



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



OFFICE OF EVALUATION

Project evaluation series

# Final Evaluation of the Joint Resilience Project in Kassala

ANNEXES

February 2018



**PROJECT EVALUATION SERIES**

# **Final Evaluation of the Joint Resilience Project in Kassala**

**ANNEXES**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
OFFICE OF EVALUATION  
February 2018**

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2018

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, Office of Evaluation (OED)  
Food and Agriculture Organization  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153 Rome  
Italy  
Email: [evaluation@fao.org](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)

Cover photo credits: @FAO/ Anne Bichard

## Contents

<b>Annex 1. Terms of Reference</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1. Background and context of the Project.....	1
2. Evaluation purpose .....	2
3. Evaluation scope .....	3
4. Evaluation objective and key questions.....	3
4.1 Evaluation Questions.....	3
5. Methodology.....	4
6. Limitations to be developed .....	6
6.1 Roles and responsibilities .....	6
7. Evaluation team composition and profile.....	7
8. Evaluation products (deliverables).....	7
9. Appendices to the Terms of Reference.....	9
Appendix 1. Overview of Kassala JRP available documentation.....	9
Appendix 2. Project Results Framework and Theory of Change.....	12
Appendix 3. Key stakeholders and partners .....	14
<b>Annex 2. Evaluation matrix</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Annex 3. Evaluation mission schedule</b> .....	<b>25</b>



## **Annex 1. Terms of Reference**

### **1. Background and context of the Project**

1. As part of its commitment to take a longer term approach to addressing humanitarian needs in chronic contexts, the Department for International Development (DFID) Sudan sponsored two initiatives under its Sudan Humanitarian Assistance and Resilience Programme (SHARP) funding envelope to pilot such approaches in the country: the Taadoud programme in Darfur and the Joint Resilience Project (JRP) in four localities in Kassala State. These initiatives have evolved over the implementation period, in terms of duration but also in the way they responded to learning over time and to a changing context affected by both drought and floods.
2. These TORs have been developed to guide the final evaluation of the Joint Resilience Project in Kassala (UNJP/SUD/077/CEF). The JRP started in September 2014 and will close, as planned, in September 2017. It was implemented in two interrelated phases: a first six-month phase led by the World Food Programme (WFP) involved a consultative process with the targeted communities; phase 2 lasted 30 months and saw the implementation of projects informed by the outcomes of the community dialogue. The consultative process continued throughout the second phase.
3. The JRP worked in the localities of Hameshkoreb, Telkok, Rural Aroma and North Delta in Kassala State and targeted 193 000 beneficiaries (0.9 percent of the population). It had an overall budget of GBP 15 942 009 and was implemented by a consortium of United Nations agencies led by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and including WFP and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The project aimed to improve nutritional status, food security and livelihood capacity and to reduce stunting within targeted communities, building on the comparative advantages of the three agencies. A synergistic set of activities were implemented to improve and strengthen communal and household level resilience, to make them better able to withstand recurrent and predictable shocks. Some components to address drought and the impact of flooding in some areas were also included.
4. The four localities selected for this joint project have some of the worst levels of malnutrition in the state and the highest maternal malnutrition and second highest maternal mortality in the country. Cultural behaviours and practices and gender disparities potentially aggravate the nutritional and health situation of women and children in these communities.
5. The JRP aimed to strengthen resilience to extreme weather shocks, namely droughts and floods, in targeted communities, through reduction of stunting in children under two years of age and anaemia in mothers and children under five. This outcome was to be achieved through a package of complementary interventions including:
  - a) engaging in participatory dialogue with communities (led by WFP);
  - b) implementing interventions to improve child nutrition with a focus on social and behavioural change of unhealthy practices (led by UNICEF);

- c) promoting access to water, sanitation and hygienic practices (led by UNICEF);
  - d) diversifying livelihoods and promoting more sustainable, nutritious, diverse and safe food production (led by FAO).
6. The programme design assumed that improving nutrition status by addressing both immediate and underlying causes of malnutrition, including behaviour change, would lead to improved maternal and child health and nutrition.<sup>1</sup>
  7. Key partners for the different components of the programme were the Government, including line ministries at state and federal levels, communities in all their demographic groups, community-based organizations (CBOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), Women's Union, Sudanese Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Water and Environmental Sanitation, Groundwater and Wadis Directorate (GWWD), Lebena, Practical Action, Rera, Moslem Aid, FPPO, Friendship for Peace and Development, Sudan vision, Bitay, WAAD, SORD, TOD, Rera, GAA, Plan Sudan, Jasmara, Pancare.

## 2. Evaluation purpose

8. This final evaluation was planned at design stage and is part of a structured monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system providing a framework to track key process, output, outcome and impact indicators throughout the lifecycle of the project. FAO takes the lead in evaluating the joint project.
9. The *primary intended users* of this evaluation are the Joint Project Steering Committee comprised of the donor and the three participating agencies, as well as all staff from the three agencies involved in the implementation of the project and Ministries and other government institutions, NGOs, CBOs, unions, local authorities involved as key partners for the various Outputs. *Secondary users* are the broader donor community in Sudan and the divisions and departments of the three agencies involved with resilience programming at corporate level.
10. DFID will commission a separate synthesis report that draws out and compares key findings from both evaluations of the initiatives commissioned under SHARP funding to capture key learning arising from their implementation. The synthesis is intended as a light touch exercise, and will:
  - summarize common (and contrasting) findings and areas of good practice identified in the evaluation reports;
  - make recommendations to all stakeholders on best practice to inform future programming and wider learning;
  - capture overall outcomes of the two different programmes.
11. Having consistency in the key questions and evaluation approach for each initiative will support a stronger and more useful summary report, and these TORs were developed taking into account key evaluation questions and requirements outlined

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Appendix 2 for the project's Theory of Change and results framework.

by DFID to ensure some commonality and consistency of approach between the two evaluations.

