



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United  
Nations

## Office of Evaluation

**Support to household food security and  
livelihood of vulnerable and food insecure  
farming families - GCP /AFG/061/LUX**

***Evaluation Report***

May 2013  
Final

## 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 2013

*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, OED  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153  
Rome, Italy  
Email: [evaluation@fao.org](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)

## **Acknowledgements**

The Evaluation team wishes to express its gratitude for the collaboration received in Kabul from FAOR Afghanistan, MAIL and MRRD staff at National, Provincial and District levels.

### Composition of the Evaluation Team

- Harry W. Denecke, Senior Evaluator

Assisted by the Project Management Team:

- Khalil Ur Rahman, National Project Manager
- Mohammad Ayoub, National Monitoring and Information Officer
- Marzia Popal, National Food Security and Livelihoods Officer
- Habibullah Malipour, National Administrative and Finance Assistant

### FAO Office of Evaluation

- Bernd Bultemeier, Evaluation Officer, FAO-OED, Rome
- Faith Nilsson, Evaluation Analyst, FAO-OED, Rome

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acronyms .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>13</b>
1.1 Background and purpose of the evaluation .....	13
1.2 Methodology of the evaluation.....	14
<b>2 Context of the project .....</b>	<b>16</b>
2.1 Developmental Context.....	16
2.2 Project Identification, Site Selection and Development.....	17
<b>3 Concept and relevance.....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 Design.....	18
3.2 Relevance .....	30
<b>4 Implementation .....</b>	<b>32</b>
4.1 Budget and Expenditure .....	32
4.2 Project Management .....	34
4.3 Technical Backstopping .....	35
4.4 Government support .....	36
<b>5 Results and contribution to stated objectives.....</b>	<b>37</b>
5.1 Outcomes and outputs .....	37
5.2 Gender issues.....	42
5.3 Capacity development .....	43
5.4 Sustainability .....	44
5.5 Impact.....	45
<b>6 Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>7 Lessons Learned.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Annex 1. Terms of Reference of the Evaluation.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Annex 2. Profile of Team members .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Annex 3. List of documents reviewed.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Annex 4. List of places visited and institutions, persons met.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Annex 5. List of activities/outputs .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Annex 6. List of Consultant and FAO backstopping missions .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Annex 7. Project Logical Framework matrix.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Annex 8. Baseline Survey of Livelihoods in Qarabagh and Surkhrod District .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Annex 9. CIGs of Qarabagh and Surkhrod District (status September 2012).....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Annex 10. Project’s Deliveries (Agricultural Inputs) to CIGs.....</b>	<b>86</b>

## Acronyms

AGNP	Nutrition Programmes Service (FAO), now ESN
ANDS	Afghan National Development Strategy
BL	Budget Line
CBO	Community Based Organizations
CDC	Community Development Committee
CIG	Common Interest Group
CSO	Central Statistics Office
DFID	Department for International Development of the United Kingdom
EU	European Union
ESA	Agricultural Development Economics Division (FAO)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAAHM	Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Information and Management Policy Unit (Statistics and Market Information)
FFS	Farmer Field School
HLP	Horticulture and Livestock Project
LOA	Letter of Agreement
LTU	Lead Technical Unit
MAIL	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEW	Ministry of Energy and Water
MISFA	Microfinance Investment Support Facility for Afghanistan
MOPH	Ministry of Public Health
MOWA	Ministry of Women's Affairs
MRRD	Ministry of Rehabilitation and Rural Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPFS	National Programme for Food Security
NRVA	National Rural Vulnerability Assessment
PICU	Programme Implementation and Coordination Unit (MAIL)
SPFS	Special Programme for Food Security
TCOS	Special Programme for Food Security Management and Coordination Service
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme of the United Nations
WHO	World Health Organization of the United Nations

1 jerib = 0.2 ha (2000 m<sup>2</sup>)

1 seer = 7 kg

## Executive Summary

ES 1. The project ‘Support to household food security and livelihoods of food insecure and vulnerable farming families’ (GCP/AFG/061/LUX) started 1 April 2010 and its present completion date is 31 March 2013. Its total funding is US\$ 2,135,700; the executing agency is FAO.

ES 2. It is implemented by MAIL in two districts Qarabagh, Kabul Province, and Surkhrod, Nangarhar Province. The direct target beneficiaries number 6515 farming families. These are grouped in Common Interest Groups, CIGs. There are 134 CIGs in Qarabagh and 124 CIGs in Surkhrod.

ES 3. The project has delivered most of the Outputs, some remaining work will be done during the last month of the project’s duration (March 2013) and thereafter during a no-cost extension period of four months. A follow-up project would be formulated soon.

ES 4. The project is implemented:

1. at the National level by staff of FAO:
  - Project Management Team: consisting of a National Project Manager, Monitoring and Information Management Officer, National Livelihoods and Food Security Officer, and support staff: National Administrative and Finance Assistant and two drivers,
2. and Counterpart staff of MAIL and MRRD:
  - at the National level by the Chief of Planning and Programming of the General Directorate of Extension
  - at the Provincial level by two Provincial Directors of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL), in each of the Provinces of Kabul and Nangarhar
  - at the District level by two teams of District Officers each consisting of 5-6 Extension Officers (of MAIL and of MRRD)

ES 5. The Development Objective of the project is:

- Decentralized government institutions successfully facilitating and coordinating the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure households, resulting in the adoption of improved livelihood strategies and household food security, contributing to the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger.

ES 6. The project has 4 main Outcomes with in total 13 Outputs.

- Outcome 1: Project Stakeholders/ beneficiaries sensitized and supported with needed services and inputs (farming technologies) to improve livelihood enterprise implementation.
- Outcome 2: Improved livelihood strategies successfully adopted by vulnerable and food insecure farming households resulting in increased household food security.
- Outcome 3: Model Extension Approach implemented to enhance National Service and Input Provision framework
- Outcome 4: Project team established and facilitated successful implementation of project at national, province and district/community level.

ES 7. The evaluation process was conducted by interviews with project staff, district level project staff, MAIL Departments’ staff, FAO staff, the farmers belonging to the target beneficiaries and CIGs, FAO-OED staff, LTU staff, by making field visits to the districts, and consultation of documents. Presented figures related to outputs, costs, agricultural inputs, delivery schedules and

were verified with beneficiaries and other staff. The Evaluation team consisted of a Senior Evaluator assisted by the Project Management Team.

## Key findings and Conclusions

### Key findings

ES 8. The project had a slow start but thereafter has operated efficiently. The project is fortunate to include very capable staff at the national, provincial and at the district level.

ES 9. The participatory approach in the baseline surveys was adequate and facilitated the identification and selection process of the target beneficiaries and grouping them into CIGs.

ES 10. The collaboration with colleagues at MAIL and at the district level with MRRD is optimal. Collaboration between FAO and MAIL is efficient also given the adjacent location of both offices.

ES 11. Virtually all the Outcomes and Outputs have been achieved (February 2013). The income of the members of the CIGs has improved considerably and so has the food security situation.

ES 12. With respect to the operation of the CIGs there is a distinct difference between Qarabagh and Surkhrod. In Qarabagh there are several CIGs who face passive or absent members; it may also apply to an entire CIG. However, the project management team believes that with a concerted effort especially by Extension Officers they may become active members again. In Surkhrod the situation is better than in Qarabagh since farmers have experience with the previous SPFS project in their communities.

ES 13. The pending issues at this moment are: –registration of the CIGs as Cooperatives, –the establishment of linkages with other rural development projects that operate in the same districts as the project, –capacity building through Farmer Field Schools, and –the supply of agricultural inputs to the CIGs for one more season since this has been lagging behind schedule; an important reason was the delay in the approval of a budget revision. These issues can be resolved during the last month (March 2013) of the project’s duration and in the no-cost extension period of four months requested.

ES 14. The core organizations of the project are the CIGs based on voluntary membership of poor vulnerable farming families, proved an excellent set-up for implementing the food security, improved livelihood and income generating activities. In fact, relatively few members left the CIGs. In the rural areas there is enthusiasm for CIGs and many people have expressed an interest to be part of future similar projects.

ES 15. The delivery of agricultural inputs is based on requests from CIGs (demand driven) after consultation with Extension Officers, and was adequate. However, prevailing procurement procedures will require CIGs to submit their request at least two months before the inputs are needed.

ES 16. Support to CIG members is limited to one jerib only. CIGs receive the agricultural inputs at the beginning of the cropping season and pay for this after harvesting the crop and selling of the crop produce; the money is deposited into a CIG owned bank account. Thereafter, CIGs are free to invest the money the way they deem useful. For instance it is possible to use the money as a contribution for benefitting from other initiatives of other agencies. Probably some more guidance would be beneficial to discuss this and assist the CIGs with the choices that are available. There is a strong feeling among the CIGs that more knowledge on business development, marketing etc. would be very useful for them.

ES 17. Gender issues need more attention and including female staff at the district level will have a positive impact on reaching out to women headed households as well as among the spouses of the male headed households.

ES 18. The so-called registration process effectively means the transfer of CIGs into single-purpose cooperatives. Many CIGs are hesitant to become registered and would prefer to remain a CIG. This is an important aspect that needs thorough consideration.

ES 19. The project achieved its immediate objective in as far as the CIGs are concerned. However with respect to the development objective aiming for an improvement in the food security situation for the entire population of the districts, a more detailed strategy should be designed and appropriate resources be allocated.

Conclusions (concluding observations) as related to the four Outcomes

Related to Outcome 1:

ES 20. Conclusion 1: The project's start was delayed four months mostly for administrative reasons.

ES 21. Conclusion 2: The project had a slow start since mobilization of staff took longer than anticipated and they had to become acquainted with computerized data formats, computerized reporting styles, baseline surveys demands, and so on.

ES 22. Conclusion 3: The recommendations by the consultancy on baseline survey, log-frame, and so on, caused some delays.

ES 23. Conclusion 4: All outputs are achieved.

Related to Outcome 2:

ES 24. Conclusion 5: The approval of Budget Revision C took about four months which affected the project as the assistance to CIGs for one cropping season was only partially realized due to delayed delivery of agricultural inputs to the CIGs.

ES 25. Conclusion 6: The FFS consultancy contribution became available only towards the end of the project; thus its benefit is less than optimal.

ES 26. Conclusion 7: The registration process of CIGs to become cooperatives should be revisited or at least adapted to suit the needs of the CIGs.

ES 27. Conclusion 8: The linkages with other rural development projects have not been fully explored as yet and this needs to be done soon (in March 2013 and thereafter in the no-cost extension period).

ES 28. Conclusion 9: To enhance the sustainability of the projects' outputs, a longer contact-time between the Extension Officers and the CIGs is needed (one season extra).

ES 29. Conclusion 10: The project achieved most of its outputs; what remains shall be done in March 2013 and thereafter in the no-cost extension period.

Related to Outcome 3:

ES 30. Conclusion 11: The project communicated its experiences and disseminated reports among relevant stakeholders; however, the implementation of its "model approach" is beyond the project's control and responsibility.



Related to Outcome 4:

ES 31. Conclusion 12: Outputs were achieved and use was made of FAO's normative products; however, in addition to the M&E system in place and in order to better assess the project's impact, representative sample surveys need to be elaborated.

ES 32. Conclusion 13: The project's mechanism for enhancing food security of the poor vulnerable farmers via CIGs and the lessons learned may be included in one of FAO's related normative products, for instance by FAO's Economic and Social Development Department.

## **Recommendations**

ES 33. Below is a listing of recommendations preceded by a short rationale for each of them. The recommendations are for FAO Senior Management, the Project Management Team, and for those in charge of formulating follow-up projects.

ES 34. In December 2010 the log frame was partly changed and an additional Outcome added; thereafter the log frame was called the "Improved Result Framework". There were several consequences and it was a cumbersome task for the Project Management Team to implement this.

### **1. Recommendation**

Avoid to change the logical framework in on-going projects unless there are very compelling reasons to do so.

ES 35. Gender issues need more attention: The workforce has not included female staff as Extension Officers at the district level; however, this would have been appropriate to deal with gender related livelihood aspects. This issue should be taken up by the General Directorate of Extension and be addressed in future similar projects.

### **2. Recommendation**

Engage in the district office at least one woman out of the five Extension Officers now assigned to the project per district.

ES 36. The baseline surveys were conducted based on a participatory approach with farmers and by Extension Workers and this resulted in a qualitative good and reliable survey. The consultancy mission to support the project staff came late (December 2010) to the project and baseline surveys were completed late.

### **3. Recommendation**

For the baseline survey the participatory approach in the districts for the inventory of livelihoods and the subsequent selection of poor and vulnerable farmers to form CIGs, proved to be an excellent approach and is recommended for similar projects.

### **4. Recommendation**

Field baseline support missions at the onset of a project and conduct baseline studies immediately after the start of the project.

ES 37. Assessing the performance of CIGs (or as Cooperatives) needs to be done at a later stage.

### **5. Recommendation**

The assessment of the functioning of the CIGs (for the benefit of its members) should not be linked to the upcoming registration process. If the CIGs (registered as and transformed into cooperatives, or not) continue to function satisfactorily "for at least one year after the termination of the project", than this cannot be evaluated now within the project's duration.

This must be evaluated later.

ES 38. Assistance to farmers should be reduced gradually and not abruptly.

**6. Recommendation**

The upcoming formulation of the follow-up project, also called Phase II, for two other districts, should include continued assistance to the Districts of Qarabagh and Surkhrod; however, based on a gradually reduced support to these Districts and provided to the CIGs according to their specific needs. In general this will be more of an advisory nature.

ES 39. Prevailing procurement procedures require a certain amount of time to acquire agricultural inputs and requests should be submitted earlier.

**7. Recommendation**

CIGs should submit their requests, for agricultural inputs, about 2-3 months before they are needed to the project's Administrative and Finance Assistant, who further prepares them for submitting to FAO. This will give FAO's procurement officer the time needed for acquisition of the goods.

ES 40. CIGs expressed their concern to be transformed into cooperatives and this should be reviewed carefully.

**8. Recommendation**

Reassess the need and justification to register and transform CIGs into Cooperatives and/or seek adequate alternative solutions. It is recommended to elaborate two appropriate assistance packages to assist CIGs: –to register as cooperatives or –to continue to operate independently.

ES 41. A representative sample of CIGs should be monitored closely to allow for assessing the project's impact.

**9. Recommendation**

To better assess the impact of the project on the rural livelihoods, monitor intensively about two CIGs per Extension Officer (This is in addition to the present regular monitoring of the 20-25 CIGs per Extension Officer).

ES 42. During discussions held in the districts with CIGs, they expressed the need to acquire more knowledge on business development, marketing, and so on.

**10. Recommendation**

Provide CIGs with training on business development, marketing of their crop produce, trading aspects, investigate to initiate business incubators.

ES 43. CIGs would need more guidance on how to use the revolving fund beneficially and to learn to distinguish better between consumptive spending and investment in order to make appropriate choices.

**11. Recommendation**

Investigate whether CIGs should be recommended to use the revolving fund to purchase agricultural inputs for the next season that were in the preceding year financed by project funds, and if so, convey this information and discuss this with the CIGs in view of alternative investments options.

ES 44. To assess the medium-term impact, a good instrument would be to follow bank deposits and how the withdrawals are spent.

**12. Recommendation**

CIGs should inform the project on their bank deposits to be able to assess the cost recovery and the sustainability of the investments over a period of about 4-5 years.

ES 45. The National Project Management Team's performance is adequate.

**13. Recommendation**

The set-up of the project management team proved adequate and efficient and it is recommended to provide for similar projects similar project management structures.

ES 46. The provision of some technical tools and a small increase in allowances for district staff will be a great help for them to perform their tasks even better.

**14. Recommendation**

Equip District Office staff with apparatus to identify possible pests and diseases efficiently and other tools for their work and increase small allowances.

ES 47. The exit strategy, its timing and duration should be linked to CIGs' needs and they are linked to the specific cultivated crops.

**15. Recommendation**

Design an exit strategy lasting minimum one agricultural cropping season and depending on the major livelihoods of the CIGs.

ES 48. The Farmer Field School (FFS) activity has started on time as per the Prodoc, but to obtain maximum benefit from this activity it should be planned much earlier.

**16. Recommendation**

Field FFS consultancy missions to the project sooner, preferably start in the first year.

Linkages of the project with other agencies should be more intensively explored.

**17. Recommendation**

The project should elaborate modalities and agreements for future collaboration with agencies / NGOs / projects that operate in the project's districts and can provide useful services to the CIGs / farming families now and after the project's assistance has come to an end.

ES 49. Food security is definitely improved; however nutritional aspects need more attention.

**18. Recommendation**

Engage a food nutritionist consultant or obtain services from relevant FAO projects already in place in Afghanistan to train Extension Officers on nutrition aspects who shall extend the information to CIGs and/or women groups in the rural areas.

ES 50. Capacity Development

**19. Recommendations related to Capacity Development**

-Extension Officers: provide more capacity building related to financial aspects, marketing aspects, business development.  
-CIGs: increase allowances to facilitate an intensification of contacts with Extension Officers  
-FFS: the integration of FFS into the farming community needs to be assessed soon

-Technical staff: provide technical equipment to better facilitate their work

ES 51. Maintain contacts with CIGs over a longer period of time.

