan of the Project in the villages and help the working groups with challenges and problems they face. The VMCs are then responsible for reporting and discussing progress and challenges in the implementation of the Project to Section Monitoring Committees (SMC) which are three in Chikwawa District and are composed of representatives from VMCs from several villages.

Ideally, the progress of the Project should be reported to the district authorities in Chikwawa (ADC, DEC and eventually DDC and the District Assembly) through cooperation between the SMCs and the VDCs. However, in reality, although generally supportive of the Project, many VDCs do not function efficiently, mainly, it seems, because of a lack of support from the government but also partly because they do no longer have a mandate as a government body since local elections are long overdue in the area. According to ELDS staff in Chikwawa, most 'work groups' in the villages and the VMCs function well and show great enthusiasm in the implementation of the Project. While the Project staff gives them guidance on how to implement activities and conduct their responsibilities, it is up to each group how they work out the details. During the consultations in the villages in Chikwawa, the evaluation team was able to confirm the enthusiasm for the Project in the villages that were visited and it was reported in consultation meetings that most work groups meet 1-2 days a week, while VMCs try to meet monthly. Some VMCs write a report about the progress in the villages while others give a verbal report to the SMCs. The SMCs have in turn reported directly to the ADC (because of the largely ineffective VDCs). However, ELDS is currently in the process of changing its monitoring structure and in the future the SMCs will be expected to report to extension workers in the area (government extension staff as well as the ELDS Development Facilitators) as well as the VDCs, which in turn will report to the DEC and the ADC respectively. In order for this to work, capacity building has to be built within the VDCs and their linkage to the ADC strengthened. In a bid to promote this, the ELDS is planning to make the capacity of local development structures in Chikwawa one of its main components in the next phase of the Project – without capacity on local level, the inputs of the Project would go a short way in promoting changes and wellbeing in the communities. At the end of each month, the ELDS Project Officer in Chikwawa compiles a progress report about the overall progress of the Project in the district, which is based on reports from the Development Facilitators. These reports are submitted to the Project Coordinator in Lilongwe and form the basis of his quarterly reporting to ICA, along with his own monitoring visits to the area.

As the account above shows, ELDS has developed a sophisticated monitoring system for the Project, designed to observe progress and to enable staff to respond reasonably quickly to needs within the communities. Apart from the weakness in the government structure – which is a significant weakness in terms of sustainability (see below) – the

monitoring system seems to have been effective overall. With the recruitment of the MEO and through the current adjustments in the monitoring system, the ELDS is making an effort to iron out the weaknesses and making it more effective. As with the management system, however, the PD for 2004-2006 as well as the draft PD for 2007-2010, is quite vague about the monitoring procedure itself. While outlining the monitoring structure (who is involved), the documents only refer to 'periodic meetings' between different bodies involved in the monitoring process. Again, for the sake of a systematic evaluation of the Project's efficiency, ELDS may want to spell out in the PD the planned frequency of meetings (those that the Project is in control of), who are expected to attend and how the meeting procedure will be documented and reported.

Collaboration with government

The collaboration between ELDS and government offices in Chikwawa has in some respect been one of the weakest aspects of the Project but it has also had strong aspects and seems to be developing in the right direction. In the Chikwawa District Planning Office (DPO), which is the government office responsible for coordinating all development activities in the district in line with the long-term District Development Plan (DDP), the ELDS is known as a well organized NGO capable to deliver valuable outputs. According to the head of the DPO, the ELDS takes the DDP into consideration in its work and it delivers Project progress reports regularly to the DPO office, which enables the District authorities to monitor its activities. The DPO would like to see the Project expand to cover a larger area of the district.

While the collaboration with the DPO seems to be good, ELDS appears to have a weaker relationship with government ministry offices in the District. To a large degree this is due to a chronic lack of resources and capacity within the government offices, notably the Chikwawa Department of Irrigation and Water Development which is practically non-functional with no technical officer at the time of the evaluation. The lack of capacity and resources in government offices is a nation wide problem which is by no means defined to Chikwawa and is, obviously, largely beyond the Project's control. However, collaboration with government is important for sustainability. While it is not reasonable to expect a small NGO like ELDS to have resources to support capacity building within the government or subsidize salaries of civil servants, to build up a formal working relationship with the government offices in the district and facilitate linkages between them and the communities is something ELDP should put added effort into, and perhaps resource. In some of the government offices visited during the evaluation fieldwork, senior offices appeared to know little to nothing about the ELDP Project. Others indicated that their staff had been invited to or participated in some activities of the Project and were aware of the impact it is having in the communities. However, many emphasized that their offices did not have the capacity or the resources to support the ELDP Project as much as they would like. According to the ELDP staff, effort is now being made to improve the collaboration with government. This includes the development of formal procedures to involve relevant government ministry offices in the Project planning and regular consultations to coordinate and avoid duplication of activities. This is an important progress in the implementation of the Project. However, the outcome will, of course, depend not only on efforts from ELDP but also on the capacity and will of government authorities.

Relationship with ICA/ICEIDA

A good working relationship has developed between ELDS and ICA through the collaboration over the last three years. From ICA's point of view well prepared project plans and quantifiable goals have been some of the strengths of the Project, while qualified and motivated staff is seen by ICA as being an important asset as well. Furthermore, the emphasis on participatory approach resonates well with ICA's own preference and approach to development. ICA's main concern about the Project is the lack of baseline data to measure the Project's impact against. As mentioned above, the ELDS is in the process of addressing this problem and a baseline survey is budgeted for in the draft PD for the new project period.

From ELDS's point of view the collaboration with ICA has been a positive experience. According to the ELDS management, ICA and ICEIDA have been reliable donors and the flexibility that ICA has shown in the collaboration is much appreciated within ELDS. The annual visits that ICA makes to Malawi, which are not only used for visits to the Project's sites but also to work with the ELDS staff on strategies and challenges, are viewed by ELDS as a very valuable part of the collaboration and somewhat unusual. The sense within ELDS is that ICA has confidence in the organization and that this confidence has strengthened the collaboration significantly. So far, the ELDS relationship with ICEIDA has mainly been through ICA. During the consultation in Malawi, however, the ELDS management expressed a clear interest in strengthening the relationship with the ICEIDA field office in Lilongwe, to share experiences and best practises.

3.6 Impact of Project Activities

The concept of impact in project evaluation refers to a broad range of consequences of project implementation – positive and negative, planned and unplanned (Samset 1993; DANIDA 1999). Many issues relating to impact have already been covered in this chapter, especially in relation to the Project's efficiency. Here, the impact of the Project will be considered more broadly and from two main points of reference: the Project's impact on direct beneficiaries and the impact of the Project in the wider community. Given the time-limit of the evaluation fieldwork, this assessment of the impact is inevitably going to be tentative and based on a limited data. It should also be kept in mind that general impact of a project takes time to manifest and the Project in Chikwawa has only been implemented over a relatively short period of time.

One of the most encouraging aspects of the Project in Chikwawa is the enthusiasm that it appears to have created in the targeted communities and among the beneficiaries in particular. This was evident in all the villages visited by the evaluation team where people felt the introduction and the implementation of the Project had overall been effective, and relationship with ELDS staff good. The participatory approach used in the Project seems to have worked well in that it seems to have created a sense of ownership among the beneficiaries and other community members involved in its implementation. Most of the VMCs, for example, appear to be functioning well and those that the evaluation team was able to consult with directly reported that the Project was enabling the most vulnerable people in the villages to get a relieve from the despairing poverty situation they are locked into.

Some also mentioned that the Project had promoted a change in attitudes and appreciation of team spirit among the participants in the Project's activities. This is an important overall impact of the Project which has significance for the sustainability of its activities and outputs. This will be discussed further below.

During focus group discussions people also noted that the physical inputs of the Project had significantly impacted the participants' quality of life and in some cases made a difference for the community as a whole. The goat scheme in particular seems to have created enthusiasm in the villages. Due to a high reproduction rate and low maintenance cost, many people have been able to raise 3-4 goats from the one goat received through the Project's 'pass-on' scheme, which in turn is said to have increased food security directly as well as the income level of households through selling surplus goats. Where the irrigation schemes have been successful it has also added to food security and diversified income base of individual households. In a similar vein, where the wells have lasted and where san plat toilets have been constructed, people indicated that water borne diseases had gone down and general health situation in the village improved. It can therefore be concluded that the consultation with the Project's beneficiaries gave an unmistakable impression that the Project has already made an important impact in terms of food security and sanitation among the targeted households, albeit on a small scale. The draft of the Project's new PD indicates that ELDS is going to capitalize on the success it has had with the goat pass-on schemes in Chikwawa. This shows ability to act on the lessons learned and should be encouraged. A common complaint in the villages during the consultation was that the goats (and other livestock) had been delivered too young or had difficulties adjusting to the climate in Chikwawa and many did not survive. This is a weakness in the scheme that should be fairly easy to iron out. Given the apparent suitability of goat rearing in Chikwawa and the potential impact it has on food security in the district, it seems also reasonable to suggest that the Project should consider expanding the scheme. Furthermore, given the desperately poor availability and access to water in many areas of Chikwawa, it seems very important that the Project keeps trying to find a lasting water solution in the targeted communities. The shift from constructing shallow wells to making boreholes and the continuation of promoting and developing small-scale irrigation systems show that the Project is adjusting its approach to take on board the lessons learned from the 2004-2006 project period. In this area, however, it is vitally important to consider the issue of sustainability. This will be discussed further below.

Given the limited time the evaluation team had in Chikwawa and the lack of baseline data to measure the evaluation findings against, it was difficult for the evaluation team to meaningfully assess the impact of the cross-cutting and long-term goals of the Project to promote gender equality and tackle issues related to the HIV/AIDS epidemic. The impact of the attempts of the Project to promote women's and men's gender awareness; the recognition of women's contribution to society and the importance of their participation in decision-making will inevitably take a long time to manifest and is largely beyond the scope of this evaluation. At this point, it seems uncertain whether some of the initiatives made by the Project, such as the training and sensitisation meetings offered to women during the 2004-2006, has had any impact at all. Other initiatives, such as the construction of wells (and in the future, boreholes) and the promotion of women's participation in the Project's management bodies on community level, certainly seem have potential to promote women's empowerment.

However, if the Project is serious about promoting gender awareness and women's empowerment, it needs to establish relevant database and develop indicators that can be used to measure its impact in this area. If this is not done, any talk of women's empowerment will sound empty. The Project staff and management need to be aware that women's active participation in the Project's implementation does not necessarily mean that it is having a lasting impact on their position in society or their empowerment. There is a need to continuously assess whether the demand for women's participation in the Project's activities matches the benefits they reap so that their participation does not turn into reinforcement of disempowering social expectations and restrictions. In a similar vein the impact of the Project in terms of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the area is difficult to measure in the absence of systematically collected baseline data. However, the Project's focus on food security and water availability for the most vulnerable and poorest households is highly likely to have had mitigating effect on the burden caused by HIV/AIDS. Again, more systematic approach and the development of measurable indicators are needed in order to assess the real impact.

Most villages in the areas targeted by the Project in Chikwawa face considerable difficulties related to the recurrent draught and flood situation which periodically ruins crop and kills livestock on a large scale. Most of the communities also have limited or no access to potable water which severely affects the sanitation standard in the communities and people's health. The Project's focus on water, sanitation and food security are, therefore, welcomed in the villages and is seen as highly relevant to the main development problems and livelihood threats in the area. While the impact may be on a small scale, it is clearly felt in the villages and the main frustration is that it is not on a larger scale – that the Project is not able to deliver more goats than it has, that it hasn't provided more inputs into improving water security, etc. One of the areas where the Project has clearly impacted not only the targeted beneficiaries but the communities as a whole is through its construction of wells. This was emphasized during focus group discussions in the villages and the general impression seems to be that it has significantly improved health in the communities. Although in many villages there had been problems with the wells because of floods or excessive drought, the wells had been an important asset to the communities while they functioned. The challenge to the Project now is to improve the impact of this component and to ensure it is made sustainable.

