

**Evaluation Report –Summary-**  
**Enhancing food security and nutrition in and  
around Monrovia and Tubmanburg - “UPANI”**  
**in Liberia**  
**AF 1582 / LBR 1034 - 11**  
**DCI / FOOD / 2011 / 278883**  
**implemented by**  
**Welthungerhilfe**  
**in cooperation with**  
**ACF and RUAF**  
**co-financed by**  
**European Union**  
**on behalf of Welthungerhilfe**

**Barbara Jilg**

**Hinterwössen, January 2014**

## **I. Summary**

### **1 Brief description of the project and framework conditions**

The evaluated project “Enhancing food security and nutrition in and around Monrovia and Tubmanburg” started in 01/12/2011 and ends in 31/05/2015. Its objective is: “Households and farmers in Greater Monrovia, Tubmanburg and Saint Paul River District have improved their food security and their nutritional practices.” The project has planned four results:

- Improved agricultural production of urban, peri-urban and rural farmers
- Improved income opportunities and access to capital of farmers
- Increased knowledge about nutritional aspects, diversified diets and home gardening
- Strengthened capacities of Urban Farmer Association, MoA and MoH and Citizen Townships

Responsible for the project implementation is Welthungerhilfe in partnership with the international NGOs ACF (Action Contre la Faim, France) and RUF (Resource Centres on Urban Agriculture & Food Security Foundation, Netherlands). At the moment the project is managed by an Interim Project Manager who will hand over the project to a new manager during the next weeks.

After the end of the civil war in 2003 the situation in Liberia is improving slowly, but Liberia remains one of the world’s poorest nations. Urban and peri-urban agriculture offers large potentials to improve the situation of urban habitants, but there are also serious challenges such as land availability, litter and waste water.

### **2 Relevance**

The relevance of the project under evaluation is high. According to the opinion of the target group, the project objectives and the planned outputs and results are relevant for the core problems of the target group. Today more than half of Liberia’s population lives in urban areas.

The country policy 2010-2014 of Welthungerhilfe shows that project objectives are in line with the objectives of Welthungerhilfe in Liberia. The project considers the focus of Welthungerhilfe on availability, access and utilization of food, but not all three components were equally addressed with all involved target groups. The project objectives fit also in the strategies of the implementation partners RUF and ACF as well as in those of EU Liberia.

The project is in line with poverty reduction strategy of the government of Liberia. In the last years urban agriculture has gained importance in national policies.

### **3 Effectiveness**

The project objective with its two indicators (increased food intake and improved nutritional practices of 70% of direct beneficiaries) has been achieved or can be achieved until the end of the project.

The target group of 2,000 households has already been reached and it can be expected that until the end of the project this number will be exceeded. Measures to strengthen institutions reached more than the planned 40 representatives of different stakeholders.

Most of the planned activities have been realized or are likely to be realized until the end of the project.

The change of key personnel in management and administration of the implementing organisations was difficult for project execution. At the beginning of project implementation, the two organizations did not coordinate and cooperate sufficiently, but worked with different activities and strategies in different regions. Welthungerhilfe staff focussed more on the enhancement of availability and access to food, while ACF was concentrating also on the improvement of use and utilization of food.

There are some weak points of the quality of project implementation, regarding calculations of profitability, Memorandums of Understanding (MOU), the flow of information, the high number of value chains and in some cases group members complained about the quality of distributed seed and tools.

Positive aspects are especially the pay-back system and the Saving and Loan groups which already are causing multiplication effects.

#### **4 Efficiency**

The project costs per household are between 1,000.- and 1,700.- € per household. There are no exact figures about project benefits. Comparing the approximate benefits and costs of productive measures per households it can be estimated that the benefits during ten years correspond nearly to the costs.

The monitoring system has improved in relation to the previous project UPA 1, but it is not outcome oriented. Only for the nutritional component outcomes and impact are measured.

#### **5 Outcomes and impacts**

The most important outcomes and impacts of the project are:

- Increased and diversified agricultural and animal husbandry production for about 70 % of the 2,000 direct beneficiaries
- Improved food security (different levels of improvement for about 1,400 households)
- Increased income at different levels for some of the groups and group members
- Better access to small amounts of capital (in most cases about 10.- to 30.- €) for more than 200 members of the 50 S&L groups which already took loan
- Improvement of nutritional practices, particularly in the region where ACF is working
- Better organization of the UPA farmers
- Improved marketing (mostly caused through measures which started already during the predecessor project)
- Better group cohesion and mutual support in some groups; improvement of the self help potential, especially in the S&L groups
- Awareness and interest of governmental institutions for urban agriculture with some concrete support activities

- Increased knowledge and skills (gardening, nutrition, group management, business, hygiene aspects)
- Better health of children
- Strengthening of women
- Linkages of some groups to governmental institutions

## 6 Sustainability

Many of the improvements caused by the project still depend on financial and extension support of the project, especially some processing and animal husbandry groups, the farmers associations TUPUFU und FLUPFA and the Multi Stakeholder Forums.

Knowledge about agricultural production and on nutrition practices is likely to be used partly also after the end of the project. Members of Save and Loan groups confirm that they will continue after the end of the project, the same applies to small income generating activities resulting from these groups. Empowerment of women will continue and some of the multipliers trained by the project are likely to continue their function with a sense of responsibility.

## 7 Recommendations

The most important recommendations which should be considered during the remaining project period are:

- To **improve the sustainability** of the groups and processes, to reschedule activities, to adapt the budget and the indicators of the logframe and to elaborate exit strategies for FLUPFA and TUPUFU, the processing groups, the demo gardens near health facilities, the Farmers` Resource Center, the market stand in the outskirts of Tubmanburg and the Multi Stakeholder Forum (financial sustainability)
- To increase the **efficiency of project implementation** especially regarding calculations of profitability, flow of communication, transport, contracts (MoU) and the revision of the pay back scheme
- The improved **collaboration and coordination between Welthungerhilfe and ACF** should be continued and intensified.
- For the crosscutting issues **Gender and HIV/AIDS** it is recommended to elaborate as soon as possible a brief strategy, to train staff in gender and HIV/AIDS issues and to include some priority topics into trainings.

## 8 General conclusions and lessons learnt

If two or more partner organisations are implementing a project together, it is necessary to plan for regular meeting of representatives of all implementing organisations and a joint management.

Hygienic and fodder difficulties pose problems to animal husbandry in urban settings. It appears to be more adequate to peri-urban areas.

In urban agricultural production litter and waste water may cause serious hygienic problems. This has to be considered in the elaboration of project proposal.

In regions / cultures where Save and Loan or similar groups are already known, it seems promising to combine income generating activities with the support to Save and Loan groups.

Calculations of profitability and contracts (MOU) with the beneficiaries before the implementation of the measures are indispensable preconditions for the support of income generating activities.