**20. Recommendation**

It is recommended that the project maintains a longer working relationship with the CIGs albeit less frequent to assist CIGs with their operation of the revolving fund, then the 2-3 years foreseen in the Prodoc. This will increase the sustainability of the CIGs in achieving food security. Especially the very poor members of the CIGs need longer support.

## **1 Introduction**

### ***1.1 Background and purpose of the evaluation<sup>1</sup>***

#### ***1.1.1 Project title and status***

1. Project title: ‘Support to household food security and livelihoods of food insecure and vulnerable farming families’. The project’s code is GCP/AFG/061/LUX. The project is often called and referred to as “Support to Household Food Security”.

2. The project’s duration is three years. It was scheduled to start on 1 December 2009 and to complete on 31 November 2012; however it started 1 April 2010 and its completion date is now 31 March 2013. The reasons for a delayed start were mostly of an administrative nature related to FAO’s procedures as mobilization of staff, making ORACLE operational for the project, mobilization of staff, and so on.

3. Executing Agency: FAO/UN the total funding of the project is US\$ 2,135,700. The budget has not changed since the agreements were signed between the donor (Luxembourg), the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and FAO.

4. A no-cost extension request for a period of four months has been prepared by the National Project Manager for FAOAF and this was submitted by FAOAF to the donor; it is expected that this will be approved soon. In the meantime a follow-up project would be formulated expected to commence 1 August 2013.

5. The reasons to request a no-cost extension are: -more time required for the registration process of the CIGs, -elaboration of linkages of the CIGs with relevant agencies, -a budget revision request submitted in May 2012 was signed only in July 2012 causing delays in implementation during the cropping season, -bridging the gap between the on-going project and the start of the new project (expected to become operational 1 August 2013).

#### ***1.1.2 Background***

6. The Government of Luxemburg supports the project which aims at improving the household food security in two districts, Surkhrod district of Nangarhar province and Qarabagh district of Kabul province, by facilitating and coordinating, through the decentralized governmental institutions, the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure farming households in adopting improved livelihood strategies, contributing to the achievement of the 1st MDG Goal (eradicate extreme poverty and hunger). The project was to build the capacity of the decentralised governmental institutions in the project districts. Together with the local communities a participatory assessment was to be initiated to identify the relevant improved livelihood strategies and the needed support, and the project was to support the formation and strengthening of farmer producer and Common Interest Groups (CIGs). The needed inputs were to be provided to the CIGs for free, but distributed within the CIGs on a cost recovery basis to generate capital to strengthen the CIGs and to sustain the activities. For training and backstopping support, the project was make use of the expertise available in the relevant ministries, projects and other organizations. In

---

<sup>1</sup> The content of Chapters 1 and 2 and to some extent Chapter 3 is partly obtained from the Prodoc GCP-AFG-061-LUX

order to do this the project was to establish linkages with relevant ministries, projects and other organizations and to link farmer producers organizations/associations and projects with CIGs to enhance follow-up support after the termination of the project.

### *1.1.3 Purpose*

7. This evaluation appraises the overall contribution of the project towards the set goals and objectives. The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the approach of the project and the outcomes and to provide recommendations to support designing and implementing similar projects in future. In particular, this evaluation documents the lessons learned by the project's stakeholders and the effectiveness of the project in creating a conducive environment to ensure continuation of the project approach beyond project life. The evaluation took place from 30 January – 23 February 2013.

## *1.2 Methodology of the evaluation*

### *1.2.1 Approach*

8. With respect to the evaluation criteria, the major reference used to evaluate the project's performance has been the adapted Logical Framework (Prodoc)<sup>2</sup> to become the Improved Result Framework, see Annex 7. The Outcomes and Outputs as detailed in the framework were verified with the data provided by the project management team and through discussions with the target beneficiaries and district level staff.

9. Under the overall guidance of the FAO Office of Evaluation the approach is as follows:

- i The evaluation adheres to the UNEG Norms & Standards;
- ii The evaluation adopted a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered underpins the validation of evidence collected and its analysis and supported conclusions and recommendations;
- iii The evaluation made use of the following tools: review of existing reports, structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, review of check lists; direct observations during field visits; review of surveys and questionnaires.

### *1.2.2 Consultation process*

10. The evaluation team has maintained close liaison with the FAO Office of Evaluation, project management, and relevant officers at headquarters and at country level, and key stakeholders. The list of places visited and persons met is in Annex 4. The evaluation team has discussed with concerned national authorities the evaluation's main findings and matters relevant to its assignment; however, it has not made any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

11. The evaluation briefing and debriefing process includes the Government, the resource partners, the FAO Representation and other relevant actors. The evaluation

---

<sup>2</sup> "Prodoc" is the Project Document of the project "Support to household food security and livelihood of vulnerable and food insecure farming families" (December 2019)

team presented its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations during a debriefing meeting in Kabul with key stakeholders, in order to discuss and obtain feedback. The Team Leader had a debriefing meeting in FAO HQ to present the results of the evaluation team.

### *1.2.3 Evaluation Team*

12. The team consisted of a Senior Evaluator (Team Leader) who was assisted by the project management team (Project Manager, M&I Officer, Food Security & Livelihoods Officer, Administrative and Finance Assistant) and other national officials (notably MAIL staff at Kabul and MAIL and MRRD staff at District level) and international stakeholders (FAOAF staff, FAO HQ staff). No representative of the donor was available.

### *1.2.4 Reporting*

13. This evaluation report illustrates the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the ToR (See Annex 1). It includes an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis are annexed to the report. Recommendations are stated: they are evidence-based and focused and actionable. The outline of this report is based on the standard evaluation template.

14. Annexes to the Evaluation Report include:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of Team Members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of places visited and institutions and persons met;
- List of activities / outputs
- List of Consultant and Backstopping missions;
- Project Logical Frame matrix;
- Baseline Survey of Livelihoods in Qarabagh and Surkhrod Districts;
- CIGs of Qarabagh and Surkhrod Districts(status September 2012);
- Project's Deliveries (Agricultural Inputs) to CIGs.

### *1.2.5 Timetable and Itinerary of the Mission*

15. The evaluation team spent about three weeks in Afghanistan including travel days to the field. A debriefing meeting by the Evaluation Team Leader was held in FAO Headquarters in Rome immediately after the return from Kabul to Rome. The Team Leader submitted a draft version of the evaluation report during the meeting in FAO HQ. The itinerary is given in Annex 4. The Evaluation mission commenced its work with introductory meetings with the project team, the FAO Representation and officials of MAIL in Kabul. The evaluation mission visited the project sites in Qarabagh and Surkhrod and observed and discussed the project's achievements and activities with project stakeholders and the target beneficiaries. In addition, the evaluation team held detailed meetings with relevant officials of MAIL and project partners in Kabul. The mission held a debriefing meeting in Afghanistan in FAOR Afghanistan on 21 February 2013. Present were Francesco Del Re (FAOR a.i.),

Mohammad Aqa (Assistant to FAOR), Mohammad Akbar Shahrستاني (National Food Security Coordinator, MDG Project), Ahmad Khan Faraz (National Operations Officer, FAO AF), the Project Management Team and the Senior Evaluator.

## **2 Context of the project**

### **2.1 Developmental Context**

16. Despite huge reconstruction efforts and significant economic growth since early 2002, Afghanistan remains one of the poorest countries in the world. In its Human Development Report of 2004, UNDP ranks Afghanistan as the 173rd (out of 178 countries). The 25 years of war, repeated droughts and other natural calamities have heightened the concern for food insecurity and poverty in Afghanistan. The drastic increase in food prices since 2007 (over 100 percent on some markets, which fortunately, started to decrease again after the good cereal harvest in 2009), the very harsh winter (2007-2008) that led to 10 percent livestock losses, and drought have also contributed to severely worsen an already alarming food security and economic situation.

17. According to National Rural Vulnerability Assessment (NRVA) conducted in 2005, 44 percent of Afghan households perceive themselves as food insecure. The preliminary results of the NRVA 2007/2008 show a deterioration of the situation compared with 2005, with 35 percent of households not meeting their caloric needs, and 46 percent of households having very poor diet diversity and poor food consumption, compared with around 25 percent in 2005 (MRRD and CSO, 2008). According to information collected in 2007, 42 percent of the Afghan population lives below the poverty line. This means that about 12 million people in Afghanistan live with incomes of less than 45 cents per person per day. This widespread poverty translates into chronic malnutrition rates of up to 60 percent amongst children under five and prevalent micronutrient deficiencies.

18. Addressing these challenges requires much greater investments and capacity-building in the agricultural sector, where Afghanistan's main resources for social and economic development lie. Agriculture also has the potential to provide the main resources for business development.

19. The challenges in developing the agricultural sector are to ensure that economic growth in the agricultural sector benefits all sections in the society and reduces food insecurity and poverty. Similarly, developing agriculture while preserving the country's natural resources and protecting the diverse and often fragile eco-systems of Afghanistan will be essential to ensure that agricultural development is sustainable and contributes to the population's well-being. These concerns are addressed in the government policies on agriculture and rural development.



## **2.2 Project Identification, Site Selection and Development**

### **2.2.1 Identification**

20. The assistance provided to Afghanistan since 2002 has led to the planning and implementation of numerous projects, in various sectors, aiming to address sustainable livelihoods, food security and nutrition. These projects have notably involved the agricultural sector, rural development, health, education, employment, and others. However, their effectiveness and impact has been negatively affected by the fragmentation and lack of coordination between complementary initiatives. This fragmentation can be partly attributed to a lack of consensus on what food security and livelihoods interventions consist of, and what effective strategies are to address food insecurity.

21. This project sought to address these problems by building linkages with relevant interventions in close cooperation with MAIL's PICU (Programme Implementation and Coordination Unit). As much as possible the project was to make use of the expertise in MAIL and other projects/organizations in providing the needed support to the vulnerable and food insecure farming households in the selected project districts. The project was supposed to build these linkages at national level, through the National Project Management Unit situated in and closely working with PICU and at provincial/district level through the Project District Teams. The project was also to try to support the farmer producer/common interest groups in building linkages with relevant interventions for follow up support.

### **2.2.2 Site selection**

22. A previous project SPFS/AFG/2301 "Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) in Afghanistan - Preparatory Phase for Community-Based Food Production Capacity Building", Oct 2003 - March 2009), implemented food security projects in several communities in four provinces. The experiences and lessons learned with implementing these field activities under the SPFS were used in developing this project and in the identification one of its districts/sites. One of the districts selected for this project is a previous SPFS district namely Surkhrod district in Nangarhar province, which made it possible to build on the successful experiences of the SPFS. The beneficiaries for this project would be combination of new and old beneficiaries. The other district selected is Qarabagh, Kabul Province, since its major characteristics satisfied the selection criteria and for logistical reasons (in the vicinity of Kabul where the Project Management Team is established) and security concerns (relative secure). The project limits its interventions to two districts given the available budget and time span.

### **2.2.3 Development**

23. Target Beneficiaries. The ultimate beneficiaries of the project are the food insecure households in the selected project districts, Surkhrod district of Nangarhar province and Qarabagh district of Kabul province. The project made a complete inventory of the total number of households in both districts of about 30 000 families. Together with the local CDCs and by its own judgment 6515 farming families were selected as the project's target beneficiaries. The main criteria applied was the land size of the farm holdings to be in the range of about 0.2 – 0.6 ha, or about 1-3 jerib to ascertain that the vulnerable poor farmers are included. The survey of the farmers and their main livelihoods systems illustrates the land use pattern accurately, see Annex 8.

24. In those two districts the project is targeting a total of 6515 farming households, 15 percent of the total population. Special attention is paid to benefit both male as well as female farmers. These households were organized in so-called Common Interest Groups (CIGs) and they received training, inputs and backstopping support on the improved livelihood strategies selected by them. The overview of the CIGs shows the actual organization of the project's target groups accurately and has been added in Annex 9.

25. **Main Stakeholders.** The main stakeholders are the main project implementers and the target beneficiaries. They include: staff from decentralized MAIL and other decentralized governmental institutions, as MRRD, responsible for the selected project sites; they are the key partners and major stakeholders. The project assists them with training, backstopping support and the means to facilitate the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure farming households in adopting improved livelihood strategies and improved household food security. Other stakeholders and major partners include other projects and institutions involved in food security related activities or initiatives. As much as possible the project made use of their expertise in providing the proper support to the vulnerable and food insecure farming households in the project districts. The planning and policy department and the agriculture extension department of MAIL are involved in monitoring the developments of the project in support of the development and implementation of a national agricultural extension framework.

26. **Programme Implementation and Coordination Unit (PICU).** The PICU hosts the National Project Management Unit (Project Management Team) of the project. The project works closely with the PICU in coordinating the needed support to the vulnerable and food insecure households in the two project districts and in coordination on food security related issues and the development of related monitoring and management information systems. PICU's role was taken over by the General Directorate Office of Extension (of MAIL) in March 2012. The reason for the change was that the PICU as such was not fully institutionalized and their staff was engaged on a temporary basis. In addition there was an overlap with the Directorate of Policy and Planning. PICU no longer exists and it has now become a programme directorate under the Directorate of Policy and Planning.

### **3 Concept and relevance**

#### **3.1 Design**

##### **3.1.1 *Appropriateness of outcomes (immediate objectives)***

27. The original Logical Framework (in the Prodoc) had three Outcomes and the project operated on the basis of this log frame for about ten months. In December 2010 a consultant visited the project who was to prepare a. o. the TOR for the Baseline Study and partly changed the log frame and added an additional Outcome; thereafter the log frame was called the "Improved Result Framework". See Annex 7. In fact, this change required the project staff to adapt the reporting system, relate anew activities to budget lines, separate some activities from others and link them to different outcomes and outputs, and so on. This was a cumbersome task and has been time consuming. Even if the new logical framework may more clearly separate the

different outcomes and outputs, it would have been possible to report these outputs under the previous three outcomes.

#### Recommendation

Avoid to change the logical framework in on-going projects unless there are very compelling reasons to do so.

28. The project has now four outcomes and their appropriateness is discussed below per outcome.

- 1) Outcome 1: Project Stakeholders/ beneficiaries sensitized and supported with needed services and inputs (farming technologies) to improve livelihood enterprise implementation.

29. The major aim of this outcome is to enhance the district level government agencies to provide the support and services to the project's target beneficiaries. This is a very appropriate immediate objective as these agencies are crucial to the implementation of the project. The decentralized offices are much closer to the farming community and can act faster to respond to regular or urgent needs. It avoids lengthy procedures and miscommunication since at the district level the officers are capable to quickly observe and assess the needs of vulnerable farming community and consequently can provide rapid adequate support.

- 2) Outcome 2: Improved livelihood strategies successfully adopted by vulnerable and food insecure farming households resulting in increased household food security.

30. The appropriateness of this outcome is obvious and it constitutes the core objective of the project.

- 3) Outcome 3: Model approach implemented in support of the development of a National Service and Input Provision Framework

31. The approach (model) adopted by the project to deliver the food security strategies to benefit the rural vulnerable farming families seems largely successful. Therefore, this outcome is appropriate and the project's model may be used as a basis for up-scaling the project to adjacent districts and could form the basis for a national approach; naturally the model must be adapted to prevailing local circumstances.

- 4) Outcome 4: Project team established facilitating successful implementation of project at national, province and district/community level.

32. This outcome is appropriate.

#### 3.1.2 Causal relationship between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes (immediate objectives) and impact (development objectives)

33. Causal relationships

- Related to Outcome 1: Project Stakeholders/ beneficiaries sensitized and supported with needed services and inputs (farming technologies) to improve livelihood enterprise implementation

- Related to Output 1.1: Awareness created at national, provincial and district level to obtain the needed support from different institutions to implement the project in the two selected districts.
- The project activities under this output were very instrumental in achieving the awareness at national, provincial and district level and to foster their needed support to implement the project in the two selected districts.
- Related to Output 1.2 in each district staff members of MAIL act as centre of development with collaboration of, MRRD and other relevant governmental decentralized institutions selected and trained as District Project Officers

34. The project activities under this output concerned mostly selection, training and backstopping of district level staff. These activities resulted in motivated and dedicated staff capable to implement the food security strategies. Not all intended outputs may have been fully obtained as the workforce has not included female staff as Extension Officers which would have been more adequate to deal with gender related livelihood aspects. This issue should be addressed in future similar projects. The recruitment of MAIL as well as MRRD staff lead to a fruitful collaboration; the different background and experience of the Extension Officers, including plant protection specialists, animal husbandry specialists, etc. was very opportune for addressing CIG's needs.

#### Recommendation

Engage among Extension Officers at each district at least one female Extension Officer.

- Related to Output 1.3: District Project Officers able to facilitate the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure farming families.

35. The project provided the necessary equipment to the district officers and made incentive payments which facilitated their work to reach out to the vulnerable and food insecure families.

- Related to Outcome 2: Improved livelihood strategies successfully adopted by vulnerable and food insecure farming households resulting in increased household food security
- Related to Output 2.1: Participatory assessment of the relevant livelihood strategies conducted in each site.

36. The project's participatory approach to investigate farmer's needs and discuss the best livelihood strategies to enhance food security, were essential for the identification and selection of the target beneficiaries. It allowed for an efficient and smooth implementation of the project. This model may be used elsewhere for similar projects.

- Related to Output 2.2: Strong farmer producer and common interest groups (CIGs) formed in order to support the introduction and sustainability of improved livelihood strategies.