As mentioned above, a close and beneficial relationship seems to have developed between the Project staff and people participating in the Project's activities in the villages in Chikwawa. The community based approach used in the Project appears to have successfully promoted active participation in the Project's activities and a sense of ownership, responsibility and team spirit among the participants. However, during the consultation there were some indications that this sense of ownership may be too restricted to the direct beneficiaries of the Project. In some places, for example, it was felt that while the focus on the most vulnerable was justifiable, the goat scheme could easily expand to benefit more people in the communities. This is something that the Project team may want to consider. While prioritising the poorest and most vulnerable, a wider involvement of other groups in the communities may further increase and broaden the sense of enthusiasm and ownership of the Project in the communities – which in turn may increase the likelihood of its sustainability.

Overall assessment of impact

In conclusion, although the impact of the Water Resource Use and Management Project in Chikwawa may be small scale, the consultations in the villages gave strong impression that it is having an important impact on the targeted households already. This is particularly evident in the impact the goat pass-on scheme appears to have had on food security and income level of those households. Other initiatives such as the construction of wells, where they have lasted, have clearly had positive impact in the wider communities. However, the short time the Project has been implemented in Chikwawa means that its impact is just starting to manifest and the lack of baseline data makes it practically impossible to measure the impact systematically. In regard to impact assessment, the challenge to the Project now is to collect baseline data which makes it possible to measure the impact (this is planned during the next project period) and also to consider carefully what can be done to promote the sustainability of the positive impact it has had.

3.7 Sustainability of Impact and Activities

When considering sustainability of a project the central question is: will the activities initiated by the Project continue and will the outputs be prolonged after the implementing organization pulls out and donor funding discontinued. In regard to the ELDS Water Resource Use and Management Project in Chikwawa, two issues that are important in terms of sustainability will be considered here: the capacity within communities and institutional linkages.

The priorities of the Project are highly relevant in terms of development problems in Chikwawa district and the Project staff has done well in identifying and addressing needs within the communities, as well as creating enthusiasm about the Project on community level. The participatory, community based approach used in the Project has been important tool in promoting this, by making sure that the Project beneficiaries, community volunteers and local leaders are involved in planning and take responsibility of implementation and monitoring. However, inadequate technical knowledge in the communities to sustain some of the outputs of the Project, notably the wells/boreholes and irrigation systems, is a real threat to the sustainability of the Project's outputs and the enthusiasm in the communities. While the Project did put some resources into technical training to enable the communities to maintain the wells/irrigation system and do minor repairs, this appears to have been too little. When the emphasis in the Project will shift from making shallow wells to drilling boreholes in Chikwawa, it will be even more important to build up technical knowledge in the communities. It is vital for the Project to start tackle this as soon as possible to both sustain the physical outputs and promote self-reliance in the communities. According to the draft of the new PD (ELDS 2007a) this kind of training is planned alongside borehole drilling during the new project period.

In regard to the sustainability of boreholes, irrigation systems and other physical outputs it is important for the Project to collaborate closely with the office of the Irrigation and Water Development Ministry as well as the Agriculture Ministry in Chikwawa, to try to find a way to provide the communities with sustainable technical extension services. In the absence of extension services the sustainability of many of

the physical outputs of the Project will be in danger of becoming 'white elephants'. Unfortunately, the chronic lack of financial and technical resources within the government offices in Chikwawa is likely to be a formidable obstacle to promote sustainability in this area. The Irrigation and Water Development office in the district, in particular, seems to be severely neglected by the central government and at the time of the evaluation fieldwork in Chikwawa there was no technical extension personnel stationed in the office. This seems odd, given the severe problem with water resources in Chikwawa and it can only be hoped that the newly launched Second National Water Development Project funded by the World Bank will change this situation. What is within the power of the Project, however, is to build up adequate basic technical capacity in the communities and to collaborate with District Authorities and other NGOs in trying to promote improved government extension services.

Related to the problem of technical capacity-building in the communities is the need for other kind of capacity building, including leadership and conflict resolution training and inter-community collaboration. During the consultation in the villages for this evaluation, the monitoring committees in the communities acknowledged having received some training in leadership but all felt it had been inadequate and emphasized the need for longer and more advanced training. As indicated in the draft of the new PD, this is an area that the ELDS is planning to focus on extensively during the new project period and that is to be encouraged. In addition to governance and management training, the Project intends to offer training in resource mobilization and sustainability, as well as to promote linkages between the communities and the District Assembly (as a funding provider). With this, the Project may be able to help the communities to develop way to lobby for resources and support from the government in the future and sustain the benefits of the Project. While the planned training will, hopefully, promote the anticipated self-reliance in the communities and, therefore, the sustainability of the Project, realistically this will have to go hand-in-hand with a favourable political will on the part of the government. The point here is, to caution against the expectation that rural communities in Chikwawa, which are faced with dire poverty and limited opportunities, can become entirely self-reliant. In order for that to happen they will need basic inputs and extension services from the government. This is why it is critical for ELDS to lobby and collaborate with the government on a Project level as well.

It was pointed out in the mid-term evaluation of the ICDP in 2006 (Nakhumwa 2006) that a weak coordination and collaboration with decentralized government structures are likely to have negative implications for sustainability and this point needs also to be emphasized here, in regard to the Project in Chikwawa. The decentralized development structures of the government include the VDCs and other village- or area-based committees such as Village Natural Resource Management Committees, and it is an unfortunate fact that in many areas of Malawi, including Chikwawa, these government structures are weak and in some places non-functional. To coordinate non-government development activities with these bodies can be a major challenge and may in some cases threaten to decrease the impact of development projects. For the sake of sustainability, an attempt to collaborate with the government structure is nevertheless very important.

In Chikwawa, as in other areas targeted by the Project during 2004-2006 project period the Project facilitated the establishment of project implementation structures parallel with the government decentralized structure on a village and area level. While these structures have in most cases functioned well with the training and support provided from the Project, this kind of arrangement is, in the long run, unlikely to be in the best interest of the communities and the sustainability of the Project's outputs and activities. According to ELDS staff, the organization is planning to review this aspect of its implementation strategy. It may want to consider resolving some of the committees that have been established and put instead effort and resources into reviving appropriate government development committees on a community and area level. A considerable effort should, furthermore, be put into linking the Project's implementation committees (such as the VMCs and the SMCs) with appropriate level in the government development structure – in other words, to strengthen the institutional linkages in the area. This should promote sustainability and prepare the communities to take over the activities when the Project comes to an end. To collaborate with government is an important part of maximising the long-term impact of ELDS's much needed development activities.

3.8 Conclusion

The high relevance of the Water Resource Use and Management Project can hardly be doubted. The ELDS has crafted a project which is anchored in the development priorities of the Malawi Government and the UN Millennium Development Goals. The analysis in this report shows that the Project has put a considerable effort into achieving the original objectives and more or less followed activity plans and plans about physical inputs. The 'pass-on' goat scheme initiative appears to have been one of the most successful activities implemented during 2004-2006, notably in Chikwawa. With the goat scheme and the establishment of irrigation schemes and treadle pump garden clubs, the Project has contributed to increased food security among the Project beneficiaries. Although on a small-scale, this kind of initiative can make an important impact in areas like Chikwawa, if it is well planned and coordinated with similar development activities by government and other NGOs.

Although the conclusion of the assessment of this project is thus largely positive, there is certainly a room for improvement and some are already being planned by ELDS for the next project period. To promote a long-term impact and sustainability, a much more emphasis needs to be put on capacity building on community level as well as to develop linkages with government services and decentralized political and development structure. Increased focus on capacity building and sustainability is, in fact, already planned for the new project period, as is a shift from the construction of shallow well to the drilling of boreholes in Chikwawa. According to the new draft Project Document, the Project intends to continue to mainstream gender issues and promote women's rights. However, the draft is vague about how the Project intends to accomplish this. In order to move statements about gender and women's rights beyond empty rhetoric, the Project needs to develop relevant database and indicators that can be used to measure impact in this area against. In a similar vein, although the Project is likely to reach household affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic through focusing on the poorest and marginalized, it needs to develop a database and clear indicators which can be used to measure impact against.

One of the strength of the Project is the highly qualified staff involved in the implementation in Chikwawa (including staff based in Lilongwe). This is an important asset for the Project and should be cultivated and the active participation of staff in Chikwawa in the planning and decision making within the Project encouraged. In the interest of an efficient implementation of the Project, the Project management may, furthermore, consider finding a way to make the cash flow to the field office in Chikwawa more efficient. Finally, in terms of sustainability, it is crucial for the Project to integrate its activities and project management structure on community level into the government decentralized development and political structure in Chikwawa. According to the draft of the new Project Document this is a major emphasis in the implementation of the Project during 2007-2010 period and the findings from this assessment strongly encourage that.

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a tentative assessment of the Tete Integrated Rural Development Project (in this chapter referred to as “the Tete Project”) which is implemented by the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) in Tete Province in Mozambique. The assessment is based on a four day fieldwork in April 2007 in two of the Project’s targeted districts, namely Tsangano and Maravia districts (Annex D). Brief focus group discussions were held with beneficiaries in two villages in each district and semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with key staff members of the LWF in Tete and Maputo, as well as with government officials in Tete and in Maravia district. Representatives from ICA and ICEIDA were consulted about the collaboration with the LWF in Mozambique, through direct consultation and questionnaires (Annex E). Various logistical difficulties and unexpected travel delays because of poor road conditions in the Tete Province affected the fieldwork in Mozambique and significantly limited the time available to consult with the Project’s beneficiaries. As a result, the fieldwork data from Mozambique is more limited than from Malawi and this evaluation is therefore more heavily based on progress and monitoring documentation of the Project, made available to the consultant by the LWF Headquarters in Maputo and the ICA and ICEIDA Headquarters in Reykjavik.

The chapter starts with a brief overview of the history and work of the LWF in Tete. It then assesses the relevance of the Project in the light of the policies and priorities of the donors and the LWF, as well as the policy context in Mozambique and the local condition in Tete Province. The effectiveness and the efficiency of the Project are assessed in the chapter and followed by an appraisal of the Project’s impact and possible sustainability. The chapter ends with a concluding discussion.

4.2 History and Description of the Project

The history and work of LWF Mozambique

The LWF has, through its Department for World Service (DWS), been involved in Mozambique since 1977. To begin with, the Programme in Mozambique focused mainly on work with internally displaced people (refugees) both within Mozambique and in the neighbouring countries. Since the end of the civil war in Mozambique it has continued to work with marginalized and disadvantaged communities in the most remote regions of Mozambique. The LWF Mozambique operates as a country programme of the LWF/DWS and was in 1986 registered as an international NGO in Mozambique (LWF 2006b). The Programme is headed by an expatriate Country Representative and its funding is channelled through the LWF/DWS in Geneva. The main donors of the LWF Mozambique are both church-based and secular donor agencies in Austria, Canada, Sweden, the USA, Germany, Finland, Norway and Iceland (LWF 2004a).

Currently the LWF operates in four project zones in Mozambique: in Gaza, Sofala and Tete Provinces where it implements integrated rural development projects, and in Maputo Province where it operates a pilot project on human rights and the health of

women. In addition, it works in the Maratane refuges camp in the Nampula Province. The work of the LWF Mozambique is presently based on a Country Strategy Outline (CSO) developed through a participatory process which involved local staff, partner communities and international partners, including the ICA. Covering the period 2004-2009, the CSO spells out the strategic priorities and objectives of the operation in Mozambique; defines the strategic approach used; and gives an overview of the areas of operation in the country (LWF 2004a). Through the CSO 2004-2009 the LWF commits to continue to work with the marginalized and vulnerable and to facilitate development in the area of food security, agricultural practices, water, health and education. A major emphasis in the work of LWF Mozambique is on the cross-cutting issues of gender equality, environmental issues and HIV/AIDS.

