

# Mid-Term Project Evaluation

(Final Version)

Country: Somaliland

Project Title: **Integrated Food Security Project with Pastoral and Agricultural Communities in South Togdheer and West Sool, Somaliland**

Project Holder: Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V. - German Agro Action (DWHH/GAA), Friedrich-Ebert-Str. 1, 53173 Bad Godesberg, Germany

Principal Donor Agency: European Union, represented by the Delegation of the European Commission in Kenya, Somalia Operations Unit, Union House, Regati Road, Nairobi, Kenya

Project Number: DWHH/GAA: **SOM 1005-05**  
EC: **FOOD/2005/104-088/5**

Project Duration: 01 November 2005 - 30 June 2008 (32 months)  
Project budget: 1'498'000 Euro (EC contribution: 1'348'000 Euro)

Evaluation  
Commissioned by: DWHH/GAA  
Evaluation Period: 17 to 29 June 2007  
Evaluation Team: Harald NICOLAY (independent consultant, Germany)  
Halima SHURIA (independent consultant, Kenya)

Hann. Münden (Germany), 10 September 2007

## **I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. Short Project Description**

The overall objective of the project is to contribute significantly to poverty alleviation of 100'000 agro-pastoralists in four under-served districts of southern Togdheer and western Sool regions of Somaliland territory. The purpose / specific objective of the action is to strengthen food security at household level through community-based development of livestock and agriculture based on sound natural resource management practices. The overall objective is to be achieved through three main results:

- Community based livestock management and community based animal health services area improved and linked to existing veterinary structures, using Sustainable Agriculture Development (SAD) systems.
- Agricultural and horticultural production is improved and diversified, using SAD systems.
- Sustainable community based natural resource management is strengthened, using SAD methods.

### **2. Project Holder Analysis**

Founded in 1962, DWHH/GAA has evolved to be one of the largest German NGO. The globally active organisation is a rural development specialist. It has been active in Somaliland since 1992 executing food security and natural resource management projects. At present 3 projects are implemented. Regional offices in Kenya and Ethiopia facilitate communications with other relevant actors and provide back-stopping and administration services. The project office is located in Burao, in the project area. The project has a contingent of 10 professional and 14 support staff. The team is headed by an expatriate project manager (PM). After some delays, the project is now adequately staffed and equipped for successful completion of project implementation.

### **3. Analysis of Situation and Target Group**

Although Somaliland has enjoyed some years of political stability, security remains to be an issue in the project area. Some areas of the project region are mined. About 60% of the population are nomads. Originally the project targeted around 100'000 impoverished agro-pastoralists. Based on implementation to date, this number may not be reached. The project region is characterised by a rapidly deteriorating environmental base. This degradation is caused by excessively large herds and unsustainable levels of removal of biomass (eg. charcoal, timber) from the agro-ecosystem. Visionary nomads are increasingly aware of the risks of unilateral dependance on livestock and turning to cropping as a means to augment income and to spread risks. Agro-pastoralists, who have been farming for some time, are feeling the competition and are probing means to increase and sustain yields. Most farmers lack know-how regarding irrigation management and intensive cropping. Traditional society is under siege resulting in the disappearance of social safety nets. Women are the weakest components of society and most adversely effected. The project aims to assist these and other deprived segments of the rural population to actively improve or stabilise their livelihood situation. Communal land ownership and other endemic socio-economic factors complicate

implementation.

#### **4. Analysis of Project Preparation, Planning and Project Planning Matrix**

Inadequate resource allocation overshadowed the preparation and planning phases. Relevant data was not available. The baseline survey and assessment conducted during two planning missions ultimately could not satisfy planning needs. Although elaborate, the proposal or application fails to reflect a profound understanding of the socio-economic situation on the ground. It lacks strategic focus. The original proposal, which envisioned 7 results, subdivided into a total of 35 activities, to achieve the objective, posed formidable implementation challenges. Some activities are conceptually weak. Some indicators in the project planning matrix (PPM) were not **SMART** for **Specific Measurable Appropriate Reliable Time-bound**. The revised PPM was reduced to 3 results realised through 36 activities. Some activities were slashed completely. Others were repackaged or grouped under different headings. The revised PPM is more workable, but many indicators are still not SMART. Targets remain excessively ambitious in quantitative and qualitative terms, the area covered is still too large. Women are not directly targeted.

#### **5. Analysis of Project Management**

Original project management was apparently overwhelmed by volume, complexity and evident conceptual weaknesses of the proposal. An EC monitoring mission underlined that project management was unable to cope with the challenges of launching the project, some of which were emanating from poor project conceptualisation. DWHH/GAA resolved the problem by instituting personnel changes. Under new management, project execution improved quickly as evidenced by a spur of activities including planing exercises, internal collection of supplementary baseline data, commissioning of supplementary studies, timely reporting etc. Thanks to a dedicated team and assiduous senior staff, project management is now fully satisfactory.

#### **6. Analysis of Project Implementation**

The staff contingent is well imbedded in the project environs, maintains good working relations with officials and stakeholders and is respected by beneficiaries. Security issues are dealt with in a cool and professional manner. External supplementary studies commissioned by the project, one to obtain relevant baseline data and another to gain further impetus concerning the livestock component, did not meet the expectations of the project and the donor. A number of activities have been shelved, for others it remains unclear whether they will be taken up. Community mobilisation requires improvement. Consultations with target group and representatives would benefit from intensification. Beneficiary contribution is low, most major actions were almost exclusively funded by the project. Following severe delays during inception, the project is now well under way.