37. The project engaged in capacity building of the CIGs which strengthened the CIGs in their dealings with District Officers and increased their consciousness as farmers capable to steer their own destination as possible given their physical and socio-economic environment.

## Recommendation

For the baseline survey the participatory approach in the districts for the inventory of livelihoods and the subsequent selection of poor and vulnerable farmers to form CIGs, proved to be an excellent approach and is recommended for similar projects.

- Related to Output 2.3: Improved livelihood strategies successfully adopted by vulnerable and food insecure farming households resulting in improved household food security.

38. The project provided the necessary extension services to make farmers aware that their livelihoods can be improved which led to an intensive and fruitful collaboration with the project's Extension Officers.

- Related to Output 2.4: Expanded implementation of successfully implemented livelihood strategies in neighboring villages through a Farmer Field School programme.

39. This output is not yet fully achieved but the mechanism using FFS caused some up-scaling of the project's livelihood strategies benefitting nearby farming communities.

- Related to Outcome 3: Model approach implemented in support of the development of a National Service and Input Provision Framework
- Related to Output 3.1: Experiences obtained and lessons learned through implementing a participatory extension system facilitating the provision of need-based support to vulnerable and food insecure farming households

40. The participatory extension system combined the demand driven approach of farmers with the knowledge of the Extension Officers which lead to an adequate support to farmers. This model proved efficient and may be used for the National Service and Input Provision Framework.

- Related to Output 3.2: Advices formulated for the further development and fine tuning of the National Service and Input Provision Framework

41. This involves enhancing the project's approaches among the agencies that are to prepare policies for food security. The activities in this respect of the project concerned to report on its approach to relevant stakeholders, facilitating others to adopt a similar approach for similar projects and for the formulation of a nationwide strategy.

- Related to Output 4: Project Team established facilitating successful implementation of project at national, province and district/community level.
- Related to Output 4.1: Project management team established and operational

42. The Project Management Team was established in time and is adequately staffed. The causal relation between an adequate Project Management Team and the project's implementation is obvious and lead to an efficient delivery of inputs to the target beneficiaries and an efficient project implementation.

- Related to Output 4.2: Technical Assistance/Back-stopping missions by FAO

43. Technical Assistance / Back-stopping missions have been fielded to benefit the project. The LTU fulfilled its role correctly.

- Related to Output 4.3: Capacity strengthened at all levels of implementation

44. This was achieved and is causal and fundamental for the implementation of the project.

- Related to Output 4.4: Effective M&E system established

45. The baseline survey was conducted and was essential to identify and select poor and vulnerable farmers to become the members of the CIGs.

46. The monitoring of the project's impact should be based on regular monitoring of all CIGs and in addition monitoring very closely a representative sample of for instance 10% out of the 258 CIGs.

47. The causal relationship between the well-functioning of the Project Management Team and the inputs (recruitment of qualified staff at National and District levels, backstopping missions, surveys, and so on) is obvious and resulted in the good performance of the Project Management Team.

### 3.1.3 Relevance and appropriateness of indicators

48. Relevance and appropriateness of indicators

Related to Outcome 1

- The indicator quantifies that the decentralized governmental institutions should be able to provide the needed support to 6515 families. This is appropriate, measurable, and relevant and the outcome has been achieved.

Related to Output 1.1:

- The indicator is relevant and appropriate. The period of mobilization at the onset of the project took instead of the proposed two months, about four months when staff positions were filled. However, this has had no noticeable lasting effect on the project implementation.

Related to Output 1.2:

- The indicator is relevant and appropriate. Whereas the previous indicator stipulates that staff should be available within two months, and this indicator states that staff should be available and trained within 3 months, it is preferred that the relevant parts of both indicators state that staff should be available and trained within two months.

Related to Output 1.3:

- The indicator is relevant and appropriate. However, "Hardware" should be replaced by: no. of transport means, no. of mobile phones, no. of notebooks, no. of printers.

Related to Outcome 2

- The indicator is relevant. Another relevant indicator should be the reduction in food insecure families and this should be at least 70-80% in the project's CIGs.

Related to Output 2.1:

- The indicators are relevant and appropriate but may be adjusted by including a verification and update of the feasibility of the proposed livelihood strategies to allow for an elaborate discussion with the CIGs, for them to take sound decisions on the choice of cropping systems and related to markets.

*Crop models were prepared already for grapes, vegetables and wheat. Apparently investment in grapes and vegetables is very feasible, but also investment in wheat for food security is beneficial.*

- The wording “Community” should be replaced by CIGs. In addition a verifiable indicator may be the number of CIG meetings organized related to the number of CIGs, to assess if the project has reached out to all the members (farming households) in a sufficient manner.

Related to Output 2.2:

- The indicators are relevant but need some adjustment. The project is forming CIGs and not farmer producer groups, therefore always should be referred to CIGs.

### **Recommendation**

The assessment of the functioning of the CIGs (for the benefit of its members) should not be linked to the upcoming registration process. If the CIGs (registered as and transformed into cooperatives, or not) continue to function satisfactorily “for at least one year after the termination of the project”, than this cannot be evaluated now within the project’s duration. This must be evaluated later.

Related to Output 2.3:

- The indicators are relevant. However, again CIGs should be mentioned and not farmer groups.

Related to Output 2.4:

- The indicators are relevant. The impact of FFS as for the CIGs can be monitored by e.g. the project’s Extension Officers. The expanded implementation in neighbouring villages (as neighbours of the project’s CIGs) is much less verifiable and may be somewhat overambitious.

Related to Outcome 3:

- The indicator is relevant but should be adapted. If and when the project’s approach (model) is implemented elsewhere is beyond the control of the project. Outcome 3 should probably read: “Enhancement of the project’s approach (model) by other government agencies”. It can be verified by efforts made by the project staff as promoting this among the relevant officials, dissemination of information, and so on.

Related to Output 3.1:

- The indicator is relevant and appropriate.

Related to Output 3.2:

- The indicator is relevant and appropriate.

Related to Outcome 4.

- The indicators are relevant.

### 3.1.4 The validity of assumptions and risks

49. The assumptions upon which the project based its implementation proved mostly correct. However, there are some assumptions that proved not to be realistic:

- Availability of inputs as for some backstopping (FFS); these became available relatively late.
- The late approval of a Budget Revision caused delays.
- Other issues like emergency inputs required as IPM for urgent treatment of outbreaks of plant diseases and pests were hampered because analysis of infected plant material by specialized institutes in Kabul was slowly.
- With respect to the registration process, the standard set-up of multi- or single-purpose cooperatives to be made suitable or compatible for the CIGs, has been slightly postponed because of delayed responses by concerned government agencies.

### 3.1.5 The project's institutional set-up and management arrangements

50. The Organization Chart below shows the set-up of the project's organization at National (Kabul), Provincial (Kabul and Nangarhar) and District level (Qarabagh and Surkhrod).

51. National level. The PICU functions as a steering committee and meets regularly to discuss the progress of work, to assist where possible as for staff to be assigned, to facilitate other arrangements needed for the smooth implementation of the project. In the meantime the PICU has been replaced by the General Directorate of Extension.

52. The project has a lean and efficiently operating project management team (FAO) consisting of four national staff: - Project Manager, -Monitoring & Information Management Officer, -Food Security & Livelihoods Officer, - Administrative and Finance Assistant and 2 drivers. As counterpart staff at this level the Chief of Planning and Programming of the General Directorate of Extension (MAIL) is added to the team.

53. The General Directorate of Extension of MAIL is housed in the same building as the project and this makes frequent contacts easy.

54. Provincial level. Two officers of MAIL, as counterpart staff, at the provincial level assist and facilitate the project's implementation efficiently.

55. District level. The District Office is staffed by personnel from different ministries. For the project the ministries have engaged, as counterpart staff, about 11 Extension Officers, 6 in Qarabagh and 5 in Surkhrod at present. They consist of adequately educated staff, most have a degree in agriculture from a university or a specialized institute in Kabul. Among them are also plant protection specialists, animal husbandry specialists, etc. Most Extension Officers are employees of MAIL; some are from MRRD, which benefits the project as the different development efforts from both ministries is well known to the staff which facilitates mutual collaboration.

56. Both districts are near (Qarabagh) or at a short distance (Surkhrod) from Kabul which makes communication and the provision of inputs relatively easy.



57. Conclusion: The observation is that the project's institutional set-up and management arrangements are efficient and that the performance of both National, Provincial and District level staff is adequate.

### 3.1.6 The adequacy of the time-frame

58. The project started with some months delay; however the original duration foreseen was kept at the planned three years. There were delays in implementing some activities; this concerns - the start of the baseline survey, - providing agricultural inputs supplies to CIGs, and - the registration process of the CIGs. The first and second activity should have been planned earlier, but the third activity depends on the negotiations between the project staff and the relevant department to provide for a suitable set-up for the CIGs to become cooperatives and this has not yet crystallized. In fact, presently the project requested the Department of Cooperatives to allow for the establishment of single-purpose cooperatives in line with the present set-up of the CIGs since they are based on a single "common interest" e.g. the cultivation of grapes, or vegetables, and so on. The law on cooperatives apparently relates only to multi-purpose cooperatives.

59. To enhance the sustainability of the projects' achievements incorporated in the CIGs, and to afford a sound transition towards CIGs fully and independently operating their provision of inputs and their financial situation (revolving fund), the project's duration should be extended. This could be a 6-12 months period depending the cropping season. During this period the project's assistance would be gradually phased out and simultaneously the status of the CIGs then working mostly on their own be monitored.

Assistance to farmers should be reduced gradually and not abruptly.

#### Recommendation

The upcoming formulation of the follow-up project, also called Phase II, for two other districts, should include continued assistance to the Districts of Qarabagh and Surkhrod; however, based on a gradual reduced support to these Districts and provided to the CIGs according to their specific needs. In general this will be more of an advisory nature.

### 3.1.7 The adequacy of resources from all parties and appropriateness of budget allocations to achieve intended results

60. The resources from FAO / Donor proved adequate as there was no lack of funding in relation to the outcomes and outputs of the project.

61. The procurement process took longer than foreseen; therefore CIGs need to submit their requests for agricultural inputs sooner, at least 2-3 months before required.

62. The approval of budget revisions took too much time; this affected the project's progress and procurement process and delayed implementation somewhat.

#### Recommendation

CIGs should submit their requests for agricultural inputs about 2-3 months before they are needed to the project's National Administrative and Finance Assistant, who further prepares them for submitting to FAO. This will give FAO's procurement officer the time needed for acquisition of the goods.
---

3.1.8 The adequacy of the methodology of implementation to achieve intended results

63. In both districts, Qarabagh and Surkhrod, extensive discussions were held with –the Extension Officers and –the farmers being members of the CIGs. Major remarks and issues made during the meetings are given below:

**Box 1. Discussion with Extension Officers and CIGs**

The Extension Officers were engaged in the participatory district-wide surveys of in total about 30 000 families in both districts. The selection of farmers to benefit from the project and their grouping in CIGs was based on land size (1-3 jerib), location (living in the vicinity of each other), livelihood (single crop as major cultivation), in case of irrigated crops using the same water source (irrigation canal), related to and building on experience with the CDC or SPFS projects. The policy is that farmers only receive agricultural inputs for 1 jerib even if they possess more farmland. The expectation is that the farmers expand the experience obtained with investment in one jerib later to their whole farm land.

The CIGs collect the requests for agricultural inputs from their members, e.g. seed, fertilizer, poles for trellis, and so on. The practice is now to submit this to the project 6 weeks before needed, but this is found too short to ascertain delivery on time. The deadline should be at least 2 months before required, which gives sufficient time for the project's National Administrative and Finance Assistant to prepare the request to FAO's procurement staff to acquire the goods in time respecting the prevailing tendering system. The goods are transported to the stores at the district and the Chiefs of the CIGs divide the goods over the members who sign for receiving the goods with their ID number. CIGs receive the goods at a discount of often 20%, see Annex 10. The principle is that after the harvest the members of the CIGs pay their equivalent share into a bank account; this is registered in the name of the Chief of the CIG.

Thereafter, there is no more direct involvement of the project's Extension Officers in how the money is spent. The CIG is free to spend the money; for instance this may be used to build a water conservation dam, or buy a lorry to transport their agricultural produce, or to transport inputs to the CIG, or to purchase agricultural inputs for the next cropping season.

There would be few conflicts and resolution of them is first attempted by the Chief of the CIG, eventually the governor may be requested to assist.

Sometimes some CIG members may become passive or absent. The project distinguishes between two categories: those members who have definitely left the CIG and those that could return after a convincing effort made by the project staff. Those who leave and do not return are mostly for reasons of migration (job seekers), or deceased, or the very poor who cannot repay. Also lack of water to grow crops may be a reason for becoming passive. Occasionally the Chief or other CIG members pay for the member who is not capable of repaying in case this is a temporary situation. In addition the members who are paying their fare share find it unfair that defaulters stay as a member in the CIG and then these are requested to leave the CIG.

The opinion about cooperatives varies. Some CIG members are or were a member of a cooperative and their experience is mixed. Cooperatives ask an entrance fee (about

100 Afghanis) and an annual subscription fee (about 25 Afghanis). Members believe that they are not benefitting enough from the cooperatives.

Some Extension Officers suggested that a follow-up project should target medium size land owners (3-10 jerib) still continuing the strategy of only covering the agricultural inputs for 1 jerib. This could improve the impact of the project on food security since they could apply the livelihood strategies on the larger farm holding eventually. The preference of the Extension Officers is also to continue in Surkhrod district because the security is good and a future project can build on what has been previously achieved.

Extension Officers would like to see their incentive payments to be raised from UDS 100 to about USD 130 per month given the workload. The mobile phone credit presently USD 10 should be raised to USD 20 per month because of the need to maintain intensive contacts with farmers; equally the fuel allowance should be raised from 30 to 50 USD per month. Another request was to provide them with a first-aid kit. Each should have a digital camera to take pictures of delivered goods, plants diseases, and so on, for reporting. A microscope to identify plant diseases quickly is needed, as well as a notebook computer (but only in case of internet availability). An excursion to Indonesia is foreseen and requested.

On average the Extension Officers monitor and deal with about 20-25 CIGs. In addition to the regular monitoring of the 20-25 CIGs, to assess the impact of the project, it is suggested to monitor intensively about two CIGs per Extension Officer. This was appreciated by the Extension Officers.

64. CIGs expressed their concern to be transformed into cooperatives and this should be reviewed carefully.

#### Recommendation

Reassess the need and justification to register and transform CIGs into Cooperatives and/or seek adequate alternative solutions. It is recommended to elaborate two appropriate assistance packages to assist CIGs: –to register as cooperatives or –to continue to operate independently.

65. A representative sample of CIGs should be monitored closely to allow for assessing the project's impact.

#### Recommendation

To better assess the impact of the project on the rural livelihoods, monitor intensively about two CIGs per Extension Officer (This is in addition to the present regular monitoring of the 20-25 CIGs per Extension Officer).

### **Box 2. Discussion with CIGs**

In Qarabagh seven members (out of 23) of the CIG-Razek and in Surkhrod eleven members (out of 23) of the CIG-Noor Agha were met to discuss the impact of the project on their livelihoods. Present were the Chiefs, the treasurers, clerks and other members.

Qarabagh: The major crop is grapes. Farm sizes were as follows: 3, 1.5, 2, 3, 1, 1.5, 3

jerib. There are five women headed households, but they are registered in the name of the former husband or brother. There was a high satisfaction about the performance of the Extension Officers, but it was appreciated in case one female Extension Officer would be part of the District Office. A strong wish is a solar drying machine for the grapes. They would like more knowledge about marketing aspects, business development. With respect to cooperatives, the experience is mixed. Entrance fee is 100 Afghani, annual fee is 50 Afghani, but the benefit is too low. The registration process should be postponed.

Surkhrod: The major crop is vegetables irrigated from a canal. The farm sizes of the members present were as follows: 3, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2.5, 2.5, 3, 3 and 1 jerib. The village they are from has a population of 1200 farmers out of these 200 were selected to become a member of one of the 13 CIGs for this village. They were grouped around 6 sub-villages. The project collaborates with the CDC. This rural development agency covers 14 clusters and one cluster includes 24 families.

Farmers believe that they possess the knowledge for the cultivation of vegetables; however they would like project support to test new seeds on small trial areas. In addition they wish that new fertilizers are tested in a laboratory as once the delivered fertilizer was not appropriate.

Members mutually do help each other; for instance one member passed away and the others helped the widow to stay with the CIG.

The repayment for goods delivered now amounts to 300 000 Afghanis in their revolving fund (one year). The current account pays no interest, it is in the name of the treasurer but two signatures are needed to make withdrawals.

As wishes for future investment the CIG members consider the purchase of a green house, improved seed or means of transport. (Apparently there is no obligation from the side of the beneficiaries to use the money the next cropping season to purchase agricultural inputs.)

The performance of the Extension Officers was found satisfactory. A female Extension Officer among them is appreciated as she could deal better with women headed households and with the spouses of the members related to their specific tasks in the family and on the farm holding.

Six members are also a member of a cooperative but they believe that they are not getting enough benefits from this. They prefer to continue as CIG instead of becoming a cooperative.

In general the CIG members preferred that the project assist farmers for about 2-3 seasons to acquire agriculture inputs, which would make the project more sustainable.