Brief history of the Tete Project

LWF/DWS started its work in Tete in 1984 with a technical and material support to the Provincial Directorate responsible for rural water supply. The Tete Project was formally established in 1986, continuing with the focus on water but expanding into other areas, including health and agriculture over the next few years. In the early 1990s the emphasis of the Project was on rehabilitation of infrastructure after the civil war in Mozambique, as well as on helping returning refugees and providing emergency relief during periods of drought. During this early period, the LWF worked in four districts in Tete: Angonia, Macanga, Tasngano and Maravia.

From the mid 1990s the Project's activities have been changing from the emphasis on emergency relief and rehabilitation towards long-term community development, participatory approach, capacity building and result-based monitoring and evaluation system. ICA has been supporting the Tete Project from 1993 with donations from ICEIDA (ICA 2002). When the formal ICA/ICEIDA joint support to the Project started in 2001, it was being implemented in Macanga, Maravia and Angonia districts and coordinated from the LWF provincial office in Tete. The ICA/ICEIDA joint funding was based on a formal contract between ICEIDA and ICA (PSSÍ/Hk 2001) where each committed to contributing 50% of the total funding of US\$228.000 for a period of three years. Initially, the ICA/ICEIDA support to the Tete Project was defined as a 'project within a project' and was allocated to the water component of the Project.

During the initial three year period, ICA/ICEIDA funded the drilling/construction of 49 boreholes and shallow wells, the construction of 121 san plat toilets and the renovation of the water supply system in the capital of Maravia district, Fingoe town. In addition, the ICA/ICEIDA funding was used to train water committees to maintain the boreholes and wells, and to conduct numerous community training courses on health and sanitation issues (ICA 2004). Although the ICA/ICEIDA funding was in this way allocated to a particular component of the Tete Project, the water-related activities were implemented alongside and in correspondence with all the other components of the Project.



Photo 5: A water point constructed with funding from ICEIDA/ICA in Kalipale village in Tsangano District

ICA continued to provide funding to the Tete Project in 2004 and 2005 without contribution from ICEIDA. However, the contract between ICA and ICEIDA to jointly contribute funds to the Tete Project was renewed in 2006. In the new contract the donor agencies commit to contribute US\$300.000 over a three year period, or US\$100.000 per year. This time, ICEIDA financial contribution is to be 60% of the total amount and ICA 40%. In addition, ICA has committed to handle administration and monitoring of the Project, on behalf of the two donors. The ICA/ICEIDA support to the Tete Project is no longer defined as a 'project within a project'. It now is a contribution to the general operational funds of the Project and is used to support a variety of Project activities. The current four main objectives of the Project relate to issues of food security, human rights, HIV/AIDS and health, environmental issues, and capacity building of both LWF staff and local communities. As before the target group of the Project are the marginalized and most vulnerable groups in the community. The Project is coordinated from the LWF/DWS Tete Office, headed by a Project Coordinator (Coordenadora do Projecto), while the day-to-day implementation is the responsibility of LWF District Community Development Officers currently stationed in the Project's sub-offices in Maravia and Macanga districts. During the current project period, the Project will phase-out in Maravia and Macanga districts, where it has been implemented for over 10 years, and new sub-offices will be opened in Chifunde and Tsangano districts where the LWF has recently started to implement the Project.

4.3 Relevance: Policies and Development Priorities

The relevance of the Tete Project is assessed here in the light of the development priorities of the LWF Programme in Mozambique and of the Mozambique

Government. The relevance of the Project in terms of the local situation and needs in the Tete Province is also assessed, as well as its relevance to the policies and approaches of the donor agencies, of which an overview was given in chapter three.

LWF priorities and approach

According to the CSO (LWF 2004a), the overall mission of the LWF Mozambique is to contribute to the development of viable and sustainable households and communities in the country. The Programme takes pride in its reputation of being ‘close to the grassroots’ and works hard to involve its target groups – the vulnerable and the marginalized – in the planning and implementation of all its initiatives (“community-driven development”). LWF Mozambique emphasises integrated approach to development and among its core values are the cross-cutting themes of environmental protection and gender equality. Supporting communities to reduce risk and vulnerability to HIV/AIDS and alleviate the impact of the epidemic is one the programme’s four main strategic priorities at present. Another of its current strategic priorities is to strengthen its own organizational capacity in order to ensure the quality of its initiatives and the ability to effectively respond to emergencies.

Development priorities in Mozambique

In spite of being one of the poorest countries in the world, over the last few years, Mozambique has made considerable progress in the fight against poverty. The current blueprint for development efforts in Mozambique is the poverty reduction strategy paper PARPA II (GOMoz 2006). It is an operational development plan for the Government and its development partners, and incorporates the Government’s strategic vision for poverty reduction. The overall goal in the PARPA II is the reduction of absolute poverty through the promotion of rapid economic growth that is sustainable, favourable to investment and nurtures the national business community. In line with the emphasis in the UN MDGs, the PARPA II focuses on health, education, food-security, access to potable water and adequate sanitation facilities, and good governance. It emphasizes the consolidation of national unity and democracy in Mozambique and is committed to the confrontation of corruption. Promotion of gender equality, halting the spread of HIV/AIDS, and environmental protection are among the cross-cutting issues endorsed in the PARPA II.

The local context

Tete Province is situated in the west central part of Mozambique and bordered by Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Tete Project has and continues to be implemented in some of the most remote districts in the Province. Because of the isolation of the districts, very few development agencies are attracted to working there and the districts also seem to have been largely neglected by the central government. As a result, development work there has been limited compare to many other areas in Mozambique and infrastructure in these districts is very poor. Roads are in bad condition, which makes large parts of these districts inaccessible during the rainy season, and access to health services and education facilities is lacking or difficult. In addition, the target areas of the Project have been severely affected by frequent periods of drought during the last few years which has severely affected access to water and resulted in critical hunger situation. The Tete Province has one of the

highest prevalence of people living with HIV/AIDS in Mozambique which in part is due to the confluence there of truck drivers transporting goods between the East Coast of Africa and Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi and parts of South Africa.

Overall assessment of the Project's relevance

With the overall objective to reduce poverty and promote sustainable development, the Tete Project has emphasized capacity building and self-reliance in its targeted communities, as well as sought to empower households through the promotion of food security, access to potable water and sanitation facilities, and access to health and education. It has been implemented in geographically marginalized areas in Tete Province, with the focus on the most vulnerable social groups, including those affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. The priorities and the approach in the Project can, therefore, be said to be consistent with the development policies and priorities of both the donor agencies (see chapter 3) and the Mozambique Government (summarized above). With its emphasis on participatory approach and ability to adjust to changing local needs in the targeted communities in Tete, the Project appears to be both consistent with and relevant to the local context in which it is being implemented.

4.4 Effectiveness: Objectives, Activities and Outputs

Effectiveness of a project relates to the extent to which formally specified objectives have been achieved through the particular outputs produced (Samset 1994; DANIDA 1999). The aim here is to assess the effectiveness of the Tete Project. Although the specific objectives of the Project have changed somewhat through time, the main emphases in the Project have largely remained the same over the last seven years. The approach here will be to assess the effectiveness of the Project (the achievements of the main objectives) using the frame of the current LWF strategic priorities. While a particular attention will be given to the water and sanitation component, which ICA and ICEIDA jointly supported during 2001-2003, consideration will be given to all the components of the Project as the ICA/ICEIDA support is currently not earmarked for any particular component.

Project goal

The project goal (or development objective), which inevitably depends on a number of factors beyond the control of an individual project, should describe the anticipated long-term overall objective of the project. Although the wording of the stated goal of the Tete Project has changed slightly through time, it has stayed the same in essence – that is, to promote sustainable development and reduce poverty through increased food security and access to social services (including clean water). Support to local communities to reduce the risk and vulnerability to HIV/AIDS has also become a part of the overall development objective of the Project in the current Project Document (PD) for the period 2007-2009. There, the project goal is defined more clearly than in previous PDs and links easily to the justification of the Project and its specific objectives. Throughout, the target group of the Project has remained the same – the marginalized and the most vulnerable. However, although the Project has no doubt reached these groups, it seems a bit unclear what criteria has been used to

systematically identify the most vulnerable in the communities. This is something LWF Mozambique may want to look into.

Food security, access to social services and human rights

To empower households and communities through the promotion of food security, sustainable agricultural practices, income generating activities and access to clean water, health and education facilities has been a major focus in the Tete Project. It has remained one of the main objectives in all the PDs since 2001 and is listed as the first strategic priorities in the current CSO (LWF 2004a). It is this component to which the ICA/ICEIDA funding contributed during the period 2001-2003. Activities implemented to achieve this objective have focused, on the one hand, on inputs to promote agricultural productivity. Throughout the period, the Project has facilitated training to enhance agricultural technical skills, to raise awareness on viable agricultural practices, and to promote knowledge on processing and storage of agricultural products. The Project has also provided agricultural inputs and in later years emphasis on environmental protection has gained increasing significance. Activities towards achieving this objective have, on the other hand, focused on providing access to clean water and acceptable sanitation. This has included the construction or rehabilitation of water sources (wells and boreholes), provision of training courses on technical maintenance of water sources as well as course on hygiene and sanitation, and the facilitation of construction of latrines.



Photo 6: Consultation with members of a water committee in Massambilio Village in Tsangano District

Documents made available for this assessment show that planned activities to achieve this objective have been consistently implemented. LWF internal monitoring indicates that crop diversification (promoting food security) has increased in the targeted communities, more sustainable agricultural practices and methods to control soil

erosion have been adopted and bush burning has decreased. The Project's promotion of agro-forestry and especially the use of drought tolerant crops have been shown to make a significant impact in communities troubled by a recurrent drought situation. In terms of the water component, the Project has continued to construct and rehabilitate water sources as planned throughout. This has clearly made an impact in the communities visited during the fieldwork for this assessment. None of them had a source of clean water in the village before and according to the people consulted, the intervention has made an important impact on the health situation in the villages and on the work load of women. In Maravia district, the water committees trained by LWF to maintain and look after the boreholes seemed content with the training (technical and managerial) they had received, while in Tsangano district, where LWF has worked for only a short time, training had not yet been offered in the communities visited but is said to be planned.



Photo 7: Consultation with the CDC and other villagers in Nyamanzi village in Maravia District

The main challenge for the Tete Project towards achieving this objective appears to have been the poor infrastructure in the remote areas in which it is being implemented. The fertile soil in Maravia district, for example, gives potential for high agricultural production. However, roads are very poor and marketing infrastructure is practically non-existing. As a result the farmers have limited options when selling their product and end up selling at a very low price, even under production cost. Part of the activities implemented by LWF in relation to this objective is to offer business training courses in the communities and facilitate reconstruction of the mud-roads by the communities after the rainy season. Unfortunately, as it has been largely beyond LWF's scope to permanently improve roads and marketing infrastructure in the district the impact of these activities has been less than hoped for and their sustainability questionable.

Reducing risk and vulnerability to HIV/AIDS

Although a focus on HIV/AIDS was not listed as a specific objective in the PD for the 2001-2003 period, raising awareness of the epidemic was a part of implemented activities during that time. In the PD for 2004-2006, the reduction of risk and vulnerability to HIV/AIDS became one of the Project's main objectives and is now a part of the LWF Mozambique Strategic Priorities (LWF 2004a). Given that Mozambique has the 10th highest HIV prevalence in the world (LWF 2006a) and Tete Province has one of the highest HIV prevalence in Mozambique, this seems indeed an appropriate main objective for the Tete Project. Activities implemented in relations to achieving this objective have throughout included awareness-raising and advocacy, counselling, the facilitation of support network and other coping mechanisms in the communities in their struggle to cope with the impact of the epidemic. An important part of the LWF HIV/AIDS intervention has been to work with Traditional Healers in the communities and to train and support HIV/AIDS community activists. These volunteers then become important link between the LWF and the communities in the implementation of this component.