### 3. Evaluation scope

12. The scope of the evaluation is the entire Joint Resilience-Building Project in Kassala, including its outputs detailed above and the related activities. The timeframe considered is from September 2014 to May 2017, when the fieldwork for this evaluation will take place. The geographical scope are the communities targeted by the project in the four localities of Kassala State where the project was implemented, namely Hameshkoreb, Telkok, Rural Aroma and North Delta. The evaluation will involve the 193 000 beneficiaries of the project, aiming to include the most vulnerable sections that were a specific target for the project (see Methodology section).
13. The evaluation will collect data only from a portion of the targeted communities and households, selected according to the criteria outlined in the methodology section of these TORs. The evaluation also aims to involve some non-beneficiaries in the communities it will visit, for triangulation and comparison purposes, and in general to include their perception on the benefits of the project and their understanding and acceptance of targeting criteria. To the same end, it will also consider visiting some communities who did not benefit from JRP support.

### 4. Evaluation objective and key questions

14. The **objective** of this evaluation, as per the project document, is “to assess the impact on the selected communities’ resilience and stunting prevalence in children under two years (...) and document lessons learned.” However, seeing that the project will still be ongoing when the final evaluation is carried out, results will be assessed at outcome and output level. The evaluation also aims to provide accountability to DFID, which provided funding to the three involved agencies.
15. The evaluation will have as an overarching framework the examination of the project’s Theory of Change, including anticipated outputs and outcomes, and linkages and assumptions between them. The evaluation will be structured along the main evaluation questions outlined below and in the evaluation matrix in Annex 2 (to be developed by the evaluation team and attached) which includes sub-questions and/or information needs under each evaluation question, as well as data collection methods.

#### 4.1 Evaluation Questions

##### Design and approach

16. (*Design*) To what extent are the project design and objectives relevant to the needs and to the context? Did the Theory of Change assumptions hold true? To what extent have the project activities delivered outputs and outcomes against the Theory of Change?
17. (*Consultation process*) How have communities and individuals within them been actively engaged in the project through the community consultation process? Has this process helped shape overall priorities and design of the project, reflecting

priority concerns of different segments of the population? Has project implementation adapted in response to feedback and changing need? Has the consultation process effectively enhanced the agency of the involved communities and individuals, thereby contributing towards the resilience-building goal?

18. *(M&E)* How did the chosen monitoring and evaluation approach perform? Did it allow the project to adapt in a timely manner?
19. *(Coordination)* How effective has the relationship been between the three United Nations partners in terms of collaboration and delivery? And how efficient and effective has the collaboration been between them and their national counterparts (including implementing partners and local and national authorities)? Has the working relationship with the donor facilitated programme delivery, and how? In collaborating, which areas and practices have worked well, and which ones could be improved?

## **Results**

20. *(Impact and outcome)* What were the intended and positive and negative unintended results of the project? Are there indications that resilience to droughts and floods increased in the targeted communities, or that it is likely to increase as a result of the interventions? What internal and external key factors and critical processes supported and/or limited achievement of outcomes?
21. *(Outputs and timeliness)* Has the project been implemented and have results been achieved in a timely manner and according to schedule? To what extent have the delivery options and models ensured efficient use of funds and added value, including management structures; use of different consortia (local/international partners); integration of programme activities; delivery at scale?
22. *(Community perception)* What is the perception of the results of the project according to different segments of the community, and of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households?

## **Gender/Equity**

23. *(Gender)* To what extent and how has gender been considered in project design and implementation? What have been the results, if any?
24. *(Vulnerability)* To what extent and how have project design and implementation supported the most vulnerable and marginalized segments within the communities? What have been the results of this support, if any?

## **5. Methodology**

25. The key evaluation questions above were developed through a consultative process including the donor and the implementing agencies. They will guide the overall assessment and be refined over the course of the evaluation, with further sub-questions developed to produce an overall evaluation matrix.

26. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach within the team and with internal and external stakeholders throughout the process. The project team and the FAO Sudan M&E Officer, as well as UNICEF and WFP M&E Officers, will be an important source of information and exchange for the evaluation team. The donor and other agencies will be consulted on a regular basis through skype and face-to-face interviews. Progress in the evaluation will also be discussed during agency technical meetings, if relevant and needed. Triangulation of different data sources, perspectives (including beneficiaries and other stakeholders) and time points will underpin validation and analysis and support conclusions and recommendations.
27. In answering the evaluation questions, the evaluation will start by conducting a desk review of existing documents and other secondary data. It will make use of primary data sources, including semi-structured key informant interviews with FAO, UNICEF and WFP staff (all staff providing services and oversight on the ground and JRP Kassala office staff), government officials, development partners and civil society. Interviews will be conducted with beneficiaries at the community level too. Protocols for interviews will be developed by the evaluation team prior to the data collection phase.
28. Secondary sources will include outputs of phase 1, e.g. individual community level resilience plans, baseline data and monitoring data and project progress reports including but not limited to:
  - baseline and annual outcome indicators;
  - any existing rounds of the knowledge, attitudes and practices survey, including health, nutrition, water sanitation and hygiene (WASH), gender, agriculture and livelihood information, supposedly carried out at inception and repeated at 18 months;
  - quarterly and six-monthly reviews/reports monitoring implementation progress and identifying bottlenecks;
  - annual review of progress against plans and indicators.
29. Beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries will be interviewed in the four localities divided by gender and socio-economic groups (farmers, pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, etc.). Some non-beneficiaries from neighbouring communities who were not included in the JRP will be interviewed as well. To ensure the eventual impact of El Niño and flood response is captured, communities that benefited from those specific emergency interventions will be targeted
30. Beneficiary and non-beneficiary individuals and communities will be involved through focus group discussions with village development committee (VDC) members, but also through interviews with randomly or purposefully selected beneficiaries in the different sectors (livelihood, nutrition, health, WASH) and instances (mother support groups, cooperatives, etc.). PRA methods to collect information and elicit discussions may also be used. Feedback will be provided to communities through VDCs
31. Specific methodologies will be developed considering Outputs 1 to 4 and relative indicators. In relation to the overall Outcome "Improved maternal and child nutrition

status”, some anthropometric measurement of selected children might be appropriate in selected communities if deemed feasible and cost-effective.