Members of the CIG feel that they lack information on markets to enable them to sell their farm produce at the best moments for the best prices. Also more knowledge would be required how to run a business; for instance assistance could be in the form of a business incubator.

To assess the recovery of the advanced funding for agricultural inputs to the CIGs, they should submit the status of the bank accounts to allow the project to study this aspect and to assess the sustainability of the food security effort.

At a debriefing meeting at the FAO office in Jalalabad (17/02/2013) three representatives (two Heads of Extension Units and one Deputy Head of Extension Unit) of three other districts (Behsood, Kama, Homayoon) informed the evaluation team that their districts are very interested to be part of a future project if possible. This shows that there is significant interest among the rural population in the project's approach to food security.

66. During discussions held in the districts with CIGs, they expressed the need to acquire more knowledge on business development, marketing, and so on.

#### Recommendation

Provide CIGs with training on business development, marketing of their crop produce, investigate to initiate business incubators.

67. CIGs would need more guidance on how to use the revolving fund beneficially and to learn to distinguish better between consumptive spending and investment in order to make appropriate choices.

#### Recommendation

Investigate whether CIGs should be recommended to use the revolving fund to purchase agricultural inputs for the next season that were in the preceding year financed by project funds, and if so, convey this information and discuss this with the CIGs in view of alternative investments options.

68. To assess the medium-term impact, a good instrument would be to follow bank deposits and how the withdrawals are spent.

#### Recommendation

CIGs should inform the project on their bank deposits to be able to assess the cost recovery and the sustainability of the investments over a period of about 4-5 years.

### 3.1.9 The quality of the stakeholders' and beneficiaries identification

69. The identification and selection process of the members of the CIGs in both districts was based on a participatory approach and a complete inventory of all farming families totalling almost 30 000. Thereafter, the farm size was the most important criteria and the major livelihood as this is the common interest that provides for the social fabric of the group and unites them enhancing the success of the CIG. In addition the location of the farms formed the basis of the CIG. As opportune, for instance irrigation from the same water course, or previous experience with interventions of rural development projects as the SPFS, could lead to the formation of a CIG. The project also sought information from the CDCs to form CIGs. It is concluded that the identification and selection of the project's target beneficiaries is found adequate.

### 3.2 *Relevance*<sup>3</sup>

70. The Government of Afghanistan's policies on agriculture, rural development and nutrition were elaborated in two central documents. The first is the Afghan National Development Strategy, an interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper which outlines the development priorities for Afghanistan. During a donor conference held in Paris participants acknowledged the importance of investing more in the agricultural sector, especially in view of the growing food crisis, linked to the rising food prices and drought.

71. The other central document is the National Agriculture Development Framework. This framework has been prepared in line with the Agricultural Rural Development Sector Strategy under the Social and Development pillar of the ANDS. As stated in the National Agriculture Development Framework, the mission of MAIL is "Economic growth and food security depending upon natural resource management, increasing agricultural production and productivity and improved physical infrastructure and market development. MAIL has highlighted its priorities for responding to the crisis through a set of immediate, medium and long-term interventions. The resources for implementing these interventions are being mobilized in collaboration with other relevant ministries (namely MRRD) and with support of the Food Security Cluster, facilitated jointly by FAO and WFP and consisting of membership from NGOs and donor agencies.

72. Widespread food insecurity prevails in many Afghan provinces. The majority of farmers do not produce sufficient crops to meet their households needs and their investments (and subsequent indebtedness) and are primarily associated with meeting their household consumption needs, rather than to develop economic activities. Agricultural development strategies should thus be designed to help farmers diversify their livelihoods to reduce their vulnerability to shocks and empower them to enter the market economy.

73. In line with (a) the parts on supporting improvements in subsistence farming of the Agricultural Production and Productivity programme and (b) promoting investments in value-chains amongst small landholders and landless households, this project (GCP-AFG-061-LUX) will support farmer producer/common interest groups in identifying and adopting improved livelihood strategies to improve their household food security.

74. The transformation of traditional subsistence production systems into a dynamic, modern agricultural sector depends on a widespread introduction and use of new knowledge, technologies and practices. This objective cannot be realized without a nation-wide extension services network which is needs-based and demand-led which is a major activity of the project. The approaches should be bottom-up, holistic and gender sensitive as the project aimed for.

75. In line with building the capacity of MAIL, cross cutting item in all programmes of the National Agriculture Development Framework and in support of the development of the National Service and Input Provision Framework, this project trained in close cooperation with MAIL, extension department and teams of five staff members of different decentralized governmental institutions, including MAIL, per

---

<sup>3</sup> The text for this sub-chapter is partly from the Prodoc

project district to facilitate a participatory identification of relevant improved livelihood strategies in the project districts/sites, formation/strengthening of farmer groups. The project enabled these District Project Teams to facilitate the needed support to these farmer producer/common interest groups to implement/adopt the selected improved livelihood strategies and to provide the needed support to the groups to establish linkages with other relevant projects/initiatives and/or farmer organization/association.

76. The majority of farms in Afghanistan are small to medium size, as indicated by the fact that the average farm size is estimated to vary from 1 - 2 ha, or up to 5-7 ha for farms in rainfed areas. In order to produce a sufficient surplus, optimize investments in capital and equipment, be eligible for credit, and integrate local, regional and international market in an advantageous position, farmers need to organize themselves. This requires adequate legal and regulatory frameworks for producer organizations and simple registration processes. These organizations also require technical support, facilitation and business development support to establish strong and sustainable organizations. This is addressed by the project by establishing CIGs later to be registered possibly as cooperatives.

77. This project addressed these problems by building linkages with relevant interventions in close cooperation with and other the guidance of the PICU. The project will build these linkages at national level, through the National Project Management Unit situated in and closely working with PICU and at district level through the Project District Teams. The project will also try to support the common interest groups in building linkages with relevant interventions for follow up support.

78. The project's objectives and strategy at the time of approval and at the time of evaluation are still consistent with the present country's requirements and policies, with beneficiaries' needs, and other major aid programmes.

79. Adherence to FAO Country Programme Framework

The project both at formulation stage and at evaluation stage fully adheres to priorities as stated in the FAO Country Programming Framework, notably CPF Priority Area No 5; see the box below.

**Box 3. Adherence to CPF**

<p>CPF Priority Area No 5: Support to food and nutrition security</p> <p>Outcome 5.1: Enhanced institutional capacity to analyze food and nutrition security issues through a multi-sector and strategic approach to food and nutrition security</p> <p>Outcome 5.2: Enhanced capacity to promote initiatives – at the national, provincial and district level – that strengthen food security and nutrition of households in the pursuit of the right- to-safe food</p> <p>Outcome 5.3: Enhanced institutional capacity to address issues regarding food safety and quality including policy, legislation, Programmes, inspection and certification, infrastructure support, manpower development and inspection and certification capabilities</p>
--

## 4 Implementation

### 4.1 Budget and Expenditure

80. Coherence and soundness of Budget Revisions in matching necessary adjustments in implementation.

**Table 1. Budget revisions took place as follows:**

Budget Revision	Date submitted	Date approved	Percentage change as of total annual budget
A	9 February 2010	10 February 2011	Initial budget (Prodoc)
B	9 May 2011	6 June 2011	1
C	17 May 2012	13 August 2012	23

Budget Revision D is planned for 15 February 2013. Below is the summary of the budget revisions.

#### 4.1.1 BUDGET REVISIONS

81. Three budget revisions were made. The initial budget (IB) is in the Prodoc (December 2009). The project management addressed the needs of the project in a sound manner by responding adequately to the anticipated and actually occurring needs. In discussing the needs of the various benefiting groups or others that had financial demands on the project, there were no complaints or irregularities. Per budget line the following comments are made:

**Table 2. Comment on Budget Revisions**

Budget line	Comment on Budget Revisions, comparing IB with requirements
5011	PM's salary was earlier under "Consultants", but has now been allocated to BL 5011
5012	In BR-B some general services staff was foreseen, but at present there is no general services staff
5013	Reflects the anticipated expenditure
5014	This reflects slow and delayed expenditure for trellis, and so on.
5020	This concerns salaries of project support staffs and project counterparts (core staff extension workers, guards, etc.) and has been raised to accommodate increased demands on these workers.
5021	This concerns national and international travel and DSA.
5023	The available budget was used economically and has been lowered since less money was spent on hotels, etc.
5024	This budget reflects the direct inputs to the CIGs and the increase shows the interest among the CIGs in the project (it is used to purchase their inputs like fertilizers, seeds, etc.).
5025	This budget is used e.g. for office furniture, vehicles, and is not entirely needed.
5027	This BL covers the technical support services of short-term consultants and has been somewhat increased due to need.
5028	For this BL, which covers items like stationary, mobile phone credit cards, maintenance of vehicles motor bikes, fuel, etc. the remaining budget is probably sufficient.



#### 4.1.2 ACTUALS

82. The budget status as per 11 February 2013 is shown in the table above. The Initial Budget as proposed at the time of project formulation is in column IB. The present “Actuals” are in column E, which is the total budget as spent per 11 February 2013. The remaining budget is in column F. Per budget line the following comments are made related to the remaining budget (F) and the expected needs for the 4 months proposed as no-cost extension to the project (period 1 April – 31 July 2013):

**Table 3. Comments on Actuals**

Budget line	Comments on Actuals
5011	Some additional budget needed to cover the PM’s salary
5012	There is no general services staff
5013	Probably no additional budget needed to cover the project staffs salary based on consultant contracts’ and for the upcoming FFS consultancy
5014	This concerns e.g. purchase of trellis, and so on. This budget needs to be raised possibly from budget lines 5023 and 5024.
5020	This concerns salaries of extension workers, procurement officer, guards, etc. and is sufficient.
5021	This concerns DSA, fuel, and is sufficient.
5023	The available budget was used economically as e.g. no expensive training was given in hotels. Some budget will not be used and may be transferred to other budget lines.
5024	This budget goes directly to CIGs to purchase their inputs like fertilizers, seeds, etc. The remaining budget is about sufficient.
5025	This budget is used e.g. for office furniture, vehicles. No additional budget is needed.
5027	This covers the short-term consultants and is sufficient.
5028	This covered items like stationary, mobile phone credit cards, maintenance of vehicles, etc. The remaining budget is sufficient.

83. Efficiency in production of outputs. The project has four Outcomes each with their respective outputs. To achieve these as planned, the efficiency of the prevailing procedures is important. The procedures were reviewed and with respect to the internal project procedures as timing of the CIGs’ requests for inputs, submitting the requests from district to National level and subsequently submitting these to FAO procurement staff, there were no major constraints; the only adjustment to make is that CIGs submit their requests for agricultural inputs about 2-3 months before they are needed.

84. Assessment of rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation, compared to the initial plan. The total remaining budget is USD 448,119 or about 21% of the total budget; this is equivalent to about 7.5 months given the total project period of 36 months. This amount is intended to be spent during a period of four months (no-cost extension period requested). In fact, the late start of the project, on 1 April 2010, had as a consequence that the farmers were already into the summer cropping season of 2010 and the project could thus not fully deliver agricultural inputs as planned. The reasons for the delay (of four months) in the start of the project were mostly of an administrative nature as mentioned elsewhere. As in most projects

delivery accelerates only after an initial period of mobilization (staffing, establishment, acquisition of equipment, transport, and so on).

#### **4.2 Project Management**

85. Performance of the management function. At the national level the Project Management Team (FAO) consists of a National Project Manager, National Monitoring & Information Management Officer, National Food Security and Livelihoods Officer, National Administrative & Finance Assistant, and two drivers.

86. In addition there are counterpart staff at three levels: Chief of Planning and Programming of the General Directorate of Extension of MAIL (National level), two Provincial Directors of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock of MAIL (Provincial level), and about 11 Extension Officers of MAIL and MRRD (District level).

87. With respect to the effectiveness and efficiency of operations management within the project, it is observed that the management set-up is lean and efficient and capable to perform the managerial operations' duties. The communication with the district level staff is fast. The formal communication with the provincial level, in between the national (project) level and the district level, is not in any way having a delaying effect or otherwise would make procedures more cumbersome.

88. The most important task of the project are the services rendered to the CIGs respectively the farmers. In case of adequate planning the response of the project management to the CIGs' needs is effective and on time. However, if CIGs do request the services needed relatively late, then delays may occur in procurement. Still the project management attempts to assist the CIGs as possible.

89. The performance of the project management team is found adequate.

#### **Recommendation**

The set-up of the project management team proved adequate and efficient and it is recommended to provide for similar project management structures for similar projects.
--

90. As was the case a few times, a sudden outbreak of pest or diseases resulted in a quick reaction by the project management. However, in this respect delays in an appropriate and fast response were caused by slow analysis of plant material in Kabul institutes. The remedy was by the project management to personally interfere by contacting the management of the laboratories in order to speed up the work expected from them. In addition it is proposed to equip the project counterparts (Extension Officers, Plant Protection Officers) with apparatus to identify common pest and diseases, thereafter the required IPM or chemicals can be purchased.

91. The provision of some technical tools and a small increase in allowances for district staff will be a great help for them to perform their tasks even better.

#### **Recommendation**

Equip District Office staff with apparatus to identify possible pests and diseases efficiently and other tools for their work and increase small allowances.
--

92. With respect to the effectiveness of strategic decision-making by the project management, there has been no need for this. The strategies as formulated in the Prodoc are still valid.

93. With respect to the annual work-plans, they have been realistic and they could be implemented according to plan except for the first year since there was a delayed start of the project.

94. With respect to the efficiency and effectiveness of the monitoring system and internal evaluation processes: the baseline was finalized late (January-March 2010 and beyond). Unfortunately there has been no monitoring system in place of a representative sample of CIGs and the farming families. Therefore, it is difficult to measure the direct impact on the farming community that benefit from the projects' assistance.

95. With respect to the elaboration and implementation of an exit strategy, there is no strategy elaborated as such. The past period of about two agricultural cropping seasons saw a period with intensive contacts between the project (Extension Officers) and CIGs/farmers. This would cease abruptly at the end of the project (31 March 2013). Preferred is that there would be period with a gradually reduced level of contacts/assistance with the CIGs/farmers.

96. The exit strategy, its timing and duration should be linked to CIGs' needs and they are linked to the specific cultivated crops.

#### Recommendation

Design an exit strategy lasting minimum one agricultural cropping season and depending on the major livelihoods of the CIGs.

97. With respect to the role and effectiveness of institutional set-up, including steering bodies the following is observed:

98. The institutional set-up is believed to be efficient. The project and its staff are hosted by MAIL and this makes the communication fast and efficient. The PICU, whose functions were to some extent similar to that of a steering committee, has been dissolved; this is a sign of efficiency since the PICU was not living up to its expectations. PICU's role has now been resumed by the General Directorate of Extension.

99. With respect to the effectiveness and efficiency of operations management by FAO, the following is observed:

- The observation is that the working relations with FAO are efficient; the offices of the project (MAIL) and FAO are adjacent and this facilitates the communication.
- Concerning the delay in the start of the project, this was due mostly to administrative procedures of parties concerned.

### **4.3 Technical Backstopping**

100. Mission to prepare for the baseline survey: the mission took place in December 2010. This was late as the baseline survey had already started. The technical advice given by the mission was generally correct and provided a sound

basis to execute the baseline study. Adaptations were needed concerning the questionnaires as they were too lengthy for a normal field interview with the farming community. The change proposed in the log-frame is unfortunate.

101. FFS consultancy. The FFS are crop-specific and are for instance related to wheat, vegetables, grapes, etc. The quality of support was adequate. However, the first FFS consultancy took place in November 2012. The observation is that the support was beneficial but should have been planned earlier.

#### Recommendation

Field FFS consultancy missions to the project sooner, preferably in the first year.
---

102. Other back stopping missions were found accurate and their input and timing was efficient.

#### **4.4 Government support**

103. With respect to the government's commitment and support to the project, in particular:

- the financial and human resources made available for project operations: the observation is that the government provided adequate support and is fully committed to the project.
- the uptake of outputs and outcomes through policy or investment for up-scaling: the observation is that outputs and outcomes were largely realized; however, their uptake and the up-scaling of the results requires a longer period of time and this should be elaborated in a follow-up project.

## 5 Results<sup>4</sup> and contribution to stated objectives

### 5.1 Outcomes and outputs

#### 5.1.1 Outcome 1

**Table 4. Comparison targets with achievements for Outcome 1**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators / Targets / Activities	Achievement	Status
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Project Stakeholders / beneficiaries sensitized and supported with needed services and inputs (farming technologies) to improve livelihood enterprise implementation.	100% (about 7,000) targeted vulnerable and food insecure farming families are supported by 2012	6515 farming families covered by project (within CIGs)	Largely accomplished
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Awareness created at national, provincial and district levels to obtain needed support from different government institutions to implement project in the two selected districts	1 inception workshop conducted by 2010; 1 meeting held annually at provincial level till 2012. Quarterly meeting held at district level Establish relationship with 3 projects and initiatives annually from 2010-2012	Conducted on 23th March-2010 6 (annual) meetings held in 3 years project period 11 quarterly meeting held at district level Total 9 relationship established during 3 year project period 2010-2012	All completed
<b>Output 1.2:</b> In each site, staff members of MAIL, MRRD and other relevant government decentralized institutions selected and trained as District Project Officers.	5 Project officers selected and trained per district by first quarter of 2010 1 on the job training conducted in PY 2 and 1 PY 3.	12 officers selected and trained in both two targeted districts by 2010 Total 4 trainings conducted in two districts in PY2/PY3	Completed, 2 more trained than target  -completed according to target
<b>Output 1.3:</b> District Project Officers able to facilitate the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure farming families.	10 each of motorcycles, mobile phones computers and printers provided for Project District Officers by first quarter of 2010. Overtime payment and re-imburement of costs from PY1 to PY3.	16 motorcycles 2 computers, 2 printers Credit for mobiles  Payment done regularly	6 more than target according to target according to target mobile phones (already in possession of district staff), only credit provided for the mobiles -completed

104. All the planned outputs under the Outcome 1 were achieved; occasionally a few more staff were trained and additional motorcycles were distributed at the district level since needed by the staff.