It is largely beyond the scope of this evaluation to comment on the achievement of the HIV/AIDS objective of the Tete Project as the focus during the fieldwork in Tete was on the implementation of the water component and the time for consultation with villagers was very limited. However, there is no doubt that the HIV/AIDS epidemic is a challenge to the achievement of all of the Project's development objectives and the integration of interventions to try to reduce the risk and vulnerability of communities to the epidemic is highly appropriate. The strategy to work with Traditional Healers and community volunteers is a part of the LWF's apparently effective use of community participation in the implementation of the Tete Project and seems likely to have positive implication for both impact and sustainability.

Advocacy, local capacity and access to services

Building capacity on the local level and facilitating linkage between communities and service providers has been an objective of the Tete Project from 2001. Activities implemented to achieve this objective have mainly involved the facilitation of a variety of training courses, including courses on leadership, management and administration. In later years community training in advocacy to enable community members to demand basic services and mobilize their resources for their own development activities has become an important component in the Tete Project. To amplify the voices of the marginalized and facilitate their access to essential services is now one of the LWF's strategic priorities (LWF 2004a).

Consultations with villagers, the LWF staff and government officials during the fieldwork for the assessment gave a strong indication that the Tete Project has succeeded in building up motivation and organizational capacity in many of the targeted communities, notably in Maravia district where LWF has been working for over 10 years. The establishment and training of Community Development Committees (CDCs) in the targeted communities seem to have facilitated wide community participation. Many CDCs in Maravia have now become the driving force in the communities, in not only initiating, planning and monitoring development initiatives but also in mobilizing human and material resources. Within LWF the

capacity building and high motivation within many of the communities in Maravia is flagged up as an indication of the success of the community-based approach used to implement the Tete Project. Consultation with government officials in Maravi confirmed this view and indicated the need for LWF to pass their approach on to government. The stationing of LWF Community Development Assistants within the communities has no doubt promoted the strong working relationship between the LWF and the communities.

In addition to capacity building, and as a preparation for its 'graduation' from Maravia district, LWF has made an effort to facilitate various linkages between the communities and external service providers. An example of that is the link that has been established between the communities and private businesses that now provide spare parts for wells and boreholes to the most remote communities in Maravia district. The establishment of such linkages is obviously an important part of promoting the sustainable impact of the Tete Project.

Organizational capacity and partnership

In order to promote high performance and quality services, the strengthening of organizational capacity within the LWF has been an objective in the Tete Project since 2004 and is now also one of the strategic priorities of the LWF Mozambique Programme as a whole (2004a). The emphasis has been on training staff in effective planning, implementation and monitoring practices; improving project monitoring reporting and accountability; and improving financial management. In addition, staff has received training in IT, gender mainstreaming, environmental impact assessment and advocacy.

Although it seems a bit unusual to have it as an objective in an individual project, to maintain motivation and ensure professional capacity among staff is an important factor in a successful implementation of development projects. An external evaluation that was done on the Tete Project in late 2002 raised concerns about staff's ability to implement long-term development initiatives and it seems to have been a major focus for LWF since. Apart from staff training, this has included the institutionalization of a new result-based monitoring and evaluation system, and a larger emphasis on baseline studies to come up with indicators to measure project performance against. All of this is important development and shows that LWF is serious about the long-term impact of its projects in Mozambique.

The year 2006 marked the beginning of the implementation of some elements of the new monitoring and evaluation system, which emphasises the participation of local communities in the monitoring and the evaluation of the LWF projects. The development and refining of the system is still in progress. In 2005, a baseline study was conducted in preparation for expanding the Tete Project into the two new districts, Tsangano and Chifunde districts (LWF 2005b) and in 2006 an environmental impact assessment was conducted in Tsangano district (Chintu et al. 2006). These baseline studies give the Tete Project important baseline data to measure the impact of the Project in Tsangano and Chifunde districts against. In recent years, the LWF has also started to develop a staff training programme which is based on training-need-assessments. This will be further discussed in the chapter on human resources below.

4.5 Efficiency: Resources and Management

Human Resources

The overall planning, implementation and monitoring of the Tete Project is coordinated by a Project Coordinator who is based in Tete town. The Project Coordinator is responsible for supervising the efficient and timely implementation of planned project activities in all the targeted districts in the Province and the overall supervision of staff. In cooperation with the Assistant Project Coordinator and other staff in Tete, the Project Coordinator ensures that monthly implementation meetings are held and regular progress reports are submitted to the Maputo Office.

At a district level the implementation of the Tete Project is supervised by Community Development Officers (CDOs) who head the Project sub-offices in the districts. The CDOs are responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the Project in the districts, together with two or more Community Development Assistants (CDAs). The CDOs supervise the work of the CDAs and are responsible for preparing monthly implementation plan as well as a monthly progress report. The CDO is a key liaison person in the Project's collaboration with government authorities and development partners on the district level.

The Community Development Assistants work directly with the partner communities in the implementation of the Project and are based in different parts of the districts where they are responsible for a number of villages. The CDAs work closely with the Community Development Committees (CDCs) on local level in planning, implementing and monitoring the Project, as well as in solving problems that arise. Because of the regular contact and intimate relationship with the communities, the CDAs play a key role in facilitating the successful implementation of the Project and its sustainability.

In 2002 an external evaluation of the Tete Project raised concern about the ability of the Project's staff to effectively switch from emergency relief work to implementing long-term development (LWF 2007a). This has been responded to within LWF by putting in place a system of staff capacity development which is based on training-need-assessments of staff and the offer of appropriate, mainly internal training opportunities. The training has so far mainly tackled issues of capacity in planning, implementing and evaluating development interventions, and some staff have also been offered result-based management training. A major focus in the training is to increase staff's ability to effectively involve other stakeholders in the planning and implementing of LWF projects. Staff capacity building is now a part of the LWF Mozambique strategic priorities (LWF 2004a) and is even build into its project documents. The Tete staff acknowledges and appreciates the effort LWF is putting into building the capacity of its staff and staff members who have worked for LWF for a long time confirmed that the attention given to staff capacity has increased significantly in recent years. Nevertheless, there seems to be a sense among staff members that in the absence of human resource development policy the training is still largely done on an ad hoc basis and too often coincides with very busy periods in the annual cycle of project implementation. In the Maputo Office the lack of a human resource development policy is acknowledged as a certain weakness in the Mozambique Programme but it is an area within the Programme that is currently

being developed. In the past, the Tete Project has been challenged by a high turn-over of staff but this has apparently stabilized in recent years and some of the staff members have been with the Project for years.

The Community Development Committees and other committees established on the community level through the Project are not only beneficiaries of the Project's outputs but a vital human resource in the Project. In each targeted communities the Project team facilitates the election of approximately nine CDC members through a secret ballot during public meetings in the villages. Through training in leadership and other capacity building, provided by the Tete Project, the CDCs are expected to become the driving force of development in the communities and to develop a capacity to initiate, plan, implement and monitor community development projects, and to mobilize necessary human and material resources. In areas such as Maravia district, where the Tete Project has been implemented over a long period of time, many of the CDCs have developed into highly motivated and independent groups which initiate their own projects. A part of the 'graduation' process in districts such as Maravia, the Project team has been working on strengthening the linkage between the CDCs and the government authorities and other service providers to try to sustain the impact of the Tete Project (see further below).

Financial Resources

In the original contract for the period 2001-2003, ICA/ICEIDA pledged a total amount of US\$228.000 of which ICEIDA committed to paying 50% and ICA 50% (PSSÍ/Hk 2001). The donors did honour their commitments and dispatched the funds in a timely manner all three years. The new contract for the period 2006-2008 involves a commitment to pay a total amount of US\$300.000, or US\$100.000 per year. This time ICEIDA has committed to pay 60% of the total amount and ICA 40% in addition to handling administration and monitoring of the Tete Project (PSSÍ/Hk 2006).

A Finance Manager based in Maputo provides overall financial management support to the Tete Project and other LWF projects in Mozambique. The support to the Tete Project includes assistance with budget preparation, monitoring of project spending, preparation of financial reports and training of the Project's staff in maintenance of accounts and financial records. A Project Accountant for the Tete Project is based in Tete town and his responsibilities concern the day-to-day financial management of the Project. This includes responsibility for staff salary and payroll record, monitoring of all financial transaction and project expenditure control (including the monitoring of procurement procedures). In addition, the Project Accountant works with the Project Coordinator and other staff in Tete to make annual project budgets which are sent to the Maputo Office for comments and approval.

The financial management of the Tete Project is based on a three year project plan which is adjusted at the beginning of each year to match the donor funding available. Needless to say the dependency on donors can sometimes significantly change the implementation plan of the Project and delay activities. In 2003, for example, the planned budget was US\$761.000 while actual donor funding available that year was only US\$443.263 (ICA 2004). In cooperation with the Project Coordinator and other staff in Tete, the Financial Accountant prepares a monthly financial report of the Tete

Project which needs to be submitted to the Maputo office before the 5th of each month. The Maputo Office transfers funds to the Tete Project on a monthly basis, based on the report for the previous month and a request for operational funds for the following month which has to be submitted to Maputo before the 15th of the previous month. The monthly financial reports from the Tete Project have to be approved by the Geneva Office before funds are released. This is a slow and bureaucratic process which apparently often causes a delay in fund release and affects the activities plans of the Project. This sometimes means that planned activities have to be postponed and that can affect the trust towards LWF in the partner communities. It can also negatively affect relationship with donors as the Project may not have time to spend funds that are expected by a donor to be used by a certain time.

Generally, there are no financial transactions between the Tete Office and the Project sub-offices in the targeted districts. This is mainly because a limited range of goods and services are available in the remote districts and bank facilities are few and far between. The CDOs that head the sub-offices send monthly activities plans which show what the offices need in terms of goods, training cost, logistics, etc. The goods are then purchased in Tete town and sent along with small amount of funds, if needed, to the districts.

The account above shows that the LWF has a firm system of internal financial control of the Tete Project. The finances are controlled centrally which makes procedures and transactions slow but secure. In addition to the internal control, independent auditors audit the finances of the entire LWF Mozambique Programme annually.

Management and Monitoring

Community participation is a central feature of the Tete Project and the involvement of the partner communities is therefore an important part of management and monitoring procedures in the Project. The establishment and capacity building of the CDCs is looked at as central to the sustainability of the outputs and impact of the Project, and they play a key role in managing and monitoring the implementation of the Project on village level. Strong, motivated and independent CDCs are expected to gradually take charge of development initiatives in the communities while the LWF takes on a role of support and facilitation. Under the leadership of the CDCs, variety of community groups/committees are established in the villages which each takes parts in the day-to-day implementation of the Project. Water committees are formed, for example, in villages where wells and boreholes have been constructed. These water committees are closely involved in the construction of the water sources and take over the responsibility of maintaining them after they have been established. One or two committee member receives technical training in the maintenance of the water pumps to ensure sustainability.

The CDCs which have capacity to do so, submit written monitoring reports approximately monthly to the Project while those who do not have capacity to write reports, report verbally to the CDAs who are based in the area. The CDOs also write monthly monitoring and progress reports based on the reporting from the communities and the CDAs. These reports are submitted to the Assistant Project Coordinator, based in Tete town, who, in cooperation with the Project Coordinator

and others on the project team, writes quarterly monitoring/progress reports that are submitted to the LWF Maputo Office. The quarterly reports are used to compile bi-annual progress reports which reflect the overall progress made in the implementation of the Project, as well as reporting on its financial performance. These reports are submitted to donors and are also shared with government authorities and other stakeholders.