32. Particular attention will be devoted to ensuring that women and caretakers of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children are consulted in an adequate manner, as well as other vulnerable groups (e.g. poor people, people with disabilities, the elderly, the sick, minorities and indigenous people) who were given priority in targeting. The evaluation will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards.<sup>2</sup>

## **6. Limitations to be developed**

### **6.1 Roles and responsibilities**

33. The **Office of Evaluation (OED)** takes the lead in drafting the ToR, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the team’s work; it is responsible for the finalization of the ToR and of the team composition; it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations. The Office of Evaluation (OED) is also responsible for following up with the Budget Holder for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the follow-up to the Management Response.
34. The **Office of Evaluation (OED) Evaluation Manager** guides and coordinates the evaluation team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and coordinates the production of the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for the finalization of the ToR and of the identification of the evaluation team members.
35. The **Project Task Force**, which includes the FAO Budget Holder, the Lead Technical Officer and the Team of the programme to be evaluated (defined as the evaluand) are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the Terms of Reference and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, make information and documentation available as necessary, and comment on the draft report. The Budget Holder is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the Lead Technical Officer and others members of the Project Task Force. Office of Evaluation (OED) guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.
36. The **Evaluation team** is responsible for further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation and for producing the evaluation report. All team members will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The evaluation team will agree on the

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template. The evaluation team will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the Evaluation Manager and consultations with the Budget Holder and Project Task Force. The evaluation team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although the Office of Evaluation (OED) is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

## **7. Evaluation team composition and profile**

37. The evaluation team will consist of one external international consultant and two national consultants. The team will work under the guidance and with participation of the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) Evaluation Manager.
38. The international consultant will have experience and expertise in evaluation and one or more of the following areas: nutrition and health, sustainable rural livelihoods, WASH. The national consultants will have some experience in evaluation and food security and nutrition frameworks and methodologies, and a good knowledge of the local context.
39. The evaluation team members and national consultants should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the Joint Resilience-Building Project in Kassala.

## **8. Evaluation products (deliverables)**

- a. Evaluation TORs
- b. Evaluation matrix
- c. Draft evaluation report: the project team and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The draft report should illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the TOR.
- d. Final evaluation report: should include an executive summary and illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the ToR. The report will be prepared in English with numbered paragraphs, following the Office of Evaluation (OED) template for report writing. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.
- e. Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

40. The evaluation team will discuss with the project team involved with implementation, following which it will produce questionnaires and other data collection tools, as well as a full indicative timeline of the evaluation.

- Planning phase
- Data collection mission in Sudan
- Report writing

**Table 1:** Indicative timeline of the evaluation

<b>Task</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
ToR	Draft by 22 January 2017, Finalization by 24 February 2017	EM with BH and PTF
Team identification and recruitment	March 2017	EM with BH and PTF
Briefing of ET	March-April	
Reading background documentation	March-April	EM for ToR development; ETL and ET for preparation of the evaluation
Mission organization and travel arrangements	March-April	ETL with EM and PTF
Mission to Sudan	Early May 2017	EM and ET
First draft for circulation	June 2017	EM and ET
Final draft for circulation	July 2017	EM and ET
Validation of the recommendations	End August 2017	EM and ET
Final Report	September 2017	EM and ET

BH: Budget Holder  
EM: Evaluation Manager  
ET: Evaluation team

ETL: Evaluation team Leader  
PTF: Project Task Force

## 9. Appendices to the Terms of Reference

### Appendix 1. Overview of Kassala JRP available documentation

Name	Author	date	Description
Quarterly report		Oct-Dec 2015	
Quarterly report		Jan-March 2016	
Six monthly report		Oct 2015-March 2016	
First Annual joint progress report	FAO, UNICEF, WFP, DFID	Sept 2014/ Sept 15	
Second Annual report		Oct 2015/ Sept 16	
JRP community dialogue and action plans – Rural Aroma	Rural Aroma locality consortium	March 2015	Final Report
Telkook community dialogue implementation report	Sudan Vision, SRCS, Practical Action Consortium	24 March 2014	Final Report
Final report community consultation for the JRP in seven villages in Hameshkorieb locality	Welthungerhilfe and Bitaye Organisation	March 2015	Final Report
Hameshkorieb village profiling			Matrix for seven villages in Hameshkorieb: km distance to

			Hameshkoreib; total population; female headed households; community structure; total arable land; health facilities; education facilities; main types of shock; main income source
Village list of planning and development committees			Matrix for seven villages in Hameshkoreib
Village resource mapping exercise			Seven Hameshkoreib village maps drawn by the communities during the consultation processes
Community action plans for Hamishkorieb villages			Action plan matrices for each of the seven villages in Hameshkoreib, detailing: activities/quantities/unit/year (1, 2, or 3)/remarks by sector (agriculture, livestock, WASH, health and nutrition, education)
North Delta community profiles	North Delta consortium	February 2015	20 village profiles collected through the community dialogue process (narrative). introduction; community structure; economic activities; education; health status and services; nutrition; WASH; gender and negative practices; community needs and priorities
Telkook community dialogue presentation	Practical Action, SRCS, Sudan Vision Consortium	17 March 2015	
Hamishkorieb community dialogue	Welthungerhilfe, Betay organization	February 2015	
JRP Primary results and findings -	SORD		

consolidated			
North Delta community dialogue final findings	North Delta consortium	March 2015	
JRP Community action plans 2015-17 Rural Aroma	SORD		Aroma villages action plan matrices: activities in 22 localities/lead agency/sector/activity/timeframe
JRP Community action plans 2015-17 North Delta	Talaweit Organization for Development	8/12 February 2015	North Delta villages action plan matrices: activities in 20 localities/output/lead agency/sector/activities/timeframe
Logframe			
JRP in Kassala ProDoc	FAO UNICEF WFP	July 2014	
Actions and activities matrix			Activities/villages/population/agency/time frame for all villages in all four localities: Rural Aroma, North Delta, Telkuk, Hamashkoreib