<sup>4</sup> The term 'results' includes outputs, outcomes and impact.

### 5.1.2 *Outcome 2*

**Table 5. Comparison targets with achievements for Outcome 2**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators/Targets /Activities	Achievement	Status
Outcome 2: Improved livelihood strategies successfully adopted by vulnerable and food insecure farming households resulting in increased household food security.	40% of target group successfully implementing improved livelihood strategies by PY2 and 100% (7000 vulnerable and food insecure households) by PY3.	-	-
Output 2.1: Participatory assessment of the relevant livelihood strategies conducted in each project district	2 inventories of potential livelihood strategies (for male and female) prepared in the two districts PY1. 1 Community meeting organized per community per year introducing the project and identifying the potential livelihood strategies. 1 Focus Group Discussion (FGD) organized per Common Interest Group per year	3 inventories of potential livelihood strategies prepared in the two districts  6 Community meeting organized in project period and identifying the potential livelihood strategies.  FGDs organized per Common Interest Group yearly	Accomplished, one more than target  Accomplished  Accomplished
Output 2.2: Strong farmer producer and common interest groups formed to facilitate the introduction and sustainability of improved livelihood strategies.	No. of new/existing farmer groups formed/identified with a total membership of 3000 farming households by the end of 2011 and with a total number of 7000 farming households by the end of 2012. 40 % new/existing CIG registered by 2011 and 80% by the end of July 2012. All new/existing CIGs formed/identified received annual training on group strengthening and dynamics 20% of the groups linked to other projects/initiatives by 2011 and 50% by third quarter of 2012.	258 CIGs formed with total No of 6515 farming households  CIG registration is under discussion with Ext. And Cooperative Department of MAIL 234 CIG received annual training of group strengthening and dynamics  Under discussion with Extension Dep. Of MAIL to link with HLP	Largely accomplished  To be done  16 groups remaining  To be done
Output 2.3: Improved Livelihood Strategies successfully implemented by vulnerable and food insecure households.	200 livelihood strategies/micro support project implemented by 2011 and 300 by 2012. Amount of input support agreed upon	585 livelihood strategies/micro support project implemented  All inputs successful support to project area	Accomplished, target exceeded by 285  Accomplished

	with the different targeted Common Interest Groups made available on time. 80 % new/existing farmer groups received technical training by 2011 and 100% by the end of July 2012. 80% of the new/existing farmer groups formed/identified backstopped by PY2 and 100% by PY3. 40% groups linked to market in PY2 and 80% by PY3	234 CIGs received technical training successfully  All existing CIG formed/identified backstopped  Under discussion with Extension	16 groups are remaining but these are inactive CIGs  Accomplished  To be done
Output 2.4: Expanded implementation of successfully implemented livelihood strategies in neighbouring villages through a Farmer Field School Programme	4 successful livelihood strategies implemented/ identified by 2011 and 6 number by 2012 4 FFS Curricula developed by the end of 2011 and 6 by the end of 2012. 1 Training of FFS (farmer) facilitators held in 2011 and one held in 2012 20 FFS (farmer) facilitators trained in 2011 and another 20 in 2012. 20 FFS established by 2012 and 40 initiated for 2013	3 successful livelihood strategies implemented/ identified  2 FFS Curricula developed  1 Training of FFS conducted in Surkhrod district  26 FFS facilitators trained  16 FFS established	Accomplished (one less than target for legumes, to be done)  2 FFS Curricula remaining  One planned for 24 Feb-2013 in Qarabagh  14 are remaining to be done in February-March 2013  44 are remaining for year 2013 (during no-cost extension period)

105. Virtually all the planned outputs under the Outcome 2 were achieved except the registration of the CIGs as cooperatives. This is presently negotiated with MAIL. A major obstacle was that formally only multi-purpose cooperatives are recognized; whilst CIGs are concerned with a single crop in as far as the project assisted them. Apparently multi-cooperatives would not always live up to expectations farmers have. Many farmers and members of CIGs are hesitant to become members of cooperatives since the farming community have mixed experiences with cooperatives.

106. An important issue is if CIGs should be transferred into cooperatives or not. After the project ceases to operate, many CIGs may succeed to operate without much further assistance. For the CIGs to continue to function in a sustainable manner, it is advisable to continue rendering services to them by Extension Officers for one more cropping season albeit less intensive. This could be an exit strategy for those CIGs who do not wish to become a cooperative. For CIGs who wish to transform into a cooperative, the Extension Officers could guide this process and assist the CIGs in negotiating their future set-up as cooperative with local government officials.

107. Another pending issue is the intended linkage with other projects of relevance for the food security and livelihood status of the CIGs and their members. A suitable project would be the Horticulture and Livestock project (HLP) that operates in the districts of Qarabagh and Surkhrod. The project has already informed HLP on the 134 CIGs in Surkhrod district and the Head of the Extension Unit discussed possible linkages with HLP; this shall be explored further.

108. However, there are many NGOs that could be beneficial to the CIGs and this should be explored. These agencies all are somewhat different and specialize in different fields of rural development. The project staff should identify their specific field of work, thereafter decide on establishing contacts with them and elaborate possible linkages.

109. The observation is that the project has not sufficiently developed linkages with other agencies (NGOs, other agencies) at the moment. This should be explored, first by contacting these agencies at the national level and thereafter by contacts at the district level.

#### Recommendation

The project should elaborate modalities and agreements for future collaboration with agencies / NGOs / projects that operate in the project's districts and can provide useful services to the project's CIGs / farming families now and after the project's assistance and input has come to an end.

#### 5.1.3 *Outcome 3*

**Table 6. Comparison targets with achievements for Outcome 3**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators/Targets /Activities	Achievement	Status
Outcome 3: Model Extension Approach implemented to enhance National Service and Input Provision framework	Elements of the demonstrated approach adopted by MAIL.		
Output 3.1: Experiences obtained and lessons learnt through implementing a model extension system.	Number of documents/studies prepared on elements of the approach implemented by the project (livelihood survey, group formation, cost recovery strategies, etc.) including lessons learnt	Documents/studies prepared on elements of the approach implemented by the project (livelihood survey, group formation, cost recovery strategies, etc.) including lessons learnt	Mostly accomplished, but consultancy assistance requested (documentation / communication / extension / dissemination specialist)
Output 3.2: Advices/Recommendations formulated for further development and fine tuning of the model extension approach.	2 Advices formulated by PY1; 4 by PY2 and 6 by PY3. 1 national workshop on experiences obtained, lessons learnt and advices/recommendations organized by 2011 and 1 by 2012	Successfully formulated  Under implementation	Accomplished  To be done



110. Output 3 and its related outputs were accomplished; however, the project wishes to engage a consultant to assist with processing existing documentation produced already by the project and to be made suitable and easy to consult by the project's stakeholders or even for a wider audience, to assist with the communication aspects and to relate this to the extension effort of the project.

#### 5.1.4 Outcome 4

**Table 7. Comparison targets with achievements for Outcome 4**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators/Targets /Activities	Achievement	Status
Outcome 4: Project team established facilitating successful implementation of project at national, province and district/community level.	50% completion of project activities by 2011 and 100% completion by the end of 2012.	-	-
Output 4.1: Project management team established and operational	National project coordination team established (3 Project management staff (at least 1 woman) by 2010 National Project Director appointed by MAIL by 2010. Relevant counterparts from different departments and respective provinces appointed by MAIL by 2010 Members from the District MAIL offices of the two project districts appointed as District project team members by 2010	Successfully done	Accomplished
		National Project Director appointed	Accomplished
		Successfully appointed	Accomplished
		Completed, more than target	Accomplished
Output 4.2: Technical Assistance/Back-stopping missions by FAO	2 FAO TA/Backstopping missions by 2010; 4 by 2011 and 6 numbers by 2012	All done	Accomplished
Output 4.3: Capacity strengthened all levels of implementation	No of equipment and vehicles provided and meetings conducted. Training of MAIL staff on need basis	All done	Accomplished

Output 4.4: Effective M&E system established	1 baseline survey conducted by PY1 3 quarterly monitoring visits to project districts/communities by 2010; 4 numbers by 2011 and 4 numbers by 2012 1 MTR conducted by 2011 and 1 ICR by 2012 3 each of six monthly and annual reports produced.	Baseline survey conducted 11 quarterly monitoring visits to project districts/communities completed  MTR not conducted as not found necessary ICR (Final review) is continuing Quarterly and six month reports produced	Accomplished  Accomplished  MTR not conducted  Accomplished
--	---	--	---

111. Output 4 is fully accomplished; however, it was not considered opportune to execute a mid-term review since the project had a delayed start which resulted in only about two years of interventions related to the supply of agricultural inputs vis-à-vis the CIGs and farmers and given its relative short duration.

## 5.2 Gender issues

112. Gender issues were reflected in objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation in the Prodoc. It was suggested in the Prodoc that the approaches should be bottom-up, holistic and gender sensitive.

113. Recognized were the specific roles played by women in the family with regards to agricultural activities; this relates to work as: -care for livestock (milking, feeding, processing of animal products), -poultry, -kitchen gardening, -weeding, -harvesting of agricultural produce, -fruit and vegetable processing/drying, -housekeeping related work (cooking, washing, child care, acquiring fire wood), -maintaining social relations, and so on.

114. In addition there are women headed households where women resume all the duties that come with a (small) farm holding. However, officially the total number of women headed households is small about 1 %, but in reality this will be larger since the women headed households are often registered in the name of the deceased husband or brother.

115. The Prodoc specifically addresses women's needs for instance by proposing to include in the District staff both male and female members. This relates especially to the Extension Officers. Unfortunately this was not realized as all district's Extension Officers are male.

116. The share of women in the agricultural activities of the family farm is considerable and the women headed households merit a special approach. This would best be achieved by including women in the staff of the district offices; among the five Extension Officers per district at least one person should be a woman and she should specialize in the specific tasks that women have in the farm holding and in the family. At the national level the project team is fortunate for having one woman among its staff capable to address typical needs of rural women at the family farm holdings.

117. The project partly enhances food production and partly is an income generating project. The additional generated income can be used to purchase better food for the family. To promote a healthier diet more information to the farming families is needed to make the right choices as for their daily food requirements and composition. This should be focussed and audience-specific meetings or encounters should be held with the different farming families serving their needs in relation to their household status, to be prepared by a food nutritionist. Presently the MDG project hosted by MAIL is engaged in this type of work but the project will soon cease to operate.

#### Recommendation

Engage a food nutritionist consultant or obtain services from relevant FAO projects already operating in Afghanistan to train Extension Officers on nutrition aspects who shall extend the information to CIGs and/or women groups in the rural areas.
--

### 5.3 Capacity development

118. With respect to the extent and quality of project work in capacity development of staff and beneficiaries the following observations are made:

- Extension Officers: no professional training was needed as they had adequate education; however, the Project Management Team explained the project's objectives to them (Outcomes, outputs, target groups, etc.) and how to operate in the districts. Extension Officers expressed they would like to receive more capacity building related to financial aspects, marketing aspects, business development.
- CIGs: capacity building by subject matter specialists of MAIL and Extension Officers; however, CIGs like more intensive contacts with them, which is possible e.g. by increasing fuel allowance (now USD 30 to USD 50 /month), more credit to the mobile phone cards (now USD 10 raise to USD 15 / month).
- Farmer Field Schools (FFS). FFS type of capacity building is given to CIG Chiefs and members by an international consultant and various subject matter specialists; this activity has recently started late (first mission November 2012, second mission February-March 2013). The nature of the consultancy is Training of the Trainers (TOT). The uptake of the farming community and the incorporation in their livelihoods needs further assessment at a later stage since the late start of the activity; thereafter this can be integrated better in the "Model approach" (Outcome 3).
- Technical staff: provide equipment to Extension Officers specialized in plant protection: microscope, magnifying glass, notebook computer when internet is available which allows staff to maintain and acquire technical knowledge by using the internet.

#### Recommendations related to Capacity Development

-Extension Officers: provide more capacity building related to financial aspects, marketing aspects, business development. -CIGs: increase allowances to facilitate an intensification of contacts with Extension Officers -FFS: the integration of FFS into the farming community needs to be assessed soon
--

-Technical staff: provide technical equipment to better facilitate their work

119. With respect to the perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project, the Outcome 3 of the project is intended to reach out to neighbouring farmers and districts and eventually apply this nation-wide. The project's experiences are conveyed to the relevant authorities within MAIL and reports are disseminated among various stakeholders (MAIL, FAO). The observation made is that this aspect (Outcome 3) needs more attention and improved formulation at project design stage including allocation of resources achieve thorough results.

#### **5.4 Sustainability**

120. Sustainability from a socio-economic perspective of the CIGs. The target beneficiaries of the project were the rural poor vulnerable farming families as members of the CIGs. The provision of agricultural inputs, under Outcome 2, to their farm holdings increased crop yields and raised incomes. The mechanism for the assistance to the CIGs was to provide these inputs at the beginning of the cropping season, or in case of perennial crops e.g. grapes over a longer period of time. The agricultural inputs were given to the farmers with a discount. After the harvest the CIGs were to collect from their members the money equivalent to the costs of the inputs minus the discount and deposit this in a bank account that belongs to the CIG. This deposit is referred to as revolving fund. It may serve the purpose to acquire agricultural inputs for the next season or be used for other investments to be decided by the CIG. In fact, the revolving fund can operate only as such because of a strong social control within the CIG.

*The complete overview of all agricultural inputs delivered to the CIGs is given in the table in Annex 10. Farmers were given a discount on the purchase price of the agricultural inputs: for Qarabagh this was 40%, for Surkhrod this was 17%. This may also be interpreted as a cost recovery % of respectively 60% and 83%. The discount to CIGs in Qarabagh is high since the high investment in trellis for the grape farmers and because these are very poor farmers and may not be able to repay the full amount.*

121. Regarding the membership of the CIGs there were some members who are categorized as passive or absent members as they are less active than other members. In addition this may even occur for the whole CIG. Some of them, the project believes, may be convinced to resume their active membership resulting from efforts that the project intends to undertake to convince them of the advantages provided by the CIG; however, this will need some time. Some may have left indefinitely for various reasons (deceased, job seekers, emigrated). In Qarabagh this concerns about 49 % and in Surkhrod about 16 % of the members of the CIGs.

122. Based on the experience of the Extension Officers, it is expected that the situation could improve as the CIG members become more and more convinced of the economic benefits of the revolving fund.

123. To enhance CIGs' sustainability a longer "contact-time" between the Extension Officers and the CIG members will be beneficial instead of the current 2-3 cropping seasons possible under the project's design and budget. This increases the likelihood that the CIGs can act as centrepieces for enhancing food security in future.

124. Conclusion: From a socio-economic point of view the CIGs are expected continue as a sustainable form of enhancing food security and income generating group of farmers. However, this observation would have to be verified after 2-3years.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that the project maintains a longer working relationship with the CIGs albeit with less frequent contacts over time, to assist CIGs with their operation of the revolving fund, then the 2-3 years foreseen in the Prodoc. This will increase the sustainability of the CIGs in achieving food security. Especially the very poor members of the CIGs need longer support.

125. Sustainability from a technical perspective. The Extension Officers have communicated to the CIGs and farmers crop-specific best cultural practices under the given circumstances and for the particular climate, land, water and soil conditions. This technical information will stay with the farming community and provides a long-term benefit for them and is believed to be a sustainable component of the project.

126. Sustainability from an environmental perspective. The project is neither expanding the cultivated area nor investing in additional land and water resources development and remains a small-scale activity. Therefore, there is no negative impact on the environment.

127. Sustainability from an institutional perspective. Presently the project is discussing the possibility of forming so-called single-purpose cooperatives since under the law only multi-purpose cooperatives are recognized. As soon as this is possible the registration of the CIGs as a single-purpose cooperative would further enhance the chances of the achievements by the project to remain sustainable. In addition some CIGs may wish to continue operating as before and stay a CIG.

### 5.5 *Impact*

128. The impact is given for some important aspects:

- Food security of the project's target group: poor and vulnerable farming families.
- The major impact of the project in the two districts of Qarabagh and Surkhrod is enhanced food security and income generated for about 6500 families currently as well as in future.

129. Food security of neighbouring farming communities

- The neighbouring farmers will appreciate the positive impact of the CIGs on their members and this may provoke a demand from them for similar assistance; this is expected to improve their cropping systems' management and food security.