Apart from report writing, the monitoring and management of the Project also involves quarterly site visits by the Project management in Tete (the Project Coordinator or the Assistant Project Coordinator) and monthly meetings of a Project implementation committee. The annual planning of the Project is based on an annual internal evaluation and planning meeting which usually is held in November each year. In these meetings the quarterly reports are used as a point of reference to review the Project progress, identify problems, and discuss solutions and the way forward. External evaluation of the entire LWF programme in Mozambique is planned every six years and is expected to take place next in 2008.

Throughout the monitoring and managing process of the Tete Project, attempts are made to involve government authorities at a different level as much as possible and coordinate the work with relevant ministries and authorities (see below). The LWF management in Maputo, including the Country Representative, the Programme Coordinator and the Financial Manager, provide an overall management support to the Tete Project. This involves regular, periodic visits and regular contact to Tete to support the Project team in the planning, budgeting, monitoring, and reporting of the Project.

Collaboration with government

The management and staff of the Tete Project seem to have developed a smooth relationship with relevant government authorities in Tete town, as well as Maravia district. The Office of Water and Sanitation, which is under the Ministry of Public Work, is located next door to the LWF office in Tete and both parties assert that good communication and working relationship exists between the two offices. The role of the Office of Water and Sanitation in Tete is to coordinate all development activities related to water and sanitation in the Province. Independent NGOs that are implementing activities related to water and sanitation are expected to work according to the government water policy and the annual plans developed by the Office of Water and Sanitation in Tete, which also allocates areas to NGOs to work in. According to the government official in Tete consulted for this assessment, the government tries to encourage NGOs to work in the most needy districts of Tete Province, which often are remote. However, many NGOs are reluctant to work in districts that are far from Tete Town and are difficult to communicate with. The LWF has been different in that it has been willing to work in remote areas and that is appreciated by the government. The LWF office submits regular reports of its activities in the Province to the Office of Water and Sanitation and has also kept the Office informed about activities plans. The LWF's ability to respond quickly to emergencies in the district is greatly valued by the government authorities.

There was not a chance to consult government authorities in Tsangano District during the assessment but in Maravia district the LWF has been a long-term partner to

government in development. LWF is among very few NGOs that work in Maravia district and is the only NGO with an office in Fingoe Town, which is the capital of Maravia District. It is referred to as “the mother organization of Maravia” by government authorities there. As in Tete town, the government authorities in Maravia reported good working relationship and frequent communication with LWF. The official consulted asserted that LWF is careful in working according to the district development plan in Maravia and regularly reports to government on their activities and the progress of the Tete Project. The role that the LWF has played in dealing with emergency and refugee situation in Maravia is highly appreciated.

While working relationship and communication between LWF and government authorities in Tete appear to be smooth, the lack of government resources and ability (or willingness?) to contribute its fair share to the success of the Tete Project has frustrated the implementation of the Project and does indeed threaten the sustainability of the Project’s outputs and impact. A good example of this is the bad condition of roads in Maravia district which the local authorities appear to lack resources to maintain, which in turn has very negative impact on food security and the sustainability of the Project’s outputs. However, the current plan of the central government in Mozambique to progressively provide more funding to local governments, and in that way strengthen the decentralized government structure, does give reason for optimism. According to the LWF staff in Maravia district, the LWF is currently engaged in discussion with the local government authorities on how the outputs of the Project in the district can be sustained after the LWF withdraws from the district. Part of this is to try to ensure an effective linkage between the communities and various government offices. The communities that LWF has been working in, in Maravia, have developed technical and leadership capacity which gives the LWF confidence that they will continue with the development work that LWF has started in their villages (AusAID and LWF 2005a).

Some frustration was detected among the LWF staff for the tendency within the government to simply receive reports from the Project and not engage otherwise in the monitoring of the Project. This apparent lack of interest (which may be lack of resources?) and the implication it has on the sense of ownership and sustainability of the Project’s outputs understandably concerns the LWF staff. Another area of concern that some LWF staff expressed was the selection of villages that are targeted by the Project. Apparently the selection is based on direction from government authorities and there is a sense that the selection may sometimes be politically motivated rather than based on needs. However, while there are challenges in the collaboration with government authorities, and some of it may be largely beyond the Project’s control, it is important for the Project to continue to seek collaboration with government and negotiate solutions to challenges and difficulties.

Relationship with ICA/ICEIDA

The LWF office in Tete has little direct communication with the donors of the Project except when the donors visit the field-sites in the Province. The relationship between the LWF and the donors is nevertheless felt in the Tete Office as it has a direct effect on the implementation plan of the Project and there the ICA is viewed as a committed and reliable donor. Unlike some donors whose funding fluctuates from year to year,

the Tete Office has been able to rely on receiving a consistent funding from ICA through the years and that is clearly appreciated in the Office.

The Maputo Office is the point of contact between LWF and ICA and there too the ICA is seen as a dependable and dynamic donor. In 2003, ICA worked with the LWF Maputo Office in planning the current country strategy and that seems to have strengthened the collaboration. The ICA is perceived as showing a high interest in the Tete Project and the LWF Programme in Mozambique, and to be willing to be flexible to meet changing needs within the Tete Project. As one LWF staff member put it: "They work with us."

From ICA's point of view there is a good working relationship with LWF Mozambique. The community participatory approach used by LWF and the emphasis on working with marginalized and vulnerable people matches ICA own priorities. The effective relationships that the Tete Project has established with the communities they work in, is appreciated by ICA which perceives the planning and the objectives of the Tete Project to be clear and systematic. However, delay in the implementation of some of the components of the Tete Project, as well as late progress reports are some of the weaknesses in the Project that have caused concern. Little direct relationship exists between LWF and ICEIDA as ICA has handled the administration and monitoring on behalf of the donors. However, both the LWF Office and the ICEIDA Office in Maputo seem to be interest in establishing some communication between the offices and it would indeed seem important that the ICEIDA Office in Maputo would be kept better informed about the Tete Project than it has so far. This could be done, for example, through the attendance of an ICEIDA representative at the annual planning meeting of the Project (for auditing purposes only). The ICEIDA office in Reykjavik should, furthermore, make sure that its Maputo office receives all relevant documentation about the Project.

4.6 Impact of Project Activities

Many issues relating to the impact of the Tete Project have already been touched on above and will be brought together here to consider the impact more broadly. The reader needs to keep in mind the time-limit and the nature of this assessment which did not allow for comprehensive consultation or quantitative research into the long-term impact of the Project.

There is no doubt that the Tete Project has made a positive immediate impact in the communities in which it has worked in Tete Province. In the communities visited during the fieldwork for this assessment, villagers asserted that the construction of wells and boreholes had made a greatly valued impact in terms of access to clean water, improving health and in decreasing the workload of women in the communities. At the same time, in most places the construction of one water source was said to be nowhere near to be enough for the population it serves. In a similar way, people talked about the positive impact of the Tete Project on food security through the agriculturally related activities and the promotion of income generating activities such as bee keeping and carpentry. However, again, people's complain was that the initiative was on a too small-scale and much more is needed.

One of the main strengths of the Tete Project is its ability to reach out to and work closely and directly with the communities it serves – the grassroots. The consultation in Tete gave a strong sense that the Project has succeeded in building up motivation and organizational capacity in Maravia, where it has been implemented over a long period of time. The successful formation and motivation of Community Development Committees has been an important part of this and in many communities in Maravi they appear to be likely to carry on with development activities and resource mobilization after the Project phases-out. This has important implications for the impact of the Project and could potentially turn immediate impact into a long-term impact. How long the CDCs will sustain and keep implementing development initiatives is difficult to say though. This depends on a variety of factors, such as the support and services accessible to the communities after the Project phases-out. How this develops is to a large extent beyond the control of the LWF although the promotion by the Project, of various linkages between the communities and service providers before it phases out is likely to help prolong the impact. Perhaps the biggest threat to the long-term impact of the Tete Project, is the remoteness of many of the districts it is implemented in, including the Maravia district, and the poor infrastructure there. It seems likely, for example, that poor roads and marketing infrastructure in Maravia will make the sustainability and long-term impact of some of the Project's outputs and immediate impact, difficult to achieve.



Photo 8: A development project initiated by Mr.E. Jacabu (furthest to the left), a villager in Sangulukani village in Maravia, which was supported by the Project

The impact of the Tete Project may be on a small-scale and the sustainability of some of its immediate impact may be difficult to achieve. However, it is important to remember that many factors, necessary to sustain the Project's impact and to achieve the Project's overall goal to actually reduced poverty in the Tete Province are beyond the scope of any single NGO or development agency. What the Tete Project has certainly done is to reach out to remote areas in Tete Province, where few

development agency or NGOs want to work. It has alleviated poverty related suffering of its beneficiaries and, through capacity building and the establishment of relevant linkages, hopefully managed to develop a strategy which will promote the long-term impact of at least some of its outputs and immediate impacts. Close collaboration with government and other agencies implementing development in Tete (including other NGOs) is, obviously, a crucial factor in promoting the long-term impact of the Project.

4.7 Sustainability of Impact and Activities

In this chapter the sustainability of the activities implemented through the Tete Project in the communities will be discussed. The focus will be on two issues: the level of capacity within the targeted communities and the linkages that the LWF has facilitated between the communities and relevant institutions.

The assessment of the Tete Project showed that the Project has invested a great deal in building technical and leadership capacity within the communities where LWF has worked. The Project uses an integrated participatory approach which is designed to maximize the participation and contribution of the Project's beneficiaries in order to facilitate sustainability and a sense of ownership. Locally available material is used when possible to support the local economy and a major emphasis has been put on offering a variety of training in the communities.

The consultation in the villages for this evaluation, especially in Maravia district where the LWF has been working for over ten years, did give a sense that the LWF has build up a considerable technical capacity within the water committees which are responsible for the necessary repair and the day-to-day maintenance of the wells and boreholes that have been established largely with funding from ICA and ICEIDA. While there will, of course, always be a need for continuous training, the water committees in the villages visited did seem confident about their ability to maintain the water source in their village. Likewise, the CDCs consulted in Maravia district seemed motivated and confident with their training and ability to initiate development projects independently. In Tsangano district, where the LWF started working in 2006, the training in the villages is a work in progress. The only complain in all of the villages was that they needed more boreholes. In one village visited in Tsangano district a single well, which the Tete Project had facilitated the construction of, served almost 350 households. The national policy target is that one water source should serve no more than 500 people.

In addition to building capacity within the targeted communities, the establishment of linkages between them and service providers is important for sustainability. As mentioned above, the Project has facilitated the linkage between communities in Maravia and private businesses which supply spare parts for the repair and maintenance of boreholes and wells. This was done in collaboration with the local government authorities, which should promote further the sustainability of the linkage. The Project has not been as successful in facilitating the linkage between farmers and their buyers as the rehabilitation and construction of marketing infrastructure in beyond the scope of the Project.

Sustainable linkages between rural communities and government extension services and other kind of services are obviously of vital importance in terms of sustainability. Although the Project has apparently worked hard in establishing such linkages, there are some weaknesses in this area, which many are beyond the ability of LWF to control. Like in Malawi, lack of capacity and resources within the local government structure is a challenge in Mozambique. However, with a growing economy and a plan to better fund local government structures, this will hopefully start to improve in Mozambique. In 2006, an internal LWF Program Evaluation found that the relationship between the Community Development Committees established through the Tete Project and the decentralized government structure is not always clear. The new interest that the central government is showing in the development of the districts has promoted the establishment of new structures which the CDCs need to be effectively linked with (LWF 2006a). Although it is a challenge it is important for the Tete Project to continue to strengthen linkages with government and to promote improved extension services and marketing infrastructure in its targeted districts. Without these linkages and services the impact and the sustainability of the Project will be endangered and may not be long lived.