## Appendix 2. Project Results Framework and Theory of Change

### Theory of Change

1. The proposed programme areas have a very high stunting prevalence that signifies the erosion of people's resilience and greater vulnerability to shocks. This is mainly attributed to recurrent droughts and floods over the past decade, amongst other factors. Open defecation and limited access to safe water and to sanitation services have placed the communities at high risks of water-borne disease outbreaks. Food insecurity, which contributes to poor dietary intake and is compounded by suboptimal feeding, caring practices and unhealthy cultural practices and taboos around maternal and child nutrition further compromising the nutrition status.
2. The joint programme aims to strengthen resilience to extreme weather shocks, namely droughts and floods of targeted communities in four localities (Aroma, Hammashkoreb, North Delta and Telkok) in Kassala State through reduction of stunting in children under two years, and anaemia in mothers and children under five.
3. The proposed outcome will be achieved through a package of complementary interventions that include:
  - a) engaging in participatory dialogue with communities to enable them to identify and understand their own risks, shocks and consequences, and their strengths;
  - b) implementing effective and affordable interventions that have been proven to reduce stunting, acute malnutrition, micronutrient deficiencies and child deaths, with a strong focus on social and behavioural change of unhealthy practices;
  - c) promoting equitable and sustainable access to water resources, sanitation facilities and hygienic practices, with an intended positive impact on health and welfare, reduced pressure on water resources;
  - d) diversifying livelihoods and promoting crops that are more, diverse, nutritious and safe, and enhancing meat and milk production in a sustainable natural resource management and deep engagement of the local communities to increase and diversify food consumption and income sources.
4. The programme design assumes that improving nutrition status through addressing both immediate and underlying causes of malnutrition including behaviour change will lead to improved maternal and child health and nutrition. Reducing malnutrition is crucial to strengthening resilience because well-nourished individuals are healthier, can work harder and have greater physical reserves; households that are nutrition secure are thus better able to withstand external shocks. It is also assumed that stunting can be attributed to the occurrence of five or more diarrhoeal episodes before two years of age that can be aggravated by occurrence of floods or droughts in the targeted localities. Furthermore, agriculture can improve people's diets by increasing the availability, affordability and consumption of diverse, safe and nutritious food. Income from livestock and agriculture can contribute substantially to household investments in health, water, sanitation and education. Lastly, it is assumed that women's empowerment is positively associated with improvements in nutrition outcomes, particularly reduced stunting.

5. The Theory of Change shows that our primary objective and desired results – the outcome – focus on resilience and nutrition, which are co-dependent and mutually reinforcing. Households that are most affected by shocks and threats face the greatest risk of malnutrition; thus, strengthening resilience is essential to efforts to reduce malnutrition. The collaborative efforts of the three United Nations agencies will create synergistic impact by integrating our programmes and activities around a shared entry point and goal. The interventions that we have selected are high-impact and cost-effective in both the strengthening resilience of the selected communities and reducing stunting among infants and young children.

### **Expected Results**

**Impact:** Increase resilience to droughts and floods in the targeted communities in four selected localities (Aroma, Ammashkoreb, North Delta and Telkok) in Kassala State.

*Indicator:* Stunting reduction in children 0-23 months.

**Outcome:** Improved maternal and child nutrition status.

*Indicator:* Reduction in prevalence of anaemia in pregnant women and children under five years of age.

### **Outputs:**

1. Community owned action plans to strengthen resilience to floods and droughts are developed by end of phase 1.
2. Increase access to maternal and child health and nutrition services.
3. Increase the availability of improved drinking water, use of improved sanitation facilities and hand washing practices in two localities.
4. Increase the resilience of livelihoods to shocks that impact agriculture, food, nutrition and economic sustainability.

*From the project document of the Joint Resilience Building Project in Kassala.*

### Appendix 3. Key stakeholders and partners

Name	role	Organization/institution	Location
<b>KHARTOUM</b>			
Veronica Quattrola	Deputy Rep Sudan and FAO-JRP supervisor	FAO	Khartoum
Elwathig Mukhtar	Assistant FAO Representative (Programme)	FAO	Khartoum
Mufarah Ahmed	Technical officer for Kassala	FAO	Khartoum
Mohamed Faisal Ashraf Gameel	Operations team	FAO	Khartoum
Firoj Ahmed	M&E officer	FAO	Khartoum
Emma Conlan	Head of Resilience	WFP	Khartoum
Marco Cavalcante	Head of Programme	WFP	Khartoum
Rihab Ibrahim	Senior Programme Assistant	WFP	Khartoum
Tarig Mustafa	Programme Officer	WFP	Khartoum
Inkeri Kantola	M&E Officer	WFP	Khartoum
Medoune Diop	Nutrition specialist and JRP Coordinator	UNICEF	Kassala
Larissa Brunn	Donor's Relations	UNICEF	Khartoum
Talal Maghoub	Nutrition Specialist	UNICEF	Khartoum
Mueni Mutunga	Chief of Nutrition Section	UNICEF	Khartoum
Alastair Burnett	Humanitarian Advisor	DFID	Khartoum
Tarig Dafallah Elhassan	Deputy Programme Manager	DFID	Khartoum
Steve Burton		DFID	Khartoum
<b>KASSALA</b>			
Abu Obeida	Chief of Field Office	UNICEF	Kassala
Mohammed Ali	Nutrition Officer	UNICEF	Kassala
Zuhair Suliman	Health Officer	UNICEF	Kassala
Imad Eldin Hasan	Wash Officer	UNICEF	Kassala
Eljaili Rahamtalla	JRP Nutrition Officer	UNICEF	Kassala