130. District level staff

- Many district level staffs gained experience in extension work and improved agricultural practices also through the FFS. This impact is positive for them as well as their employers for future work on similar food security or agriculture development projects.

131. National project staff

- Regarding the professional staff at the national level, the experience obtained whilst working for the project and from back-stopping missions is positive both for MAIL and for their careers.
132. Impact on food import requirements
- This cannot be quantified but the impact is small but positive.
133. Contribution to the planned development objective and to FAO's Strategic Objectives, Core Functions and Organizational Results.
- The project's development objectives are fully in line with the CPF (see also Chapter 3.2). The CPF is based on the Government's development policy as well as FAO's Strategic Objectives, Core Functions and Organizational Results. The project's contribution is positive and congruent with development policies of both partners.

## **6 Conclusions and Recommendations**

134. Conclusions (concluding observations) as related to the four Outcomes

Related to Outcome 1:

- Conclusion 1: The project's start was delayed four months mostly for administrative reasons.
- Conclusion 2: The project had a slow start since mobilization of staff took longer than anticipated and they had to become acquainted with computerized data formats, computerized reporting styles, baseline surveys demands, and so on.
- Conclusion 3: The recommendations by the consultancy on baseline survey, log-frame, and so on, caused some delays.
- Conclusion 4: All outputs are achieved.

Related to Outcome 2:

- Conclusion 5: The approval of Budget Revision C took about four months which affected the project as the assistance to CIGs for one cropping season was only partially realized due to delayed delivery of agricultural inputs to the CIGs.
- Conclusion 6: The FFS consultancy contribution became available only towards the end of the project; thus its benefit is less than optimal.
- Conclusion 7: The registration process of CIGs to become cooperatives should be revisited or at least adapted to suit the needs of the CIGs.
- Conclusion 8: The linkages with other rural development projects have not been fully explored as yet and this needs to be done soon (in March 2013 and thereafter in the no-cost extension period).

- Conclusion 9: To enhance the sustainability of the projects' outputs, a longer contact-time between the Extension Officers and the CIGs is needed (one season extra).
- Conclusion 10: The project achieved most of its outputs; what remains shall be done in March 2013 and thereafter in the no-cost extension period.

Related to Outcome 3:

- Conclusion 11: The project communicated its experiences and disseminated reports among relevant stakeholders; however, the implementation of its "model approach" is beyond the project's control and responsibility.

Related to Outcome 4:

- Conclusion 12: Outputs were achieved and use was made of FAO's normative products; however, in addition to the M&E system in place in order to better assess the project's impact representative sample surveys need to be elaborated.
- Conclusion 13: The project's mechanism for enhancing food security of the poor vulnerable farmers via CIGs may be included in one of FAO's related normative products.

135. The recommendations are given in the text preceded by the rationale. All recommendations are meant for FAO Senior management, The Project Management and for those who will be formulating an extension or a follow-up of this project.

## **7 Lessons Learned**

136. All recommendations given in the above chapters do include lessons learned and are meant to be incorporated in similar follow-up projects.

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

### **1. Background**

1. The German Ministry of Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture (BMVEL) via its bilateral trust fund has financed several projects executed by FAO in Afghanistan. The Government of Luxemburg) supports the BMVEL in administering the trust fund and monitoring progress.

2. The three-year project '**support to household food security and livelihoods of Food insecure and vulnerable farming families**' (GCP/AFG/061/LUX) started in April 2010 with a budget of US\$ 2,135,700 and is scheduled to end in March 2013.

3. This project aims at improving the household food security in the project districts (Surkhrod district of Nangarhar province and Qarabagh district of Kabul province) by facilitating and coordinating, through the decentralized governmental institutions, the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure farming households in adopting improved livelihood strategies, contributing to the achievement of the 1<sup>st</sup> MDG Goal (eradicate extreme poverty and hunger). The project will build the capacity of the decentralised governmental institutions in the project districts. Together with the local communities a participatory assessment will be initiated to identify the relevant improved livelihood strategies and the needed support. The project will support the formation and strengthening of farmer producer and common interest groups. The needed inputs will be provided to the groups for free, but distributed within the groups on a cost recovery basis to generate capital to strengthen the groups and to sustain the activities. For training and backstopping support, the project will make use of the expertise available in the relevant ministries, projects and other organizations. In order to do this the project will establish linkages with those relevant ministries, projects and other organizations and will try to link the different farmer producer' and common interest groups to these organizations and projects as well as to relevant farmer organizations/associations for follow up support after the termination of the project

4. The final evaluation of the project is planned for November 2012 to assess the project outputs and outcomes during the last 31 months.

### **2. Purpose of the Evaluation**

5. The evaluation will be appraising the overall contribution of the project towards the set goals and objectives. The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the approach of these projects and the outcomes and to provide recommendations to support designing and implementing similar projects in the future.



6. In particular, the evaluation will document the lessons learned by the project stakeholders and the effectiveness of the project in creating conducive environment to ensure continuation of the project approach beyond project life.

### 3. Scope of the Evaluation

7. The evaluation will assess the project against the following criteria:
- Its relevance to: national development priorities, needs of the population; FAO Global Goals and Strategic Objectives/Core Functions and other aid programmes in the sector;
  - Robustness and realism of the theory of change<sup>5</sup> underpinning the project, including logic of causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impacts (against specific and development objectives) and validity of indicators, assumptions and risks;
8. Quality and realism of the project design, including:
- Duration;
  - Stakeholder and beneficiary identification.
  - Institutional set-up and management arrangements;
  - Approach and methodology;
9. Financial resources management, including:
- Adequacy of budget allocations to achieve outputs;
  - Coherence and soundness of Budget Revisions in matching necessary adjustments to requirements of implementation;
  - Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation.
10. Management and implementation, including:
- Effectiveness of management, including quality and realism of work plans;
  - Efficiency and effectiveness of operations management;
  - Gaps and delays if any between planned and achieved outputs, the causes and consequences of delays and assessment of any remedial measures taken, efficiency in producing outputs;
  - Effectiveness of internal monitoring and review processes;
  - Efficiency and effectiveness of coordination and steering bodies (if any);
  - Coordination with other projects active in the same sector
  - Quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO; and
  - Timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and support by the Government and resource partner.
  - Extent to which the expected outputs have been produced, their quality and timeliness.<sup>6</sup>
  - Extent to which the expected outcomes have been achieved.

---

<sup>5</sup> May be expressed in a logical framework matrix.

<sup>6</sup> Key outputs should be listed for the evaluation team to assess. The evaluation team may add to the list as appropriate.

11. Use made by the initiative of FAO's normative products and actual and potential contribution of the initiative to the normative work of the Organization.

12. Assessment of gender mainstreaming in the initiative. This will cover:

- Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in project objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
- Analysis of how gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the initiative;
- Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in project management.

13. The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the initiative's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the initiative. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:

- Institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
- Perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project.

14. Environmental sustainability: the initiative's contribution to sustainable natural resource management, in terms of maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base.

15. Overall performance of the project: extent to which the initiative has attained, or is expected to attain, its intermediate/specific objectives and FAO Organizational Result/s (impact), and hence, to the relevant Strategic Objectives and Core Functions; this will also include the identification of actual and potential positive and negative impacts produced by the initiative, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. The evaluation team will also evaluate if project resources were efficiently used to support the overall project objective given the overall adverse factors during project life.

16. Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by Government, FAO and/or other parties to ensure sustainable development, including any need for follow-up action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons of interest to other similar activities. Any proposal for further assistance should include specification of major objectives and outputs and indicative inputs required.

#### **4. Evaluation methodology**

17. Under the overall guidance of the FAO Office of Evaluation:

- The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards;

- The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin the validation of evidence collected and its analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations;
- The evaluation will make use of the following tools: review of existing reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by check lists and/or interview protocols; direct observation during field visits; surveys and questionnaires; the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework; the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) framework for assessment of project results.

## **5. Consultation process**

18. The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with the FAO Office of Evaluation, project management, the LTU and Task Force members at headquarters, regional, sub-regional or country level, and all key stakeholders. Although the evaluation team is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

19. The evaluation briefing and debriefing process will include the Government, the resource partners, the FAO Representation and other relevant actors.

20. The evaluation team will present its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations during a debriefing meeting in Kabul with key stakeholders, in order to discuss and obtain feedback.

21. The Team Leader will have a debriefing meeting in FAO HQ to present the results of the evaluation team. S/He bears responsibility for finalization of the report, which will be submitted to FAO within four weeks of mission completion. FAO will submit the report to Government(s) and donor together with its comments.

22. The draft evaluation report will be circulated among key stakeholders for comment before finalization; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

## **6. Evaluation Team**

23. The team will comprise experts/expertise to handle different components. Senior Evaluator (Team Leader): Extensive evaluation experience; excellent writing and presentation skills; familiarity with all phases of the programme/project management cycle; broad knowledge of Agriculture Livelihoods approaches. The expert should have experience in evaluating similar projects in developing countries.

24. Monitoring and Evaluation officer: Representative of MAIL, Government of Afghanistan Representative of the donor if available.

25. The team will be supported by local expertise.

26. Team members will be fully independent who have not been directly involved with the project formulation, implementation or backstopping. However, they should be familiar with the socio-political situation of Afghanistan.

## **7. Reporting**

27. The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the ToR. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

28. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

29. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided in Annex I of this ToR. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs.

30. The team leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to FAO within four weeks from the conclusion of the mission. Within three additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team its comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within one week.

31. Annexes to the evaluation report will include, but are not limited to:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- List of Persons Met, including job titles;
- Itinerary of the evaluation team;
- Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys – if applicable).

## **8. Timetable and Itinerary of the Mission**

32. The mission will commence in November 2012 with introductory meetings with the project team, the FAO Representation and officials of MAIL in Kabul. The evaluation team will visit the project sites in Qarabagh or Surkhrod to see activities of the projects and hold meetings with project stakeholders. In addition, the evaluation team will hold detailed meetings with relevant officials of MAIL and project partners in Kabul.

33. The evaluation team will spend at least ten days in Afghanistan including their travel days to field. A debriefing meeting by the Evaluation Team Leader will be held in FAO Headquarters in Rome within two weeks after the debriefing in Kabul. The Team Leader will submit a draft version of the evaluation report during the meeting in FAO HQ.

34. A detailed itinerary will be prepared for the evaluation team including daily activities. The mission in Afghanistan will conclude in debriefing workshop.

35. Annex: Annotated Report Outline

- Table of contents of the evaluation report
- Acronyms

When an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text, it should be explained in full; it will be included in the list of acronyms when it is used repeatedly within the report.

- Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should:

- *Be in length approximately 10-15% of the main report, excluding annexes;*
- *Provide key information on the evaluation process and methodology;*
- *Illustrate key findings and conclusions;*
- *List all recommendations: this will facilitate the drafting of the FAO Management Response to the evaluation report.<sup>7</sup>*

## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Background and purpose of the evaluation**

36. This section will include:

- the purpose of the evaluation, as stated in the Terms of Reference;
- title, starting and closing dates, initial and current total budget;
- dates of implementation of the evaluation.
- It will also mention that Annex I is the Evaluation Terms of Reference.

### **1.2 Methodology of the evaluation**

37. This section will comprise a description of the methodology and tools used and evaluation criteria that were applied by the evaluation team. This should also note any limitations incurred in applying the methodology by the evaluation team. It should also include reference to Annex II, List of people met and places visited.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Management Response is the written reply by FAO to the evaluation report; it illustrates acceptance or justified partial acceptance or rejection of recommendations, including actions, responsibilities and time plan for their implementation.

## **2 Context of the project/programme**

38. This section will include a description of the developmental context relevant to the project/programme (global/regional/national as appropriate) including major challenges in the area of the intervention, political and legislative issues, etc. It will also describe the process by which the project/programme was identified and developed and cite other related UN (including FAO) and bilateral interventions if relevant.

## **3 Concept and relevance**

### **3.1 Design**

39. Programmes and projects are built on assumptions on how and why they are supposed to achieve the agreed objectives through the selected strategy; this set of assumptions constitutes the programme theory or ‘theory of change’ and can be explicit (e.g. in a logical framework matrix<sup>8</sup>) or implicit in a project/programme document.

40. This section will include a short description of the project/programme objectives and assumptions and will analyse critically:

- The appropriateness of stated development goals and outcomes (immediate objectives);
- The causal relationship between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes (immediate objectives) and impact (development objectives);
- The relevance and appropriateness of indicators;
- The validity of assumptions and risks.

41. This section will also critically assess:

- The project/programme’s institutional set-up and management arrangements;
- The adequacy of the time-frame;
- The adequacy of resources from all parties and appropriateness of budget allocations to achieve intended results;
- The adequacy of the methodology of implementation to achieve intended results;
- The quality of the stakeholders’ and beneficiaries identification.

### **3.2 Relevance**

42. This section will analyse the extent to which the project/programme’s objectives and strategy were consistent with country’s expressed requirements and policies, with beneficiaries’ needs, and other major aid programmes, at the time of approval and at the time of the evaluation.

43. There will also be an analysis of the degree to which the project/programme corresponds to priorities in the FAO Country Programming Framework.

---

<sup>8</sup> Logical framework matrix, if present, should be reproduced as an Annex to the report.

## **4 Implementation**

### **4.1 *Budget and Expenditure***

44. This section will contain the analysis of project/programme financial resources and management, including:

- Efficiency in production of outputs;
- Coherence and soundness of Budget Revisions in matching necessary adjustments in implementation; and
- Assessment of rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation, compared to the initial plan.

### **4.2 *Project/programme Management***

45. This section will analyse the performance of the management function, including:

- effectiveness and efficiency of operations management, both within the project/programme and by FAO including timeliness, quality, reasons for delays and assessment of remedial measures taken if any;
- effectiveness of strategic decision-making by project/programme management;
- realism of annual work-plans;
- efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring system and internal evaluation processes;
- elaboration and implementation of an exit strategy;
- role and effectiveness of institutional set-up, including steering bodies.

### **4.3 *Technical Backstopping***

46. This section will analyse the extent, timeliness and quality of technical backstopping the project/programme received from involved units in FAO, at all levels (HQ, regional, sub-regional and country offices).

### **4.4 *Government support***

47. This section will analyse government's commitment and support to the project/programme, in particular:

- Financial and human resources made available for project/programme operations;
- Uptake of outputs and outcomes through policy or investment for up-scaling;

## **5 Results<sup>9</sup> and contribution to stated objectives**

### **5.1 *Outputs and outcomes***

This section will critically analyse the project/programme outputs: ideally, the evaluation team should directly assess all of these, but this is not always feasible due to time and resources constraints. Thus, the detailed analysis should be done on a representative sample of outputs that were assessed directly, while a complete list of outputs prepared by the project/programme team should be included as annex. If appropriate, the section will also include an analysis of gaps and delays and their causes and consequences.

Further, the section will critically analyse to what extent expected outcomes (specific/immediate objectives) were achieved, or are likely to be achieved during the

---

<sup>9</sup> The term 'results' includes outputs, outcomes and impact.

project/programme life's time. It will also identify and analyse the main factors influencing their achievement and the contributions of the various stakeholders to them.

## **6 Gender issues**

This section will analyse if and how the project/programme mainstreamed gender issues. The assessment will cover:

Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;

Analysis of how gender relations and equality and processes of women's inclusion were and are likely to be affected by the initiative;

Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in project/programme management.

### **6.1 Capacity development**

The evaluation will assess

the extent and quality of project/programme work in capacity development of beneficiaries;

the perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project/programme.

### **6.2 Sustainability**

This section will assess the prospects for long-term use of outputs and outcomes, from an institutional, social, technical and economic perspective. If applicable, there will also be an analysis of environmental sustainability (maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base).

### **6.3 Impact**

This section will assess the current and foreseeable positive and negative impacts produced as a result of the project/programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

It will assess the actual or potential contribution of the project/programme to the planned development objective and to FAO's Strategic Objectives, Core Functions and Organizational Results.<sup>10</sup>

## **7 Conclusions and Recommendations**

Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/ or solutions of important problems or issues. They may address specific evaluation questions raised in the Terms of Reference and should provide a clear basis for the recommendations which follow.

The Conclusions will synthesise the main findings from the preceding sections: main achievements, major weaknesses and gaps in implementation, factors affecting strengths and weaknesses, prospects for follow-up, any emerging issues. It will consolidate the assessment of various aspects to judge the extent to which the project/programme has attained, or is expected to attain, its intermediate/specific objectives. Considerations about relevance, costs, implementation strategy and

---

<sup>10</sup> See Annex III



quantity and quality of outputs and outcomes should be brought to bear on the aggregate assessment.

The section will include an assessment of FAO's role as implementing/ executing agency and the quality of the feedback loop between the project/programme and FAO's normative role, namely:

actual use by the project/programme of relevant FAO's normative products (databases, publications, methodologies, etc.);

actual and potential contribution of project/programme outputs and outcomes to FAO's normative work.

Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. They can tackle strategic, thematic or operational issues. Recommendations concerned with on-going activities should be presented separately from those relating to follow-up once the project/programme is terminated.

Each recommendation should each be introduced by the rationale for it; alternatively, it should be referenced to the paragraphs in the report to which it is linked.

Each recommendation should be clearly addressed to the appropriate party(ies), i.e. the Government, the resource partner, FAO at different levels (HQ, regional, sub-regional, national) and the project/programme management. Responsibilities and the time frame for their implementation should be stated, to the extent possible.