4.8 Conclusion

The LWF Mozambique takes pride in its reputation of being ‘close to the grassroots’. Community participation in the planning, implementing and monitoring of its development initiatives is one of the main strengths of the Tete Project. With sustainability in mind the Project has emphasized capacity building on community level and in many of the communities where the Project has been implemented over a long period of time the communities, through the leadership of Community Development Committees, appear to have motivation and capacity to sustain at least some of the outputs and impact of the Project. Now that the Project is ‘graduating’ from some of the districts in Tete it has increasingly emphasized the linkage between communities and government structures as well as various service providers. This is important for sustained project impact and should be on the agenda from the start of implementation in the districts.

With emphasis on food security and access to services (including access to clean water) there can be little doubt that the objectives of the Tete Project are relevant to the marginalized and neglected districts in which LWF works. The priorities and approaches used are highly consistent with the development policies and priorities of the Mozambique government, as well as the donor agencies (ICEIDA and ICA) and LWF seems to keep up well with the agenda of the international development cooperation.

The Tete Project has clearly made a positive immediate impact in the communities in which it has worked in Tete Province. This includes the water component which in many cases has provided the communities with the only source of clean water available to them. The Project also appears to have made significant effort to sustain the outputs in the water component of the Project by facilitating the sense of ownership of the water source in the community and by building community capacity to maintain them. The long-term impact of the project is more difficult to predict as it depends on a variety of factors which many are beyond the LWF scope to influence.

The remoteness of the places in which LWF works, weak local government structures and poor infrastructure, are some of the major threats to the sustainability and long-term impact of the Tete Project. Again, emphasis on linking the target communities and local government political and development structures, as well as private service providers, is important to have on the agenda from the beginning of implementation and avoid the development of dependency on LWF staff and services.

While emergency relief is still on the agenda of LWF Mozambique, the Programme has over the last decade been changing its emphasis from emergency relief and rehabilitation operation towards long-term community development. This has presented various operational challenges and required increased staff capacity building. Through self-assessment and external evaluation, the LWF appears to have identified many of the weaknesses in its operation over the last few years, including the need for staff capacity building and more systematic and clear monitoring and reporting. The improvement and development of these aspects is still in progress and it will be important for the LWF to continue its self-assessment as well as regular in-depth external evaluations (preferable every three years) to help iron out the weaknesses and built on the strengths. One of the things that need to continue to improve is the reporting of the Tete Project, which needs to include more analysis of the actual impact of the Project based on precise and verifiable indicators. Currently the Project's reports mainly report on the implementation of activities, outputs and felt impact.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 General Conclusions

The overall framework of ICEIDA's policy and priorities is the alleviation of poverty and **focus on poverty** has been consistent in both the ELDS Project in Malawi and the Tete Project in Mozambique, not only in terms of targeting the marginalized and the poorest in a given society but also in directing their work to the poorer geographical areas. The strength of this aspect of the projects does lie more in actions to alleviate the terrible and immediate effects of poverty on poor families, rather than resulting in noticeable and sustainable increases in their standard of living. Such major impact would in any case be beyond the capacity of any single organization and certainly a small NGO such as the ELDS. The conclusion nevertheless is that there is coherence between the projects' focus and priorities and ICEIDA's policy on poverty alleviation

In both Malawi and Mozambique, ICA has built up an effective **partnership** with the local NGOs (ELDS and LWF Mozambique) which is based on trust and close collaboration. This should be viewed as a real strength and an indication of a successful relationship which is likely to promote accountability and project efficiency. The reliability of funding from ICEIDA and ICA, the flexibility that ICA has shown and its willingness to work with the local NGOs on an egalitarian basis has been an important contribution to this partnership.

A considerable strength in the work of many NGOs is their close relationship with the grassroots and ability to effectively mobilize **community participation**. In a short evaluation study it is difficult to determine the level of actual community participation in a project. Community participation certainly seems to have been established and developed in both the Malawi and Mozambique project and there seems to be a high level of motivation in the villages. This is especially apparent in the Tete Project in those districts where it has been implemented over a long period of time. In both projects community participation is seen as the core of the implementation strategy and an important means to ensure sustainability.

Numerous studies have pointed out the tension that often exists between NGOs and government authorities, frequently because the NGOs are seen as bypassing government procedures and sometimes challenge policies and politics of the state. Some tension in the **collaboration with government** was detected in both Malawi and Mozambique, although it seems higher in Malawi. This difference is likely to be due to the constant and epidemic demand for allowances by government staff in Malawi, as a condition for collaboration with NGOs – which in turn is probably linked to lesser resources and capacity within government structures in Malawi than Mozambique. However, both projects recognize the need to collaborate with government and to build up linkages between communities and government services, in order to promote sustainability, and this is high on their agenda for the coming years. One weakness found in both projects was the establishment of community project management structures with weak linkages to parallel government decentralized structures on community level. Again, this is to a large extent due to weak and/or inactive government structure or, in the case of Mozambique, recent changes in the local government structure. Both projects seem to realize that these

linkages need to be strengthened to promote sustainability and the ELDS project includes it into one of its project objectives for the current project period.

Documentation in both projects is strong on description of the physical environment in which they are to operate, on the details of the projects, their intended objectives and on plans of operation. On the other hand, the projects are much weaker on **baseline data collection and systematic contextual analyses** of, for example, the politics, policies, actors and potential conflicts which collectively or individually could influence the projects' performance. This kind of data and analyses give projects a framework against which to assess both their progress and their potential for change in relation to the forces at play within their immediate and wider context. The LWF Mozambique has progressed further in this regard than the ELDS project as both baseline studies (including a need assessment) and environmental impact studies have recently been done for the districts in Tete in which the LWF has recently started to implement the Tete Project. These studies give important information against which the project performance can be assessed but it remains to be seen how the project will use them to measure its achievements and impact. The ELDS has plans to conduct baseline studies during the current project period and should be encouraged to implement those plans.

While both the LWF and ELDS are in the process of developing and improving their **monitoring and reporting systems**, this appears to be a certain weakness in both projects. A 2002 evaluation of the Tete Project pointed out the tendency within the Project to emphasize reporting on activities rather than impact (or result). In addition to stating the main activities implemented, the LWF annual monitoring reports for 2005 and 2006 give a list of "outcomes during the reporting period". However, no evidence is given on how these outcomes were measured or what the extent of the impact has been (for example, how do we know that "confidence and trust amongst the communities, community leadership and CDCs has grown" as stated in the report on Tete Project in the 2006 annual monitoring report?). Likewise, in the ELDS project the reporting emphasises implementation of activities while being rather vague about the general outcome and particularly about what it is that indicates that the project is having an impact.

In recent years many development agencies, including NGOs, have come under increasing pressure to show the **impact** of their development interventions. Studies have shown that those implementing development projects typically focus on what has happened over the past year, rather than on long-term trends, and on inputs and outputs, to the exclusion of the more fundamental changes. Impact relates to the concept of **sustainability** which can only really be assessed if there is a more complete understanding of what impact the development intervention might be having. While the precise definition of the concept of 'impact' varies, it is commonly understood as the *immediate and longer-term change(s) brought about by a certain development intervention*. In both the ELDS Project and the Tete Project, the focus is generally on the immediate impact and both projects have certainly had some immediate impact on the problem addressed and, as a consequence, on the lives of the beneficiaries. The immediate impact (result) is expressed in project documents in terms of outputs but there is usually also some general analysis of changes although it is often difficult to know how tangible these changes are. Needless to say, the measure of impact, especially qualitative and long-term impact, is quite formidable

and there are few development agencies which can say that they are able to effectively present the ‘impact’ of their development interventions. Indeed, it is questionable whether a small NGO such as the ELDS, for example, can be expected by itself to deliver long-term impact on poverty alleviation. On the other hand, if alleviation of poverty is the overall development goal the long-term impact should be a matter of concern. Community participation and a close collaboration with other implementers of development programmes are important factors to consider in this context.

5.2 Recommendations

There is now doubt that there is a need for the development interventions that the ELDS has initiated through the Water Resource Use and Management Project in Malawi and the LWF Mozambique through the Tete Project in the Tete Province. Although the long-term impact of the projects are uncertain and beyond this evaluation to measure, both projects have clearly made immediate impact in the areas in which they are being implemented and alleviated (if temporarily?) the poverty of the beneficiaries of the projects – and in some cases had an impact on the community as a whole (such as in the cases where wells and boreholes have been constructed). The conclusion of this assessment is also that the collaboration between ICEIDA, ICA and the local NGOs in Malawi and Mozambique has generally been going well.

With these conclusions in mind, this study recommends that ICEIDA continues its collaboration with ICA in supporting the work of the ELDS and LWF Mozambique:

- ✦ Given that the NGOs show accountability, project performance and good practises, ICEIDA and ICA should strive to continue to provide reliable and consistent funding on a long-term basis (seven to ten years). ICEIDA may want to establish a guideline on how long it is reasonable to support each NGO project.
- ✦ ICA should continue to carry out the monitoring role and be the collaborating partner to the southern NGOs. Close collaboration and partnership with the NGOs will promote further knowledge and experience within ICA on the planning, implementation and monitoring of development projects.
- ✦ ICA should make all reports of internal and external evaluations of the projects in Malawi and Mozambique available to ICEIDA (this should be required by ICEIDA). The external evaluations in particular are important tools to determine whether the projects are performing to standards and making an impact.
- ✦ Ideally ICEIDA should require that the NGOs it funds through ICA base their project proposal/document on baseline studies and contextual analysis. These kinds of studies provide important information which the project performance and impact can be measured against. Without the information it is difficult to determine what the impact of a project really is.
- ✦ ICEIDA should develop guidelines on what information it requires in project reporting from ICA/NGOs. While this should include reporting on

implementation of activities and financial performance, it should also emphasize the reporting on the immediate and long-term impact of the projects. The reporting on impact should carefully outline how the impact is monitored and measured (while subjective statements are useful they are not sufficient verification of impact).

- ✦ Guidelines should be established on what role the ICEIDA field offices in the countries where the projects are being implemented have in the collaboration. Their role could include evaluation of project proposals before funding starts (given the knowledge of the local context in these offices) and attendance to local annual project review meetings as observers.
- ✦ The ICEIDA headquarters should make copies of annual monitoring and evaluation reports from the NGO projects available to the ICEIDA field offices in the countries where the projects are implemented.

In terms of ICEIDA's collaboration with Icelandic and southern NGOs in general, this study recommends:

- ✦ That ICEIDA appoints NGO liaisons person within its headquarters who will oversee the collaboration with NGO and monitor their standard of work.
- ✦ Following the example of the other Nordic bilateral development agencies, ICEIDA should formalize the structure of its relationship with Icelandic NGOs and develop formal guidelines (or policy) which list its conditions for support, the required contribution from the NGO, assessment procedures and standard of reporting.
- ✦ ICEIDA may consider commissioning assessments of the Icelandic and overseas NGOs with which it collaborates, to determine their priorities, scope of operation, resources, ability to follow project cycle and capacity to analyse and report on the results (impact) of operations.
- ✦ ICEIDA should continue to develop and strengthen its collaboration with Icelandic and overseas NGOs, as a way to promote its support to the grassroots, human rights and democracy.

ANNEX A

Terms of reference for an Evaluation of the Collaboration between ICEIDA, ICA and ELDS in the Implementation of the Sustainable Water Livelihood Project in Malawi

1. Introduction

Malawi is one of the poorest countries in the world with the majority of the population living in the rural areas. A combination of high population density and unfavourable living conditions has given rise to extreme rural poverty. Only 47% of the population have access to clean drinking water and 97% do not have access to good sanitation facilities. Access to clean water remains a big challenge among most communities in Malawi. Poor hygiene, lack of sanitation, and low quantity and quality of drinking water all contribute to Malawi's poor health indicators. Poor water sanitation has been the main source of water borne diseases, which has considerably reduced household productivity and perpetuated the poverty vicious cycles.