Wegdan Abdulrahman	JRP officer/NPO	FAO	Kassala
Elfaki, Banaga	Technical officer	FAO	Kassala
Ahmed, Abdelazim	Technical officer	FAO	Kassala
Ahmed Lummumba	Head of office	WFP	Kassala
Salih Orabi	JRP officer	WFP	Kassala
Hassan Eissa	Technical Officer	WFP	Kassala
Afkar Osman	Technical Officer	WFP	Kassala
Nour Eldien Hussien Ali	Director General	MOH	Kassala
Dr Tahani Khidr Slman	Nutrition Director	MOH	Kassala
Hsabo Alrsoul Hmida	Director General	MOA	kassala
Gamal Mohmed Elamien	Director of Planning & Development unit	MOA	Kassala
Isam Abdelkareem	Head of office	FNC	Kassala
Mousa Osheik	Director General	MOF	Kassala
Gamal Mohamed Alhassan	Director Planning & development	MOF	Kassala
Mustafa Humod	Director General	MOSCAF	Kassala
Buthina Akasha	Director of rural women development	MOSCAF	Kassala
Hussien Ery	Head of office	TOD	Kassala
Krar Ali Mohmed Tahir	Head of Officde	Betay Organization	Kassala
Ali AlKarar	Head of Office	Sudan Vision	Kassala
Ammar Mohmed Ibrahim	Head of Office	WAAD	Kassala
Ahmed Tirik	Head of Office	Delta	Kassala
Mustafa Mohamed AlHassan	Head of Office	SORD	Kassala
Ghada Ahmed Batran	General Manager	JASMAR	Kassala
Mohamed Idris	Head of Office	ISRA	Kassala
Hatim Mirgani	Prog.Officer	GAA	Kassala
Hassan Mohamed Ahmed	Head of Office	SRCS	Kassala
Abdelmageed Jaber	Programme officer	SRCS	Kassala
Nagat Himeeda	Head of Office	Raira	Kassala
Amir Babo	Head of Office	Plan Sudan	Kassala
Mohmed Eisa	Commissioner	Hameshkoreib locality	kassala
Elegail Awad Elegail	Commissioner	Telkuk locality	Kassala

Omer Almadih	Commissioner	Aroma locality	Kassala
Elsadig Hassai	Commissioner	North Delta locality	kassala
Abubakr Mohamed	Technical engineer	WES	Kassala
Buthiena	Director of cooperative department	Coop Administration /Mo Finance	Kassala
TBD	Chairperson of VDC in the selected sites	JRP selected villages	4 localties

## Annex 2. Evaluation matrix

### JRP evaluation Matrix – Based on ToR

#### Data Collection Methods:

- Semi structured interviews
- Restitution of preliminary findings in localities/villages in Kassala with JRP team
- Documents analysis
- Field Observation

Design and Approach			
	Sub-questions	Measure/Indicator	Main Sources of Information
1.1	<b>Relevance of JRP's Design</b>	<p><b>1.1.1</b> To what extent are the project design and objectives relevant to the needs and to the context?</p> <p><i>-Process and Quality of the initial assessment needs; (E.g. analyses of existing studies, lessons learned from projects in progress or finalized in the targeted localities, from previous United Nations Joint programmes, United Nations resilience programmes and evaluations)</i></p> <p><i>-Process and quality of the review of needs during the implementation of the operation</i></p> <p><i>N.B.: Process of project design (First ProDoc, Community consultation, second logframe and matrix of activities, updated with an additional Outcome, El Niño output, and gender indicators)</i></p> <p><i>-Relevance of the geographic targeting localities and villages according to identified needs?</i></p> <p><i>-Relevance/appropriateness of the indicators proposed to assess the achievement/outcome/impact of the project?</i></p> <p><i>-Relevance of Outcomes (initial/updated) regarding the expected impact?</i></p> <p><i>-Relevance of activities and Output regarding the expected outcomes?</i></p> <p><i>-Possible alternatives?</i></p> <p>How were risks linked to recurrent climatic shocks anticipated at design stage?</p>	<p><b>Mainly document-based</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Project document(s); ProDoc, matrix, logframe</li> <li>-Needs assessment reports (?) <b>S3M</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Other?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Other relevant documents</li> <li>-United Nations staff implicated <b>in the programme design</b></li> <li>-DFID staff</li> <li>-Local Government and authorities</li> <li>-Implementing partners</li> <li>-Beneficiaries</li> <li>-Participatory Community Consultation Report</li> </ul>
		<p><b>1.1.2</b> Did the Theory of Change assumptions hold true?</p> <p><i>Relevance of the assumptions</i></p> <p><i>Relevance of causal relationship presented in the ToC</i></p>	

<p><b>1.2</b></p>	<p><b>JRP's Consultation process</b></p>	<p><b>1.2.1</b> How have communities and individuals within them been actively engaged in the project through the community consultation process?  <b>Focusing on the approach to avoid overlap with Q2 for Output 1</b>  <i>Time dedicated, method developed for community consultation?</i>  <i>Criteria adopted to identify the 75 targeted villages in the four localities?</i>  <i>Process, approach to identify individuals engaged in the process of consultation?</i>  <i>Method tools used to appreciate the engagement/adhesion of community in villages.</i></p>	<p><b>Mainly Beneficiaries, implementing partners and project staff.</b>                      -Beneficiaries                      -Implementing partners                      -United Nations staff                      -Local Government and authorities                      -Project document                      -Participatory Community Consultation Report/logframe and matrix of activities                      -Other relevant documents</p>
		<p><b>1.2.2</b> Has this process helped <b>shape overall priorities and design</b> of the project, reflecting priority concerns of <b>different segments</b> of the population?  <b>Focusing on the approach to avoid overlap with Q2 for output and Q3-2 Gender and equity (Q3)</b>  <i>Are community priorities reported in the Community plans?</i>  <i>Are community plans respected in the Matrix/logframe?</i>  <i>Inclusion/exclusion:</i>  <i>Who defined the priority in villages? Young/old; men/woman; agriculture/livestock? Village leaders/non-leaders?</i>  <i>In case of divergence between sub-groups in the village regarding the priority, how was the final decision?</i>  <i>Were there groups not involved in consultation process? Are there groups not aware of the consultation process?</i></p>	
		<p><b>1.2.3.</b> Has project implementation adapted in <b>response to feedback and changing need?</b>  <i>Identify the adaptation that occurred (after community consultation, during implementation of activities)</i>  <i>What are the reasons/causes that lead to these adaptations? How were they identified? (M&amp;E, partner feedback, implementing partner feedback)?</i>  <i>Were there regular consultations of community during implementation to adjust the programme to the needs? And adaptation of the programme based on this consultation?</i>  <i>El Niño drought (that leads to the introduction of Output 5): how were needs identified? Were communities consulted or not? Who defined the activities for Output 5?</i>  <i>How were villages/households/individuals targeted for Output 5?</i></p>	
		<p><b>1.2.4</b> Has the consultation process effectively enhanced the agency of the involved communities and individuals, thereby contributing towards the resilience-building goal?  <i>Do communities become owners of the project thanks to consultation process?</i>  <i>Was the engagement of the community real in some villages and not in others? Why?</i>  <i>Are the plans available in all villages?</i>  <i>Does the community rely on this plan?</i>  <i>What is the objective of this plan for them?</i>  <i>How does the community define resilience? And resilience to climatic shocks?</i></p>	