Although it is not possible to identify a 'correct' number of recommendations in an evaluation report, the evaluation team should consider that each recommendation must receive a response.

## **8 Lessons Learned**

Not all evaluations generate lessons. Lessons should only be drawn if they represent contributions to general knowledge.

Where this is the case, the evaluation will identify lessons and good practices on substantive, methodological or procedural issues, which could be relevant to the design, implementation and evaluation of similar projects or programmes. Such lessons/practices must have been innovative, demonstrated success, had an impact, and be replicable.

## **Annex 2. Profile of Team members**

### **The Evaluation Team consisted of the following persons:**

Harry W. Denecke, Senior Evaluator

Assisted by the Project Management Team:

Khalil Ur Rahman, National Project Manager

Mohammad Ayoub, National Monitoring and Information Officer

Marzia Popal, National Food Security and Livelihoods Officer

Habibullah Malipour, National Administrative and Finance Assistant

Their profiles (CVs) are available upon request.

### **Annex 3. List of documents reviewed**

Documents reviewed include the project's 6-monthly progress reports, projects' files (baseline surveys, deliverables, etc.), reports from consultants and backstopping missions, etc.

#### Annex 4. List of places visited and institutions, persons met

Date	Location
29-30 January 2013	Rome, Italy
31 January	Travel Rome-Kabul
1-5 February	Office / Kabul, Afghanistan
6 February	Field visit / Qarabagh, Afghanistan
7-14 February	Office / Kabul, Afghanistan
14-17 February	Field visit, Surkhrod District / Jalalabad, Afghanistan
18-22 February	Office / Kabul, Afghanistan
22 February	Debriefing meeting / Kabul, Afghanistan
23 February	Travel Kabul-Rome
24-25 February	Rome, Italy
26 February	Travel Rome – Netherlands

Date	Persons Met	Position
January 2013		
29	Bernd Bultemeijer	Senior Evaluation Officer, FAO-OED, Rome
29	Faith Nilsson	Evaluation Analyst, FAO-OED, Rome
29	Jaap van de Pol	Consultant FAO, FFS, Rome
29	Manuela Allara-Carlin	Programme Specialist IPM, Plant Production and Protection Division, FAO, Rome
29	Sam Kugbei	Seed Specialist, FAO, Rome
30	Aziz R. Arya	Food Security Officer, FAO-TCSF-TCS-TC, Rome
February 2013		
1	Najibulla	Project Driver, Support to Household Food Security, Kabul
3	Khalil Ur Rahman	National Project Manager, Support to Household Food Security, Kabul
3	Mohammad Ayoub	National Monitoring & Information Management Officer, Support to Household Food Security, Kabul
3	Marzia Popal	Food Security & Livelihoods Officer, Support to Household Food Security, Kabul
3	Habibullah Malikpour	Administrative Officer, Support to Household Food Security, Kabul
3	Abdul Wasi	Head Dryland Department and Extension Services, MAIL, Kabul
4	Sayed Ahmad Walid	Security Officer, FAOAF, Kabul
4	Tim Vaessen	Senior Operations Officer, FAOAF, Kabul
4	Ahmad Faraz	National operations Officer, FAOAF, Kabul
5	Mohammad Aqa	Assistant Representative, FAO Country Office, Kabul

5	Raziq Mojadady	Director of Cooperatives, MAIL, Kabul
5	Roshidi	Director of Cooperative Institutes, MAIL, Kabul
5	Dennis L. Richards	Internal Auditor, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok), Kabul
6	Abdul Maroup	Head of Extension, MAIL, Qarabagh,
6	M. Hassan	Extension Officer, MAIL, Qarabagh
6	Saifu Rahman	Extension Officer, MAIL, Qarabagh
6	Naqubullah	Plant Protection Specialist, Extension Officer, MAIL, Qarabagh
6	Samiullah	Plant Protection Specialist, Extension Officer, Qarabagh, MAIL
6	Rafullah	Extension Officer, MRRD, Qarabagh
6	Abdel Razek	Chief CIG “Abdel Razek”, Qarabagh
6	Moh Wazi	Deputy Chief CIG “Abdel Razek”, Qarabagh
6	Zagrullah	Treasurer CIG “Abdel Razek”, Qarabagh
6	..and 6 other members (farmers) of CIG “Abdel Razek”	CIG “Abdel Razek”, Qarabagh
14	Khushal Asifi	National Area agronomist, Emergency Rehabilitation Unit, OIC UN FAO, Jalalabad
14	Allen GayMission	Security Officer, UNDSS
15	Shoeb	Head of Unit, Extension Officer, Surkhrod, Jalalabad
15	Fazal Rahman	Extension Officer Surkhrod, Jalalabad
15	Azizudeen	Extension Officer Surkhrod, Jalalabad
15	Ebadullah	Extension Officer Surkhrod, Jalalabad
15	M. Jamil Haqmal	Extension Officer Surkhrod (MRRD), Jalalabad
15	Noor Agha	Assistant Chief CIG, Jalalabad
15	Shah Afghan	Treasurer CIG, Jalalabad
15	Moqamudeen	Clerk CIG, Jalalabad
15	.. and 8 other members of the CIG	CIG Jalalabad
17	Zabihulla	Head of Extension Unit, Behsood District Jalalabad
17	Ahmad Wali	Head of Extension Unit, Kama District, Jalalabad
17	Hamagoon	Deputy Head of Extension Unit, Khewa District, Jalalabad
21	Francesco Del Re	FAO R a.i.
21	Mohammad Akbar Shahrستاني	National Food Security Coordinator, MDG Project

## Annex 5. List of activities/outputs

The two tables below give -the training activities for and the establishment of FFS, and -the summary for trainings to CIGs and Extension Officers. There are many more activities, training events, meetings, progress reports, etc. This is an exhaustive list and is available upon request from the Project Management Team.

Farmer Field Schools (FFS) established in 2012

No.	Farmer (TOT)	Village	District	Cultivation	Livelihood	Area (M2)	Relevant Extension Officer	Training Conducted	FFS established	Conducted By
1	Sultan Jan	Ghawchak	Surkhrod	Pepper	Vegetables	4000	Fazal Rahman	10-21 November 2012	1-Dec-12	Support to household food security project
2	Noor Agha	Ghawchak	Surkhrod	Tomato		1000	Fazal Rahman			
3	Adel Shah	Ghawchak	Surkhrod	Squash		2000	Fazal Rahman			
4	Bariali	Ghawchak	Surkhrod	Okra		2000	Fazal Rahman			
5	M.Shafee	Ghawchak	Surkhrod	Karela		2000	Fazal Rahman			
6	Gul Mohammad	Zerani	Surkhrod	Tomato		2000	Fazal Rahman			
7	Raiiaz	Chacknawri	Surkhrod	Tomato		2000	Fazal Rahman			
8	M.Haroon	Shaikhani	Surkhrod	Tomato		2000	Ebadullah			

9	Rahmatullah	Said Toba	Surkhrod	Tomato		4000	Ebadullah				
10	Ghor Zang	Fathah Abad	Surkhrod	Karela		1000	Ebadullah				
11	Gul Wali	Faiz Abad	Surkhrod	Rice	Cereals	2000	Fazal Rahman	17-Jun-12	1-Jul-12	IPM project	
12	Gula Jan	Nazar Abad	Surkhrod	Rice		2000	Shoeb				
13	Gul Wali	Faiz Abad	Surkhrod	Wheat		2000	Fazal Rahman	24-Aug-12	1-Dec-12		
14	Gula Jan	Nazar Abad	Surkhrod	Wheat		2000	Shoeb				
15	Noor Agha	Ghawchak	Surkhrod	Wheat		2000	Ebadullah	10-21 Nov-2012	12-Dec-12		Support to household food security project
16	Habib Rahman	Fathah Abad	Surkhrod	Wheat		2000	Ebadullah				
17	Abdul Razaq	Karez	Qarabagh	Grape	Grape	1000	M.Hassan	17-Jun-12	1-Jul-12	IPM project	
18	Said Agha	Qarabagh yousifi	Qarabagh	Grape		1000	Maroup				

FFS training in Qarabagh will be conducted on 27 Feb-2013

TOT = Training of Trainers

Farmer (TOT): Farmer trained through FFS

IPM = Promoting Integrated Pest Management in Afghanistan; GCP/AFG/058/NOR

Summary of Trainings for CIG members and Extension Officers

Date	Training Topic	No. of Training Days	No. of Trainees in Districts			
			<b>Surkhrod</b>		<b>Qarabagh</b>	
			Member of CIG	Extension Officers	Member of CIG	Extension Officers
10-29 Dec-2011	Management /Finance	3			220	9
7-20 Feb-2012	Management /Finance	3	248	12		
29 Sep-4 Oct-2012	Food Security and Livelihood	6				34
10-21 Nov-2012	Farmer Field School (FFS) training	11	24	7		
8-13 Dec-2012	Food Security and Livelihood	6		48		
23-26 Dec-2012	Farmers to farmer visit	4			46	10



## Annex 6. List of Consultant and FAO backstopping missions

No	Date	Name	Title	Purpose of Mission
1	17-30 March 2010	Mr. Jaap Van de Pol	Back Stopping supporting Consultant	Project Inception workshop
2	24 Nov - 19 Dec 2010	Dr. Ayodeji Alexander. A. Coker	M&E Consultants	Base line survey and M&E advice
3	05-18 Dec 2010	Mr. Jaap Van de Pol	Back Stopping supporting Consultant	Update project document
4	16-23 June 2011	Mr. Abdul. Q. Kobakiwal	Chief TCSF-FAO-HQ	Aide memoir
5	18-22 June 2011	Dr. Kevin Gallagher	FAOR-Pakistan	Aide memoir
6	20 Sep-12 Oct 2011	Aziz Aria	Food Security Officer FAO-HQ	follow up of Aide memoir
7	17-23 June 2011	Wilfried O. BAUDOIN	Horticulture Specialist	Development of Urban and peri-urban horticulture concept <sup>11</sup>
8	5-25 Nov 2011	Aziz Aria	Food Security Officer FAO-HQ	Food for life
9	23 Nov - 15 Dec 2011	Nugroho WIENARTO	Consultant	Extension model development <sup>12</sup>
10	10- 14 Dec 2011	Dr. Kevin Gallagher	FAOR-Pakistan	Extension model development
11	06 - 27 Nov 2012	Mr Wahyu Sutisna	International Master Trainer	Farmer Field School Training
12	30 Jan – 23 Feb 2013	Mr Harry W. Denecke	International Consultant-Evaluation Mission	Final Evaluation of Project
13	18 Feb - 11 March 2013	Mr Wahyu Sutisna	International Master Trainer	Farmer Field School Training (Grape)

<sup>11</sup> Not paid by 061/LUX

<sup>12</sup> Not paid by 061/LUX

## Annex 7. Project Logical Framework matrix

In the Prodoc the Logical Framework is given and on the basis of this log-frame the project operated for about one year.

The Log-frame as per the Prodoc was changed as a result of a consultancy mission (December 2010) that was to prepare a. o. the TOR for the Baseline Study. The changed log-frame was called “Improved Results Framework” and is given below. From the beginning of 2011 the project operated on the basis of this log-frame. The “Improved Result Framework” moves some activities as mentioned under the various outputs to another column as compared to the original log-frame. One outcome (4) was added to the original log-frame concerning the performance of the “Project Team”.

### Improved Result Framework

Improved Result Framework			
Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators/Targets	Means of Verification/Data Sources	Important Assumptions
Sector Goal (ARD): To promote growth-oriented and revenue generating investment and equitable distribution of benefits for growth and poverty reduction.	Percentage of people living under poverty line. Percentage self-sufficiency in staple foods Percentage of population above standard weight Percentage increase in agriculture's contribution to GDP between 2010 and 2013.	National Risk & Vulnerability Assessment Report (NRVA) Central Statistics Office reports Impact Survey report FAAHM/SAEMISS reports MDG Progress report	Government remains committed to pursuing the MDGs. Macro-economic and political situation in the country are conducive.
Project Level			
Development Objective: Decentralized government institutions successfully facilitating and coordinating the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure households, resulting in the adoption of improved livelihood strategies and household food security, contributing to the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger	10% reduction in number of households in project districts having very poor diet diversity and food consumption.	NRVA Baseline Study Central Statistics Office records and reports Impact Survey Report	Political stability ensured. Government commitment to decentralization and food security.
Logical Framework			
Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators/Targets	Means of Verification/Data Sources	Important Assumptions
Outcome 1: Project Stakeholders/ beneficiaries sensitized and supported	100% (7,000) targeted vulnerable and food insecure farming families	NRVA report Survey reports	Commitment of provincial and district officials in

with needed services and inputs (farming technologies) to improve livelihood enterprise implementation.	are supported by 2012		MAIL to project is maintained throughout the project duration Security
Output 1.1: Awareness created at national, provincial and district levels to obtain needed support from different government institutions to implement project in the two selected districts	1 inception workshop conducted by 2010; 1 meeting held annually at provincial level till 2012. Quarterly meeting held at district level Establish relationship with 3 projects and initiatives annually from 2010-2012	Project reports	Commitment of provincial and district officials involved in project implementation.
Output 1.2: In each site, staff members of MAIL, MRRD and other relevant government decentralized institutions selected and trained as District Project Officers.	5 Project officers selected and trained per district by first quarter of 2010 1 on the job training conducted in PY 2 and 1 PY 3.	Project Reports MAIL Reports	Political and security situation in the two project districts stable enough to implement the project. Commitment of relevant government staff involved in implementation.
Output 1.3: District Project Officers able to facilitate the needed support to vulnerable and food insecure farming families.	10 each of motor-cycles, mobile phones computers and printers provided for Project District Officers by first quarter of 2010. Overtime payment and re-imbursement of costs from PY1 to PY3.	Project Reports	
Outcome 2: Improved livelihood strategies successfully adopted by vulnerable and food insecure farming households resulting in increased household food security.	40% of target group successfully implementing improved livelihood strategies by PY2 and 100% (7000 vulnerable and food insecure households) by PY3.	Project Reports from the Districts	Political and security situation in the two project districts stable enough to implement the project activities in the two districts.
Output 2.1: Participatory assessment of the relevant livelihood strategies conducted in each project district	2 inventories of potential livelihood strategies (for male and female) prepared in the two districts PY1. 1 Community meeting organized per community per year introducing the project and identifying the potential livelihood strategies. 1 FGD organized per common interest group per year (male/female).	Project reports	Willingness of the targeted beneficiaries to participate in the participatory assessment.
Output 2.2: Strong farmer producer and common	No. of new/existing farmer groups	Project reports	Relevant staff are available for

<p>interest groups formed to facilitate the introduction and sustainability of improved livelihood strategies.</p>	<p>formed/identified with a total membership of 3000 farming households by the end of 2011 and with a total number of 7000 farming households by the end of 2012.  40 % new/existing farmer groups registered by 2011 and 80% by the end of July 2012.  All new/existing farmer groups formed/identified received annual training on group strengthening and dynamics  20% of the groups linked to other projects/initiatives by 2011 and 50% by third quarter of 2012.</p>		<p>training the groups  Willingness of other projects/initiative to establish linkages with groups in the project district.</p>
<p>Output 2.3: Improved Livelihood Strategies successfully implemented by vulnerable and food insecure households.</p>	<p>200 livelihood strategies/micro support project implemented by 2011 and 300 by 2012.  Amount of input support agreed upon with the different targeted common interest groups made available on time.  80 % new/existing farmer groups received technical training by 2011 and 100% by the end of July 2012.  80% of the new/existing farmer groups formed/identified backstopped by PY2 and 100% by PY3.  40% groups linked to market in PY2 and 80% by PY3</p>	<p>Progress reports from project districts.</p>	<p>Availability of needed inputs  Availability of established institutions and qualified personnel for training</p>
<p>Output 2.4: Expanded implementation of successfully implemented livelihood strategies in neighbouring villages through a Farmer Field School Programme</p>	<p>4 successful livelihood strategies implemented/ identified by 2011 and 6 number by 2012  4 FFS Curricula developed by the end of 2011 and 6 by the end of 2012.  1 Training of FFS (farmer) facilitators held in 2011 and one held in 2012  20 FFS (farmer) facilitators trained in 2011 and another 20 in 2012.  20 FFS established by</p>	<p>Progress reports from districts</p>	<p>Availability of capable FFS facilitators</p>