2. Background

The Evangelical Lutheran Development Programme was established in 1989 in response to a request from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Malawi and Malawi Government, primarily to assist the Mozambican refugees who were in Malawi then. Since Malawians were as equally poor as the Mozambican counterparts, a component called Rural Community Motivation and Development Project was initiated within the programme to assist Malawian communities. The activities addressed some of the rights to development, which included functional adult literacy, construction of shallow wells, environmental rehabilitation and food security.

Currently, the Evangelical Lutheran Development Programme is operational in six districts namely, Chikwawa, Phalombe in the south; Dedza and Dowa in the central; and Karonga and Nkhata Bay in the northern region. The programme includes the project "Sustainable Water Livelihood Project". The project is collaboration between the Evangelical Lutheran Development Service, which is the implementing organisation, and the Icelandic Church Aid, which is the funding organisation. The Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) covers 60% of the funds provided through the Icelandic Church Aid. The cooperation between the parties has been ongoing since 2004. Current project phase covers the period 2007-2010.

The Project is to be implemented in 10 villages in the Chikwawa district. The overall objective of the Project is to empower poor rural communities to be self-reliant and sustain management of water resources for their livelihoods.

Specific objectives of the project:

- To strengthening capacity of local development structures in sustainable livelihoods by 2010
- To promote effective utilization of water for household nutrition by 2010
- To promote household water supply and sanitation to enhance care for HIV/AIDS affected and infected households by 2010
- To promoter watershed management to protect and conserve water livelihoods by 2010

3. Scope and focus of the evaluation

The focus of the evaluation shall be on information gathering for ICEIDA, the Icelandic Church Aid and the Evangelical Lutheran Development Service. Recommendations made by the evaluator will form the basis and guidelines for the continuation of collaboration between the partners, and assist ICEIDA in forming a policy on partnership with NGOs.

4. Issues to be studied

Special attention shall be paid but not necessarily limited to the following issues:

- Review the collaboration and structure of communication between ICEIDA, ICA and ELDS. What lessons can be learned from this partnership and how can this partnership inform ICEIDA's partnership with other NGOs?
- Review Project organisation (including management, reporting and monitoring).
- With a focus on the implementation of the project in the Chikwawa district, assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the support provided by the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA; have the resources been efficiently used? To what extent have objectives been achieved? What problems have arisen? Have the inputs provided the planned outputs?
- With a focus on the implementation of the project in the Chikwawa district, assess other effects (impact) of the support provided by the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA, negative or positive. What are their causes? Technological and socio-cultural factors affecting the Project implementation shall be considered.
- Assess the relevance of the support provided by the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA in relation to the policy of the Government of Malawi and the approach of the Evangelical Lutheran Development Service.
- Assess the benefits of the support continuing beyond donor involvement. Has the Project managed to empower the target groups and contributed to the struggle for poverty alleviation?

5. Plan of work

The exercise is initiated by ICEIDA in consultation with the Icelandic Church Aid and the Evangelical Lutheran Development Service. The consultant will work in close collaboration with the staff of the Evangelical Lutheran Development Service in Malawi. Consultations will also need to be held with representatives of the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA.

The consultant is expected to carry out interviews with the key contact people; representatives of the local governance structures, including members of Village Development Committees, Area Development Committee, District Executive Committee and District Development Committee. Staff members of the Evangelical Lutheran Development Service will be interviewed as well. Meetings will be held with authorities and stakeholders in question.

The consultant will have full access to policy papers, reports, contracts, data and other material concerning the Project.

The consultant is responsible for writing and delivering a final report within a specified time frame. The Evangelical Lutheran Development Service and the Icelandic Church Aid shall have the opportunity to comment on a draft version of the report.

6. Required expertise

A postgraduate university degree in social science is required as well as experience in working in community based projects in developing countries, preferably in Malawi.

7. Timetable and reporting

Data collection is expected to be carried out in Chikwawa and Lilongwe from 10-17 April 2007. A final report should be submitted to ICEIDA in English no later than 1 July 2007.

ANNEX B

Terms of Reference for an Evaluation of the Collaboration between ICEIDA, ICA and LWF/DWS in the Implementation of the Tete Integrated Rural Development Project in Mozambique

1. Introduction

Mozambique is among the poorest countries in the world. It is also ranked to have one of the highest HIV prevalence in the world. For a country still recovering after devastating civil war that ended in 1992, after 16 years of fighting, it faces many challenges. Tete Province in the central zone of Mozambique has one of the highest prevalence of people living with HIV/AIDS in the country and this situation has direct implication for household food security. A related problem is the potential for environmental degradation which is likely to result from the ongoing discriminate de-forestation. Yet another major problem is the lack of access to safe water and sanitation in the area.

2. Background

The Lutheran World Federation has through its Department for Word Service, DWS been involved in Mozambique since 1977. Since 1998 LWF-Mozambique has engaged in a holistic, area-based participatory integrated rural development approach, based on the needs identified by the poor communities themselves. This is a bottom-up approach, which aims to empower communities by putting the target groups in the centre and allowing their maximum participation throughout the development process, thus making the development process sustainable.

Currently, the Lutheran World Federation Mozambique Programme is operational in four provinces namely, Tete in the west central part, Sofala on the eastern cost, and Gaza and Chamanculo in the southern part of the country. The programme includes the Tete Integrated Rural Development Project with the title “The Complexity of Household Food Insecurity Increasing Impact on HIV/Aids and Potential Threat to the Environment in Tete Province in Mozambique”. The project is collaboration between the Lutheran World Federation/Department of World Service, which is the implementing organisation, and the Icelandic Church Aid, which is the funding organisation. The Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) covers 60% of the funds provided through the Icelandic Church Aid. The cooperation between the parties in Tete Province was initially launched in 2001. Current project phase covers the period 2007-2009.

The Project is to be implemented in Chifunde, Tsangano, Macanga and Maravia districts in Tete province. The development objective of the project is to contribute to poverty reduction and institutionalization of sustainable development by supporting communities to reduce risk and vulnerability to HIV/AIDS as well as strengthening their capacity to become food secure and to contribute more effectively towards accessibility to safe drinking water and acceptable sanitation.

Specific objectives of the project:

- To contribute to the reduction in the risk and vulnerability to HIV infection by strengthening the capacity of the communities in their ability to alleviate the impact and address the challenges of the epidemic at both community and household level.
- Empower households and communities through food security, agricultural practice, income generation activities, water, health and education.
- Strengthen organizational capacity to achieve high performance and quality service.

3. Scope and focus of the evaluation

The focus of the evaluation shall be on information gathering for ICEIDA, the Icelandic Church Aid and the Lutheran World Federation in Mozambique. Recommendations made by the evaluator will form the basis and guidelines for the continuation of collaboration between the partners, and assist ICEIDA in forming a policy on partnership with NGOs.

4. Issues to be studied

Special attention shall be paid but not necessarily limited to the following issues:

- Review the collaboration and structure of communication between ICEIDA, ICA and LWF/DWS. What lessons can be learned from this partnership and how can this partnership inform ICEIDA's partnership with other NGOs?
- Review Project organisation (including management, reporting and monitoring).
- With a focus on the implementation of the project in the Tete province, assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the support provided by the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA; have the resources been efficiently used? To what extent have objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved? What problems have arisen? Have the inputs provided the planned outputs?
- With a focus on the implementation of the project in one district, assess other effects (impact) of the support provided by the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA, negative or positive. What are their causes? Technological and socio-cultural factors affecting the Project implementation shall be considered.
- Assess the relevance of the support provided by the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA in relation to the policy of the Government of Mozambique and the approach of the Lutheran World Federation/Department of World Service.
- Assess the benefits of the support continuing beyond donor involvement. Has the Project managed to empower or is likely to empower the target groups and contributed to the struggle for poverty alleviation?

5. Plan of work

The exercise is initiated by ICEIDA in consultation with the Icelandic Church Aid and the Lutheran World Federation/Department of World Service. The consultant will work in close collaboration with the staff of the LWF/DWS in Mozambique.

Consultations will also need to be held with representatives of the Icelandic Church Aid and ICEIDA.

The consultant is expected to carry out interviews with the key contact people; including members of village communities, local government and government departments. Staff members of the Lutheran World Federation will be interviewed as well. Meetings will be held with authorities and stakeholders in question.

The consultant will have full access to policy papers, reports, contracts, data and other material concerning the Project.

The consultant is responsible for writing and delivering a final report within a specified time frame. The Lutheran World Federation in Mozambique and the Icelandic Church Aid shall have the opportunity to comment on a draft version of the report.

6. Required expertise

A postgraduate university degree in social science is required as well as experience in working in community based projects in developing countries, preferably in southern Africa.

7. Timetable and reporting

Data collection is expected to be carried out in Tete Province and Maputo from 17-23 April 2007. A final report should be submitted to ICEIDA in English no later than 1 July 2007.

ANNEX C

FIELDWORK ITINERARY IN MALAWI 9-17 APRIL

<u>Date:</u>	<u>Activity:</u>
09.04.07	Arrival of the external consultant
10.04.07	Meeting at the ICEIDA Headquarter in Lilongwe for introduction and practicalities
	Interview with the ELDS National Director, Lilongwe
	Interview with the ELDS Projects Coordinator, Lilongwe
11.04.07	Interview with the ELDS Projects Coordinator (cont.)
	Interview with the ELDS Finance Officer, Lilongwe
	Travel to Blantyre
12.04.07	Interview with the ELDS Chikwawa Project Officer and Development Facilitators, Nchalo Town
	FGD with the VMC in Chikadayenda village
	FGD with representatives from a project implementation group (project participants/beneficiaries) in Chikadayenda village
13.04.07	Meetings with Government District Officials (DPD, DAO, DEHO and DWDO), Chikwawa Boma
	FGD with representatives from the ADC in the Project area, Dolo Town
	FGD with Government Extension Officers in the Project area, Dolo Town
14.04.07	FGD with the Project Section Committee for Jani, Ganyo, Masache and Mlooka Villages, Jani village
	FGD with representatives from different project implementation groups in Ganyo and Jani Villages, Jani village
	FGD with representatives from different project implementation groups in Mlooka and Masache villages, Mlooka village
	KII with three individual project participants/beneficiaries from Mlooka and Masache villages, Mlooka village

- 15.04.07 Review of data collected, the way forward
- 16.04.07 FGD with representatives from different project implementation groups in Thonje and Thobwa villages, Thonje village
- Interview with the ELDS Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Blantyre
- 17.04.07 External consultant travels to Mozambique (through the Mwanza border)

ANNEX D

FIELDWORK ITINERARY IN MOZAMBIQUE 17-24 APRIL

<u>Date:</u>	<u>Activity:</u>
17.04.07	Arrival of the external consultant Brief intro meeting with the LWF Tete Project Coordinator
18.04.07	Meeting with the Head of the Department for Water and Sanitation in Tete (government) Travel to Tsangano District Brief FGDs in Massambililo and Maphonela villages Visit to Kalipale village Brief interview with the LWF Community Development Officer in Tsangano District
19.04.07	Travel to Maravia District Ongoing consultation with the LWF Tete Project Coordinator
20.04.07	Interview with the acting Administrative Director for Maravia District Ongoing consultation with the LWF Tete Project Coordinator FGD in Nyamanzi and Kope villages Visit to Mtendezi and Nhansegula villages
21.04.07	Interview with the LWF Community Development Officer in Maravia District Travel back to Tete Interview with the LWF Tete Project Accountant
22.04.07	External consultant travels to Maputo Consultation with the ICEIDA Country Director, Maputo
23.04.07	Meeting with staff at the LWF Headquarter in Maputo Consultation with the LWF Country Representative Interview with the LWF Tete Assistant Project Coordinator Interview with the LWF Programme Coordinator in Maputo
24.04.07	External consultant travels back to London