1.3	M&E	<p><b>1.3.1</b> How did the chosen monitoring and evaluation approach perform?  <i>What was the process to build and <b>adapt</b> the JRP M&amp;E system?</i>  <i>Coordination between agency on monitoring</i>  <i>Did the M&amp;E approach allow (or not) the project to adapt in a timely manner?</i></p>	<p>-JRP Coordinator                      -United Nations Kassala                      -United Nations M&amp;E                      -DFID staff                      -Field visit reports                      -M&amp;E reports                      -Implementing partners</p>
1.4	JRP's Coordination approach	<p><b>1.4.1</b> How effective has the relationship been between the three United Nations partners in terms of collaboration and delivery?  <i>Effectiveness of the mechanism of coordination</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>in Khartoum</i></li> <li>• <i>in Kassala</i></li> </ul> <p><i>At the different stages/for different activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Needs assessments</i></li> <li>• <i>Joint Planning process at village level. Coordination to optimize and activities' implementing periods?</i></li> <li>• <i>Joint target regarding villages, Households and individuals</i></li> <li>• <i>Monitoring of the activities/Joint Reporting</i></li> <li>• <i>Human resources management (joint capacity building, shared resources)</i></li> <li>• <i>Logistic issues: optimization of logistical costs (transport, storage, etc.)?</i></li> <li>• <i>Administrative and financial management of the operation (appropriateness and respect of procedures)</i></li> <li>• <i>Optimization of implementing partners mobilization</i></li> <li>• <i>Joint dissemination/communication about the programme</i></li> <li>• <i>Joint exit strategy-building and measure planned to support the sustainability of the actions implemented</i></li> <li>• <i>Donor relation and joint resource mobilization strategy</i></li> </ul> <p><i>SWOT of the joint project management in JRP</i></p>	<p>-United Nations staff Khartoum and Kassala                      -Implementing partners and local authority                      -DFID                      -MoU inter-agency                      -Minutes of technical committee (Kassala and Khartoum)                      -Documents of planning of activities                      -Logistic, administration and finance management tools                      -Distribution reports                      -Partners reports                      -M&amp;E reports                      -Project equipment                      -Project budget/financial report</p>
		<p><b>1.4.2.</b> How efficient and effective has the collaboration been between JRP/United Nations and national counterparts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>implementing partners?</b>  <i>Quality and constraints of partnerships, partner's capacity?</i>  <i>Capacity-building plan for implementing partner?</i>  <i>Joint implementing partners or not?</i>  <i>What was planned for ownership by national actors and sustainability of actions?</i></li> <li>• <b>local authorities (and national) authorities</b>  <i>What Involvement of local authority?</i>  <i>What was planned for ownership by national actors and sustainability of actions?</i></li> </ul>	<p>-United Nations staff Khartoum and Kassala                      -Implementing partner                      -MoU with partners                      -Local authority                      -United Nations Staff                      -DFID</p>

		<p><b>1.4.3</b> Has the working relationship <b>with the donor</b> facilitated programme delivery, and how?  <i>Effectiveness of mechanism of communication (steering committee, joint field visit, reporting)?</i>  <i>How is the relationship (during proposal writing, implementation phase) appreciated by the different key actors</i></p>	<p>-JRP and United Nations Kassala          -United Nations Khartoum          -DFID staff          -Steering committee minutes</p>
<p><b>2.1</b></p>	<p><b>Activities implementation and timeliness</b></p>	<p><b>2.2.1</b> Have the project activities been implemented in a timely manner and according to schedule? Reason for difference between planned and achieved?</p> <p><b>Output 1:</b>  <i>-Decision making and planning on the changes that need to be made based on identified concerns</i>  <i>-Identification of the existing community structures to implement the action plans and creation of new ones if required</i>  <i>-Sharing with the wider community in the 32 villages action plan and implementation platforms developed by their representative validation and buy in</i>  <i>-Strengthening or establishment if needed of women's community groups/centres</i></p> <p><b>Output 2:</b>  <i>-Improved prevention and treatment of childhood illnesses</i>  <i>-Prevention of acute malnutrition and stunting</i>  <i>-Improve global acute malnutrition management</i>  <i>-Improve maternal nutrition</i></p> <p><b>Output 3:</b>  <i>-Community approach to open defecation (CATS)</i>  <i>-Community mobilization, sensitization and hand washing with soap</i>  <i>-Household treatment and safe storage</i>  <i>-Water facility management structures and systems</i></p> <p><b>Output 4:</b>  <i>-Support the construction of small dams, store chains terraces, haffirs ,gabion and mesquite management, etc. (see sub-activities) (FAO and WFP)</i>  <i>-Support the establishment and enforcement of agreed-upon-protection measures for grazing and forest areas, and support targeted reforestation and broadcasting of grasses, as well as mesquite reduction to enhance the natural vegetation cover (see sub-activities) (FAO)</i>  <i>-Ensure durable access to appropriate traditional and new knowledge in sustainable natural resource governance and management through interactive training approaches suitable for experienced practitioners (see sub-activities) (FAO and WFP)</i>  <i>-Provide support to households to sustainably improve production and productivity of their livestock and crop-based activities (see sub-activities)</i>  <i>-Preventive measures for flooding and water contamination (WFP)</i>  <i>-Home Gardening with focus on nutrition for 30 000 households (see sub-activities) (FAO)</i></p>	<p>-Matrix March <b>2015 to be confirmed/updated with JRP Staff</b>          -Annual Reports, annual survey          -M&amp;E reports          -JRP staff          -Implementing partners          -Beneficiaries of each activities          -Direct Observation          -Local authority          -Field visit reports          -Partner's reports</p>