## **7. Findings and Conclusions on DAC Criteria Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability**

Relevance: The project addresses the needs and potentials of the region. The region is not served by the government and other agencies. The planned outputs are only partially adequate to achieve the specific objective. The intervention logic is based on the wish to mitigate the effects of recurrent drought by improving preparedness and coping strategies. This is based on the assumption that, within the project cycle of under 32 months, the project will deliver visible impact towards results that Somali society has had problems achieving in countless generations. This puts the project under immense delivery pressure from most actors from the outset. Environmental interventions are exceedingly relevant, but this is not perceived as such by many beneficiaries. Promotion of women is equally relevant, but is viewed with some scepticism by some segments of the stakeholders.

Efficiency: Due to the prevalent security situation, the large project area, the necessity of expatriate staff and other framework conditions, only around 23 % of the budget percolates directly to the target group. Arithmetically, every beneficiary receives 3.50 € during the project cycle, or 1,30 € per year of planned project duration. At this stage of project elaboration, reliable cost-benefit analysis and rate-of-return calculations are not possible. The project has been delayed since inception. Staff replacements have improved management quality. Baseline data remains inadequate for meaningful project planning and for installing a functional M&E system. The project is spread over an excessively large area. Although coverage has been reduced, a further reduction is sensible. Security concerns led to prolonged absences of the project manager, although the project remained operational at a high level throughout. Since mid 2006 the project has made visible advances and is now operating reasonably efficiently. Two monitoring visits were conducted by the EC Somalia Operations Unit. Additional visits by the EC field officer proved very helpful to the project. The project received only moral support from national bodies.

Effectiveness: Actions do satisfy beneficiary needs. No harmful side effects were identified. Generally effectiveness is satisfactory. Problems were encountered with select deliveries. A rehabilitated irrigation scheme was not utilised by farmers. A river deviation spawned conflict amongst user groups. Some outputs benefit absentee landlords. Management has reacted flexibly to adopt to changing conditions and requirements. Some approaches are both innovative and highly successful, such as the use of gabions to regulate the flow direction of seasonal rivers.

Impact: Some activities are already yielding improvements to the food security situation of beneficiaries. Others may be expected to have a positive impact on the food security situation later on. For some actions it is too early to assess the impact, as most deliveries do not offer short-term benefits. The literacy programs for women, well construction and some of the gully plugging and river flow management measures are already yielding visible benefits. Apparently some duplication occurred with regard to training of animal health workers, who were trained previously by another project.

Sustainability: The sustainability is generally perceived as being very low. This is especially the case for actions related to environmental interventions. It remains unclear if and to what extent activities and innovations related to primary production will attain commercial sustainability following project termination.

## 8. Recommendations

### To the project ...

- i. Consider a project extension of 6 - 10 months.
- ii. Ensure an adequate overlap, if the present PM terminates his contract prematurely.
- iii. Consider discontinuation of livestock components to achieve sectoral consolidation.
- iv. Consider swapping livestock activities with VETAID to avoid duplication.
- v. Consider massive reinforcement and elevation to result level of the gender component.
- vi. Spatial consolidation: Consider a withdrawal from Aynabo, Eeg and other areas.
- vii. Make a tangible effort to improve monitoring.
- viii. Consider study tours / exchange visits for beneficiaries (especially women) and staff.
- ix. Consider stronger use of on-farm demonstration plots.
- x. Consider options to intensify interaction with communities to enhance sustainability.
- xi. Consider means to increase community ownership to increase sustainability.
- xii. Consider contracting a short term adviser to conceptualise an environmental strategy.
- xiii. Consider installation of a number of 5-10 ha fenced areas to demonstrate conservation effects.
- xiv. Consider a second budget revision and a further revision of the PPM, following further deliberations with relevant partners including the donor.
- xv. Consider intensification of staff training based on training-needs-assessment.
- xvi. Consider taking a more assertive stance towards staff who's contracts are terminated.
- xvii. Explore possibilities to foster cooperation with University of Burao.

### To DWHH/GAA generally ...

- i. Consider marking all documents with a standardised document signature.
- ii. Reduce e-mail correspondence and file hard-copies of important correspondence.
- iii. Consider enlarging DWHH/GAA profile / presence at Hargeisa.
- iv. Consider preparing a country concept paper for Somaliland. This should include sectoral strategy papers for the main sectors targeted.

### To the EC ...

- i. Consider options to refine and apply uniform rules and regulations for EC-funded projects in Somaliland (eg. allowances for GoS officials, handing-over procedures concerning vehicles and equipment following project termination, etc.).
- ii. Explore avenues to harmonise policies and procedures with WFP concerning food-aid.

## 9. General Conclusions and Lessons Learnt

The EC's Somalia Operations Unit and the Somaliland field office have shown an active and highly supportive interest throughout project elaboration. Relations with the project are generally cordial and based on a substantial degree of mutual trust. After severe delays the project is now running smoothly and may be expected to make a tangible impact within the limits discussed above.