ANNEX E

LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AND CONSULTED

ICEIDA:

Mr. Sighvatur Björgvinsson, Director General, Reykjavik
Ms. Þórdís Sigurðardóttir, Office Manager, Reykjavik
Ms. Margrét Einarsdóttir, outgoing Country Director for Malawi, Lilongwe
Mr. Jóhann Pálsson, Country Director for Mozambique, Maputo

ICA:

Mr. Jónas Þórir Þórisson, Director General, Reykjavik

ELDS, Lilongwe:

Mrs. Judith Jere, National Director
Mr. Francis Ngopola, Project Coordinator
Mr. Dickens Mtonga, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer

ELDS, Chikwawa District:

Mr. Limbani Gomani, Project Officer, Nchalo
Mr. Mbachí Munthali, Development Facilitator, Ngabu
Mr. Chifundo Zulu, Development Facilitator, Ndakwera

Government Officials and Extension Staff, Chikwawa District:

Mr. Warren Palani, Director of Planning and Development
Mr. Warren Ndhlovu, District Agricultural Development Officer
Mr. Thomson Kajombo, District Environmental Health Officer
Mrs. Veronica Mkukumila, Senior Environmental Health Officer
Mr. Owen Phiri, District Water Development Officer

Mr. Leno Malinda, Dolo Health Centre
Mr. Lawrence Chaima, Health Surveillance Assistant
Mr. George Chilumpha, Agriculture Assistant Extension Development Coordinator
Mr. Jason Phiri, Animal Health Surveillance Assistant
Mr. Sekani Joni, Agriculture Field Assistant

Community consultations in Chikwawa District (local leaders, committee members and other Project participants):

Khalimu Ngwali, Jefule Tito, Samuel Katsitsi, Selena Mponya, Samuel Danison, Decla Mchenga, Gene Kamangira, Elise Gidiyoni, Akimu Mtonga, Amosi Chimtengo, Westeni Thomi, Specel Ngalu, Hester Mbuzi, Wandason Seda, Walasi Nsona, Gift Makani, Patrick Malona, Tomasi Luka, Maxsoni Nsona, Malita Nowa, Evelini Mcheka, Magetsi Bulusi, Oliva Sintilawo, Kelita Forbilika, Esinati Washeni,

Jenifa Wyson, Belita Jerad, Esta Jailosi, Aliyanesi Mindozo, and other anonymous participants.

LWF, Maputo:

Mr. Philip Wijmans, LWF Representative
Mr. Lucas Owuor-Omondi, Program Coordinator

LWF, Tete:

Mrs. Maria Jonasse, Project Coordinator, Tete
Mr. Virgilio Amos Phiri, Assistant Project Coordinator, Tete
Mr. Ricardo Bassopa, Project Accountant, Tete
Mr. Selvino Saundi Katimba, Community Development Officer, Tsangano District
Mrs. Manuela José Constantino, Community Development Officer, Maravia District
Mrs. Perpetua Caco Maquina, Community Development Assistant, Maravia District
Mrs. Fatima Zondane Alfandega, Community Development Assistant, Maravia District

Government Officials, Tete and Maravia District:

Mr. Pedro Fernandes, Tete Department of Water and Sanitation
Mr. Adolfo Herculano, Maravia District Administration

Community consultations in Tsangano District (representatives from a Community Development Committee, Water Committee and Carpentry Group in two villages):

Vito José, Joyce Blazio, Agness Bwayila, Moses Banbuelo, Chadrick Samison, Fredrik Chilason, Jonathan John, Selena Bround, Mafiel John, Simion Kaonemalo, Jovita Stephano.

Community consultations in Maravia District (Community Development Committees and Water Committees in two villages):

Airaqui Condenani, Atipirire Banda, Judi Sankurukani, Asicola Anastasio, Nhancoma Sacala, Quesirini Chunga, Denis Mwanza, Katemo Specha, Taissoni Sancurukani, Dalison Socossi, Elina Lupenga, Cristina Sancurukani, Verenassi Aptoni, Jusitina Samisoni, Airaqui Kwesekani, Piassoni Sauti, Elisa Sacala, Esinati Perurani, Azinessi Isael, Josefi Azuvero, Agnessi Daka, Roidi Ziyarura, Sitiphini Penso, Airaqui Sinditaika, Arakwisa Penye, Tionengi Nhancupe, Emeria Jairossi, Richard Fungurani.

ANNEX F

LITERATURE AND DOCUMENTATION

AusAID and LWF 2005. *Developing an Effective Mechanism for Graduating Primary focus Communities of the LWF Mozambique Program: A Pilot Project Tete IRDP Mozambique (2006-2008). A Concept Paper for Discussion*. Maputo: LWF Mozambique Programme.

Chintu, R., K. Linyunga, P. Matakala, M. Jonasse and V. Phiri 2006. *A Preliminary Environmental Baseline Report for LWF Project Target Areas in Tsangano District*. Maputo: International Centre for Research in Agroforestry, Publication no. 1.

DANIDA [Danish International Development Agency] 1999. *Evaluation Guidelines*. Copenhagen: DANIDA.

ELDP (Evangelical Lutheran Development Programme) 2003. *Building a Sustainable Livelihoods for Water Development (Water Resource Use and Management)*. Application for Funding submitted to Icelandic Church Aid October 2003. Lilongwe: ELDP.

ELDS 2005. *Water Resource Use and Management Project: Income and Expenditure Report 2004*. Lilongwe: ELDS.

ELDS 2006. *Integrated Community Development Programme (ICDP): Narrative Annual Monitoring Report January to December 2005*. Lilongwe: ELDS.

ELDS 2007a. *Sustainable Water Livelihood Project 2007-2010*. A Project Document. Lilongwe: ELDS.

ELDS 2007b. *End of Project Narrative Report Submitted to ICEIDA*. Lilongwe: ELDS.

GOMal (Government of Malawi) 2000. *Draft Water Policy and Implementation Plan*. Lilongwe: GOM

GOMal 2005. *Integrated Household Survey 2004-2005. Vol. 1: Household Socio-Economic Characteristics*. Zomba: National Statistical Office. [Accessible on the internet:
http://www.nso.malawi.net/data_on_line/economics/ihs/IHS2/IHS2_Report.pdf]

GOMal 2006. *Malawi Growth and Development Strategy: From Poverty to Prosperity 2006-2011*. Lilongwe: GOM. [Accessible on the internet:
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/MALAWIEXTN/Resources/MGDS_2006_Final.pdf]

GOMoz (Government of Mozambique) 2006. *Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty 2006-2009 (PARPA II)*. Final Version Approved by the Council of Ministers on May 2, 2006. Maputo: Government of Mozambique. [Accessible on the internet: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/mozambique-parpaii.pdf>]

ICA (Icelandic Church Aid) 2002. *Ársskýrsla frá Mósambík 2001. Samstarfsverkefni Þróunarsamvinnustofnunar Íslands og Hjálparstarfs kirkjunnar: Uppbygging og viðhald vatnsveitna og vatnsbóla*. Reykjavík: ICA.

ICA 2003a. *Skipulagsskrá*. On the Icelandic Church Aid webpage <http://www.help.is/?starfid/skipulagsskra> (Accessed 06/05/2007)

ICA 2003b. *Application for Funding and Cooperation Presented by Icelandic Church Aid (ICA) to Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA)*. Reykjavík: ICA.

ICA 2004. *Vatnsverkefni í Mósambík 2001-2003. Samstarfsverkefni Þróunarsamvinnustofnunar Íslands og Hjálparstarf kirkjunnar: Uppbygging og viðhald vatnsveitna og vatnsbóla. 3. áfangaskýrsla 2003*. Reykjavík: ICA.

ICA 2006. *Water Resource Use and Management, Malawi: Joint Project Between ICEIDA and ICA through ELDS. Report 2*. Reykjavík: ICA.

ICEIDA 2004a. *ICEIDA's Gender Equality Policy*. Reykjavík: ICEIDA.

ICEIDA 2004b. *ICEIDA's Policy and Plan of Operations*. Reykjavík: ICEIDA.

LWF (Lutheran World Federation) 2001. *Planning and Monitoring Document: Tete Integrated Rural Development Project 2001-2003*. Maputo: LWF Mozambique Programme.

LWF 2003. *Country Strategy Outline (CSO): Evangelical Lutheran Development Program, Malawi Program 2004-2008*. Geneva: LWF/DWS.

LWF 2004a. *LWF Mozambique Country Strategy Outline 2004-2009: Contributing to the Development of Viable and Sustainable Households and Communities in Mozambique*. Geneva: LWF/DWS.

LWF 2004b. *Tete Integrated Rural Development Project: Planning and Monitoring Document 2004-2006*. Maputo: LWF Mozambique Programme.

LWF 2005a. *LWF Annual Monitoring Report January-December 2005*. Maputo: LWF Mozambique Programme Unit.

LWF 2005b. *Baseline Data for Chifunde and Tsangano Districts*. Maputo: LWF Mozambique Programme.

LWF 2006a. *LWF Annual Monitoring Report January-December 2006*. Maputo LWF Mozambique Programme Unit.

LWF 2006a. *Accompanying the Marginalized and the Most vulnerable in the Pursuit of Equitable and Sustainable Development: Contextual Analysis and Major Highlights 2004-2006*. Geneva: LWF DWS.

LWF 2007a. Tete IRDP: *Project Document 2007-2009*. Maputo: LWF Mozambique Programme.

LWF 2007b. *Mozambique: The Lutheran World Federation annual Report 2006*. Geneva: LWF Department for World Service.

Lög um Þróunarsamvinnustofnun Íslands nr. 43/1981. On the ICEIDA webpage <http://www.iceida.is/um-thssi/log-um-thssi/> (Accessed 06/05/2007).

Nakhumwa, T., A. Dzilankhulani and J. Chima 2006. *Mid-term Evaluation of Integrated Community Development Project (ICDP)*. Lilongwe: Evangelical Lutheran Development Service.

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) 1999. *The Logical Framework Approach (LFA): Handbook for Objectives-oriented Planning*. Fourth edition. Oslo: NORAD.

Samset, K. 1994. *Evaluation of Development Assistance: Handbook for Evaluators and Managers*. Oslo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Thomas, A. and Tim Allen 2000. "Agencies of Development". In *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century*. A. Thomas and T. Allen eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations 2000. *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. General Assembly Resolution A/RES/55/2. New York: United Nations. [Accessible on the internet: <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf>].

Waldorff, P. 2006. *Conceptions of Poverty and Development in a Malawian Village Setting*. MA thesis. Montreal: Department of Anthropology, McGill University.

Þróunarsamvinnustofnun Íslands og Hjálparstarf kirkjunnar (ÞSSÍ/Hk) 2001. *Samstarfssamningur Þróunarsamvinnustofnunar Íslands og Hjálparstarfs kirkjunnar: Vatnsveitur, brunnar og þjálfun starfsfólks, Tete, Mósambík*. Reykjavík.

ÞSSÍ/Hk 2006. *Samstarfssamningur Þróunarsamvinnustofnunar Íslands og Hjálparstarfs kirkjunnar 2006-2008: Þróunarverkefni í Tete-héraði, Mósambík*. Reykjavík.

ÞSSÍ/Hk 2007. *Samstarfssamningur Þróunarsamvinnustofnunar Íslands og Hjálparstarfs kirkjunnar 2007-2010: Vatnsöflun og vatnsnýting í Malaví*. Reykjavík.