		-F2M (6500 farmers per year for three years at USD 20 in the four location) (WFP) <b>Output 5</b>	
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Output attainment</b>	<p><b>2.1.1</b> What is the level of attainment of the planned outputs? Reason for difference between planned and achieved?  <i>1.1 Proportion of women in leadership positions in the Village Development Committees (VDCs) (WFP)</i>  <i>1.2 Number of targeted villages (communities) with resilience plans developed with participation of both women and men (WFP)</i>  <i>1.3 Number of targeted villages/communities implementing action plans with participation of both women and men (WFP)</i>  <i>2.1 Number of mothers of children 0-24 months with access to infant and young child feeding (IYCF) promotion and counselling services in the targeted villages (UNICEF)</i>  <i>2.2 Number children under five (disaggregated by male/female) in the targeted villages receiving severe acute malnutrition (SAM) treatment services (UNICEF)</i>  <i>2.3 Number of children under five (disaggregated by male/female) in the targeted villages receiving moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) treatment services. (WFP)</i>  <i>2.4 Number children under five (disaggregated by male/female) in the targeted villages receiving moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) prevention services. (WFP)</i>  <i>2.5 Number of pregnant and lactating women in the targeted villages receiving moderate acute malnutrition treatment services. (WFP)</i>  <i>2.6 Number of pregnant and lactating women in the targeted villages receiving moderate acute malnutrition prevention services (WFP)</i>  <i>2.7 Number of children under one year (disaggregated by male/female) who received first dose of measles vaccination (UNICEF)</i>  <i>2.8 Number of children (disaggregated by male/female) receiving medical treatment as per IMCI guidelines and standards (UNICEF)</i>  <i>3.1 Number of targeted villages/communities that declare and are certified Open Defecation Free (ODF) in Aroma locality (UNICEF)</i>  <i>3.2 Number of targeted households with mothers and children carers (disaggregated by male headed/female headed households) washing hands with soap at critical times (after defecation, after cleaning child faeces, before eating, before feeding a child and before cooking) (UNICEF)</i>  <i>3.3 Number of targeted households (disaggregated by male headed/female headed households) with access to functional water facilities at any given time (UNICEF)</i>  <i>3.4 Number of people (disaggregated by gender) who have access to improved sanitation facilities (UNICEF)</i>  <i>4.1.1 Number of villages/communities with improved and sustainably managed vegetation cover (valuable local tree, shrub and grass species) (FAO)</i>  <i>4.1.2 Number of villages/communities with water management facilities (terraces, dykes, stone chains, small dams, haffirs and basins etc.) (FAO)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Annual Reports, annual survey</li> <li>-M&amp;E reports</li> <li>-JRP staff</li> <li>-Implementing partners</li> <li>-Beneficiaries of each activities</li> <li>-Local authority</li> <li>-Field visit reports</li> <li>-Partner's reports</li> </ul>

		<p>4.2.1 Number of small holder agro-pastoralists (disaggregated by male /female) with more sustainably productive small ruminants and poultry producing nutritious food (milk, meat, eggs, etc.) for household consumption and income generation (FAO)</p> <p>4.3.1 Number of smallholder farmers (disaggregated by male /female) sustainably producing nutritious food (legumes, vegetables, etc.) from their own home gardens for household consumption and income generation (FAO)</p> <p>4.3.2 Percentage of JRP supported villages where women have increased access to assets (WFP)</p> <p>5.1.1 Number of children under five (disaggregated by male/female) in the affected villages receiving severe acute malnutrition treatment services (SAM)</p> <p>5.1.2 Number of children under five (disaggregated by male/female) with diarrhoea who receive good diarrhoea treatment in affected villages (UNICEF)</p> <p>5.1.3. Number of children (disaggregated by male/female) receiving treatment as per IMCI guidelines and standards (UNICEF)</p> <p>5.2.1 Number of affected population washing hands with soap at critical times in affected villages (UNICEF)</p> <p>5.2.2 Number of affected population with access to improved sanitation facilities (UNICEF)</p> <p>5.2.3 Number affected population with access to improved drinking water sources (UNICEF)</p> <p>5.3.1 Number of El Niño affected households with enhanced access to livestock inputs (water, animal feed, fodder and mineral lick) (FAO)</p> <p>5.3.2 Number of people benefiting from general food distribution in affected households (WFP)</p> <p>5.3.3 Number of children under five receiving a preventative nutrition ration (WFP)</p>	
<p><b>2.3</b></p>	<p><b>Outcome</b></p>	<p><b>2.1.1</b> What were the intended and (positive and negative) unintended outcomes of the project?</p> <p><b>Intended outcome/impact:</b></p> <p>1: Improved maternal and child health and nutrition status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator: Proportion of children under five (disaggregated by male/female) with diarrhoea that received good diarrhoea treatment in the last two weeks (UNICEF)</li> <li>• Indicator: Reduction in prevalence of anaemia in children under five (disaggregated by male/female) (UNICEF)</li> <li>• Indicator: Reduction in prevalence of anaemia in pregnant women (UNICEF)</li> </ul> <p>2: Improved adaptive capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator: Proportion of targeted communities reporting improved or stabilized capacity to manage climatic shocks and risks (WFP)</li> </ul> <p>Intended impact: Increase resilience to droughts and floods in the targeted communities in four selected localities (Aroma, Hammashkoreb, North Delta and Telkok) in Kassala State.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator: Stunting prevalence in children (disaggregated by male/female) &lt; two years (UNICEF)</li> </ul> <p><b>What other outcomes</b> (positive and negative) are perceived by the different stakeholders?</p>	<p>-Annual reports, annual survey</p> <p>-M&amp;E reports</p> <p>-JRP staff</p> <p>-Implementing partners</p> <p>-Beneficiaries of each activities</p> <p>-Direct observation</p> <p>-Local authority</p> <p>-Field visit reports</p> <p>-Partner's reports</p>
		<p><b>2.1.2</b> What is the perception of the results of the project according to different segments of the community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Male/female?</li> </ul>	<p>-Direct observation on the field</p> <p>-Beneficiaries</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young/old people?</li> <li>• Leader/Non-leader?</li> <li>• Beneficiaries/non-beneficiaries households?</li> </ul> <p>To what extent have the project activities delivered outputs and outcomes against the Theory of Change? Are there indications that resilience to droughts and floods increased in the targeted communities, or that it is likely to increase as a result of the interventions?</p> <p>What are these indications according to the different stakeholders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United Nations/JRP</li> <li>• Local government</li> <li>• Implementing partners</li> <li>• Community (different segment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Implementing partners</li> <li>-JRP staff</li> <li>-Annual reports, annual survey</li> <li>-M&amp;E reports</li> <li>-Direct observation</li> <li>-Local authority</li> <li>-Field visit reports</li> <li>-Partner's reports</li> </ul>
		<p><b>2.1.3</b> What internal and external key factors and critical processes supported and/or limited achievement of outcomes/results?</p> <p><u>Internal factor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Design of the programme</li> <li>-Resources available (time/budget/human resources)</li> <li>-Resources allocated to the different activities</li> <li>-Decision making process and constraints management</li> <li>-Logistic/administrative procedure</li> <li>-Support provided by the different United Nations national offices to the project team</li> <li>-Implementing partners capacity</li> </ul> <p><u>External factor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Political, economic, institutional and security situation</li> <li>-National policies and strategies, and institutional support to the operation</li> <li>-Evolution of the food security/nutrition situation</li> <li>-Occurrence of shocks</li> <li>-Situation of women and girls</li> <li>-Socio-cultural characteristics and knowledge, behaviour of beneficiaries</li> <li>-Access to field/beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-United Nations staff in Khartoum and Kassala</li> <li>-Donor</li> <li>-HAC, local government and technical services</li> <li>-Health centre staff</li> <li>-Beneficiaries</li> <li>-Other key informants</li> <li>-Policy and strategy documents</li> <li>-Partners reports</li> <li>-M&amp;E reports</li> </ul>
		<p><b>2.1.4:</b> To what extent have the delivery options and models ensured efficient use of funds and added value, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• management structures</li> <li>• use of different consortia (local/international partners)</li> <li>• integration of programme activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-United Nations staff Khartoum and Kassala</li> <li>-Implementing partners and local authority</li> <li>-DFID</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• delivery at scale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Logistic, administration and finance management tools</li> <li>-Distribution reports</li> <li>-Partners reports, LOA</li> </ul>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<p>To what extent and how has gender been considered in project design and implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Needs assessment: situation and specific needs of women/girls are considered</li> <li>-Activities are shaped to allow women inclusion</li> <li>-Specific activities are proposed to answer their needs.</li> </ul> <p>What have been the results, if any?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Improvement of women position in the community</li> <li>-Improvement of women capacity</li> <li>-Perception of women on project result</li> <li>-Perception of men/leaders on gender results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Participatory Community Consultation Report</li> <li>-Project document(s)</li> <li>-Other relevant documents</li> <li>-United Nations staff</li> <li>-DFID staff</li> <li>-Local Government and authorities</li> <li>-Implementing partners</li> <li>-Beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Vulnerability</b>	<p>To what extent and how have project design and implementation supported the most vulnerable and marginalized segments within the communities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Relevance of targeting criteria to identify beneficiaries</li> <li>-Quality of the selection process, level of reported inclusions and exclusions, including complaint mechanism</li> <li>-Level of participation and satisfaction of stakeholders (including beneficiaries) in the definition of selection criteria and on the beneficiary selection process</li> </ul> <p>What have been the results of this support, if any?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Improvement of social position of the most vulnerable</li> <li>-Impact on social cohesion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Participatory Community Consultation Report</li> <li>-Project document(s)</li> <li>-Targeting reports? Distribution reports?</li> <li>-Other relevant documents</li> <li>-United Nations staff</li> <li>-DFID staff</li> <li>-Local Government and authorities</li> <li>-Implementing partners</li> <li>-Beneficiaries</li> </ul>

### Annex 3. Evaluation mission schedule

#### Full Mission Schedule

		MAY 2017																			
		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
ETL	Arrival in Khartoum	■																			
ET	Meeting in Khartoum: United Nations Staff –DFID – ZOA - CRS	■	■	■																	
ETL	Documentation Analysis; Matrix consolidation				■																
ET	Travel to Kassala Meeting with JRP team and United Nations representative					■															
ET	Visit to the HAC Meeting with Partners: Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Social and Cultural Affairs						■														
ET	Field work: 15 villages, four localities (see details below)							■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■						
EM	Arrival in Khartoum, meeting at FAO, DFID															■	■				
EM	Travel to Kassala																■				
ET	Meetings with JRP Team and meeting with United Nations officers Meeting with NGO partners Meeting with State Partners on WASH (Water and Environmental Sanitation, Ministry of Health)																■	■	■		
ET EM	Discussion on the findings																		■	■	







**Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations**

**OFFICE OF EVALUATION**  
[www.fao.org/evaluation](http://www.fao.org/evaluation)