	2012 and 40 initiated for 2013		
Outcome 3: Model Extension Approach implemented to enhance National Service and Input Provision framework	Elements of the demonstrated approach adopted by MAIL.	National Service and input Provision framework development reports of MAIL	
Output 3.1: Experiences obtained and lessons learnt through implementing a model extension system.	Number of documents/studies prepared on elements of the approach implemented by the project (livelihood survey, group formation, cost recovery strategies, etc.) including lessons learnt	Project document/studies prepared	Support of the different relevant ministries in the two project districts
Output 3.2: Advices/Recommendations formulated for further development and fine tuning of the model extension approach.	2 Advices formulated by PY1; 4 by PY2 and 6 by PY3. 1 national workshop on experiences obtained, lessons learnt and advices/recommendations organized by 2011 and 1 by 2012	Progress reports  Workshop reports	Willingness to adopt more participatory extension approaches
Outcome 4: Project team established facilitating successful implementation of project at national, province and district/community level.	50% completion of project activities by 2011 and 100% completion by the end of 2012..	Project progress reports; MTR and ICR reports.	All arms of implementation committed to project activities.
Output 4.1: Project management team established and operational	National project coordination team established (3 Project management staff (at least 1 woman) by 2010 National Project Director appointed by MAIL by 2010. Relevant counterparts from different departments and respective provinces appointed by MAIL by 2010 Members from the District MAIL offices of the two project districts appointed as District project team members by 2010	Periodic reports	Willingness of MAIL to release required personnel. Possibility of securing highly qualified and experienced staff.
Output 4.2: Technical Assistance/Back-stopping missions by FAO	2 FAO TA/Backstopping mission by 2010; 4 by 2011 and 6 numbers by 2012	Periodic reports FAO consultancy and technical assistance reports.	Political stability to allow for visits of technical experts.
Output 4.3: Capacity strengthened all levels of implementation	No of equipment and vehicles provided and meetings conducted. Training of MAIL staff	Project reports	Continued budgetary support.

	on need basis		
Output 4.4: Effective M&E system established	1 baseline survey conducted by PY1 3 quarterly monitoring visits to project districts/communities by 2010; 4 numbers by 2011 and 4 numbers by 2012 1 MTR conducted by 2011 and 1 ICR by 2012 3 each of six monthly and annual reports produced.	Baseline survey report Project reports Evaluation reports	

## Annex 8. Baseline Survey of Livelihoods in Qarabagh and Surkhrod District

Baseline Survey

Qarabagh District

### Summary of Livelihoods Groups

#### A. Grape Production Group

No.	Main Cultivation	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Grape	none	5562
2	Grape	Flowers	15
3	Grape	Maize	11
4	Grape	Vegetables	7
5	Grape	Wheat	1263
6	Grape	Wheat/Vegetables	28
7	Grape	Wheat/Vegetables/Maize	4
Total no Families			6890

#### B. Wheat Production Group

No.	Main Cultivation	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Wheat	none	594
2	Wheat	Grape	973
3	Wheat	Grape/Vegetables	57
4	Wheat	Maize	5
5	Wheat	Vegetables	8
Total no Families			1637

#### C. Livestock Production Group

No.	Main Cultivation	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Livestock	none	31
2	Livestock	Grape	89
3	Livestock	Grape/Wheat	57
4	Livestock	Wheat	8
Total no Families			185

#### D. Official Job Group

No.	Official Job	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Official Job	none	123
2	Official Job	Fruit	3
3	Official Job	Grape	133
4	Official Job	Grape/Wheat	22
5	Official Job	Wheat	9
Total no Families			290

#### E. Shopkeepers Group

No.	Shopkeeper	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Shopkeeper	none	289
2	Shopkeeper	Grape	431
3	Shopkeeper	Grape/Wheat	87
4	Shopkeeper	Wheat	23
Total no Families			830

#### F. Skilled Labourers Group

No.	Skilled Labour	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Skilled Labour	none	355
2	Skilled Labour	Grape	323
3	Skilled Labour	Grape/Wheat	56
4	Skilled Labour	Wheat	35

Total no Families	769
-------------------	-----

G. Other Groups

No.	Main activity	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Flowers		2
2	Maize		2
3	Vegetables		6
4	Daily workers without land		1320
5	Animal sellers		9
6	Other livelihood		37
Total no Families			1376

H. Female headed households

Total no Families	163
-------------------	-----

Grand Total no of Families of all Groups in Qarabagh	12140
--	-------

Baseline Survey

Surkhrod District

Summary of Livelihoods Groups

A. Cereals Production Group

No.	Main Cultivation	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Cereals	none	291
2	Cereals	Fruit/Flowers/Legume/Vegetables	12
3	Cereals	Legume/Vegetables	37
4	Cereals	Livestock	307
5	Cereals	Vegetables/Legume	607
Total no Families			1254

Horticulture Production

B. Group

No.	Main Cultivation	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Vegetables	none	54
2	Vegetables	Cereals	159
3	Vegetables	Flowers/Cereals/Fruit	28
4	Fruits	Cereals/Vegetables/Legume	98
5	Flowers	Cereals/Vegetables	15
Total no Families			354

Livestock Production

C. Group

No.	Main Cultivation	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Livestock	none	85
Total no Families			85

D. Official Job Group

No.	Official Job	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Official Job	none	1125
2	Official Job	Cereals/Vegetables/Legume/Fruit	184
3	Official Job	Legume/Vegetables	654
4	Official Job	Vegetables/Cereals/Legume	174



Total no Families	2137
-------------------	------

E. Shopkeepers Group

No.	Shopkeeper	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Shopkeeper	none	977
2	Shopkeeper	Cereals/Legume/Vegetables	471
3	Shopkeeper	Fruits/Cereals/Vegetables	42
4	Shopkeeper	Vegetables/Legume/Cereals	134
Total no Families			1624

F. Skilled Labourers Group

No.	Skilled Labour	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Skilled Labour	none	1505
2	Skilled Labour	Cereals/Vegetables/Legume	888
3	Skilled Labour	Fruit/Vegetables/Legume/Flowers	57
4	Skilled Labour	Vegetables/Legume/Cereals	330
Total no Families			2780

G. Daily Workers Group

No.	Daily Workers	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Daily Workers	none	5707
2	Daily Workers	Cereals	1168
3	Daily Workers	Cereals/Vegetables/Legume	719
4	Daily Workers	Fruit/Cereals/Vegetables/Legume	233
5	Daily Workers	Livestock	164
6	Daily Workers	Vegetables	276
7	Daily Workers	Vegetables/Cereals/Legume	419
Total no Families			8686

H. Handicraft Group

No.	Handicraft	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Handicraft	none	183
2	Handicraft	Cereals/Vegetables	45
Total no Families			228

I. Others Group

No.	Others	Minor Cultivations	No of Families
1	Income from abroad	none	52
2	Others not included in above groups	Cereals/Vegetables	310
Total no Families			362

J.	Female headed households	157
	Total no Families	157
Grand Total no of Families of all Groups in Surkhrod		17667

**Annex 9. CIGs of Qarabagh and Surkhrod District (status September 2012)**

**Qarabagh District**

Name of Extension Officer	Village Name	Serial No.	Name of Group (Chief)	Main Livelihood	Active Members	Passive-absent, need more efforts	CIGs	Remaining Members	Officer at project initial stage
Abdul Maruf ( 22 Groups )	Qarabagh Yusifi	1	Said Agha	Grape	33			33	Abdul Maruf
	Karez	2	Abdul Razaq	Grape	23			23	
		3	M.Zahir	Grape	26			26	
		4	Shah Agha	Grape	25			25	
		5	Sofi Abdul	Grape	25			25	
		6	M.Wassim	Grape	25			25	
		7	H.Safiullah	Grape	30			30	
		8	Gul Alam	Grape	25			25	
		Qala BeBe	9	Abdul Wahid	Grape	21			
	10		Saber	Grape		24		24	
	Qala Dewana	11	M.Azim	Grape		21		21	
		12	Ghulam Hassan	Grape		31		31	
		13	Payanda Gul	Grape		28		28	
	Qala Dana	14	Hazar Gul	Grape		13		13	
	Nahri Kalan	15	Abdul Ghaiass	Grape		35		35	
	Bagh Areeq Ulia	16	Hanif	Grape		31		31	Abdul Qahar
		17	Rahmatullah	Grape		30		30	
		18	Shafee	Grape		30		30	
		19	Anger	Grape		30		30	

		20	Basmillah	Grape		31	31	
	Shaor Khil	21	M.Mir	Grape		27	27	
	Qala Haji	22	Abdul Wakil	Grape		19	19	
Mohammad Hassan (22 Groups)	Kakerha	23	Khalilullah	Grape	20		20	Mohammad Hassan
	Sardar Beg	24	Fazluminullah	Grape	27		27	
	Mian Joe	25	M.Karim	Grape	38		38	
	Faqir Abad	26	M.Zaman	Grape	22		22	
		27	Abdul Hai	Grape	17		17	
	Bagh Zaghan	28	Ghulan Haider	Grape	15		15	
		29	Shah Mohammad	Grape	9		9	
		30	Nazar Mohammad	Grape	29		29	
		31	Ghulam Jailani	Grape	23		23	
		32	Mullah Jabar	Grape	32		32	
	Chawni Qala Lal	33	Nezamaldeen	Grape		23	23	Gulbudeen
		34	Welayat Khan	Grape		23	23	
	Qala Faiz	35	Hakim Khan	Grape		30	30	
		36	Gul Wali	Grape		26	26	
		37	Zekrullah	Grape		20	20	
		38	M.Sadeeq	Grape		29	29	
	Khan Khil Langar	39	Aminullah	Grape		10	10	
	Qala Baran	40	M.Nasir	Grape		27	27	
	Nasim Khil	41	Shah Ghassi	Grape		21	21	
	Qala Shahi	42	Ali Khan	Grape		20	20	
	Qala Saman	43	M.Rahim	Grape		30	30	
	Tor Khil	44	Aminullah	Grape		25	25	

Samullah Groups)	(21	Qala Qazi Payan	45	Mohammad Fazil	Grape	28		28	Ubaidullah
			46	Rahmatullah	Grape	26		26	
			47	Aminudeen	Grape	20		20	
		Sabz Sang	48	Khan Agha	Grape	21		21	
			49	Shir Mohammad	Grape	25		25	
		Taraki Qala Faiz	50	Abdul Wakil	Grape	12		12	
		Logari Bala & payan	51	Sultan Mohammad	Grape	20		20	
		Qala Qazi Ulia	52	Mohammad Yaqub	Grape	24		24	
		Qala Jafar	53	Gulbudeen	Grape	21		21	Gulbudeen
		Sofyan Dawadzai	54	M.Jan	Grape	23		23	
			55	Ali Shah Khan	Grape	14		14	
		Qala Pahlawan	56	Abdul Salam	Grape		35	35	
			57	Safaudeen	Grape		33	33	
		Qala Kuhna	58	Khoshal	Grape		30	30	
			59	Samangul	Grape		30	30	
		No pala Payan	60	Gul Zaman	Grape		28	28	Ubaidullah
		Tamerat	61	Mohammada Jan	Grape		32	32	
		Qala Qazi Qala Now	62	Sharif	Grape		25	25	
		Bagh Areeq Payan	63	said Yahya	Grape		30	30	
			64	Zelmai	Grape		31	31	
			65	Zafar Khan	Grape		30	30	
Naqibullah Groups)	(25	Garchi	66	Toryali	Grape	23		23	Naqibullah
			67	Abdul Salam	Grape	23		23	
			68	Said Rahim	Grape	30		30	
			69	Said Agha	Grape	30		30	

		70	Samaullah	Grape	18		18	
		71	Usool Mohammad	Grape	20		20	
		72	Khoja Nimatullah	Grape	34		34	
		73	Sadat Khan	Grape	28		28	
	Bagh Alam	74	Raqib	Grape	26		26	
	Dergi Mir Kalan	75	Moula Gul	Grape	15		15	Dr.Yaqoob
		76	M.Hasheem	Grape	28		28	
	Mardi Khil	77	Safiullah	Grape	8		8	
	Alar	78	Mir Agha	Grape	24		24	
		79	Abdul Aziz	Grape	25		25	
		80	Shamsudeen	Grape	27		27	
	Bagh Alam	81	Najibullah	Grape		24	24	Naqibullah
		82	Qadeem	Grape		25	25	
		83	Sardar Gul	Grape		29	29	
	Garchi	84	Hafizaullah	Grape		32	32	
	Payanda Khil	85	Said Alem	Grape		22	22	
		86	H.Mir Ahmad	Grape		22	22	
	Ashraf Gul	87	Ashuqullah	Grape		23	23	
	Mardi Khil	88	Mehrab	Grape		23	23	Dr.Yaqoob
	Alar	89	Mir Shamsudeen	Grape		16	16	
		90	Nazir	Grape		19	19	
Rafullah Group)	(24 Bagh Alam	91	Qamardeen	Grape	30		30	Rafiullah
		92	Said Hakim	Grape	33		33	
		93	Jan Mohammad	Grape	24		24	
	Qala Dasht Aka Khil	94	H.Gul Hatam	Grape	20		20	

		95	M.Daud	Grape	25		25	
		96	Mousa Khan	Grape	16		16	
	Qala Najara	97	Noorulzaman	Grape	22		22	
	Jarchi	98	Atullah	Grape	30		30	
	Petawa	99	Moulla Gul	Grape	26		26	
	Sabz Sang	100	Said Alam	Grape	30		30	Abdul Qahar
		101	Allah Mohammad	Grape	30		30	
		102	Ferdawas	Grape	29		29	
		103	Wahab	Grape	31		31	
		104	Gul Hassan	Grape	29		29	
		105	Gul Rahman	Grape		30	30	
		106	Shamsulhaq	Grape		30	30	
		107	Sawab	Grape		30	30	
	Petawa	108	Aslam	Grape		36	36	Rafiullah
		109	Naiz Mohammad	Grape		26	26	
	Sar Pul Ouria Khil	110	Lal Gul	Grape		36	36	
		111	Mira Jan	Grape		30	30	
		112	Abdul Wahid	Grape		30	30	
	Jarchi	113	Abdul Khaliq	Grape		31	31	
		114	Mahboob	Grape		31	31	
Saifurahman (20 Groups)	Kakasi Aka Khil	115	Aminullah	Grape	14		14	Saifurahman
	Longi Khil	116	Mohammad Zahir	Grape	29		29	
		117	Anwar Khan	Grape	22		22	
	Kohistani Aka Khil	118	Attah Mohammad	Grape	27		27	
	Awrang Khil	119	Khoshal	Grape	18		18	
	Anderha	120	Mohammad Alim	Grape	15		15	

	Qala Regi Akakhil	121	Shir Mohammad	Grape	20		20	Dr.Yaqoob
	Betani Qala Adalat	122	Naqibullah	Grape	20		20	
		123	Abdul Ghafoor	Grape	25		25	
	Denar Khil Ulya	124	M.Saber	Grape	29		29	
		125	Mohammad Aqul	Grape	30		30	
	Betani Ulia	126	Said Amir	Grape	18		18	
		127	Said Hamid	Grape		22	22	
	Longi Khil	128	Zary	Grape		21	21	Saifurahman
	Gia Khil Akakhil	129	Basmillah	Grape		15	15	
	Qala Regi Akakhil	130	Naqibullah	Grape		28	28	
	Qala Mahmoodi	131	Nasir Ahmad	Grape		31	31	
	Qala Mossa Payan	132	Mulla Jan	Grape		24	24	
		133	Abdul Hadi	Grape		29	29	
	Nahri Bala	134	Mir Ahmad	Grape		12	12	
Total		134			1700	1665	3365	

### Surkhrod District

Name of Extension Officer	Village Name	Serial No.	Name of Group (Chief)	Initial Number of Group members	Main Livelihood	Active Members	Passive-absent, CIGs need more efforts	Remaining Members	Members of Cooperative		Officer at project initial stage
									Initially	Present	
Fazal Rahman Shazada (30 Groups)	Tatang Nawab Jabar Khan	1	Muslam/Akram	22	Cereal	14		14		4	Fazal Rahman Shazada
		2	Gharib Jan /Nader	26	Cereal	19		19		4	
		3	H.Nawroz	20	Cereal	14		14	1	4	
		4	Ab.Latif	15	Cereal	15		15	1	4	



Bemaran Abdullah	Qala	5	M.Zaher	30	Cereal	25		25		
		6	Nangiali	31	Cereal	26		26		
		7	Maruf	42	Cereal	37		37		
		8	Kuchi	30	Cereal	23		23		
Naghrak		9	Farooq	21	Cereal	14		14		2
Faiz Abad		10	Mussam	19	Cereal	15		15	3	1
		11	Gul Wali	30	Cereal	19		19	3	3
		12	Mira Jan	24	Cereal	12		12	2	2
		13	Shah Nawaz	16	Cereal	14		14		2
		14	Ab.Khaliq	25	Cereal	16		16		3
Tatang N.J.Khan		15	Sultan .M	25	Cereal	16		16		4
Naghrak		16	M.Yousif	19	Cereal		19	19		
Banda BB.Said		17	Ab.Rashid	31	Legume		31	31		
Ghawchak		18	Noor Agha	24	Vegetable	23		23	16	10
		19	H.Barat/Alla Nazar	25	Vegetable	18		18	6	4
		20	Del Agh	28	Vegetable	17		17	7	3
		21	M.Zaher	19	Vegetable	17		17	1	2
		22	Ab.Satar	29	Vegetable	15		15	8	5
		23	Ghofran	24	Vegetable	17		17	10	6
		24	Sultan Jan	28	Vegetable	17		17	11	6
Zerani		25	H.Gul.M	24	Vegetable	18		18		
Chaknori		26	M.Azim	24	Vegetable	22		22		
Ghawchak		27	Washeem Gul	18	Vegetable		18	18	8	5
		28	Ubaidullah	19	Vegetable		19	19	6	5
		29	Ramazan	36	Vegetable		36	36	2	3
		30	Zafar	26	Vegetable		26	26	9	1

Ebadullah (30Groups)	Bar Kakrak	31	Malal	20	Cereal	17		17		
		32	Hashim	30	Cereal	25		25		1
		33	Shah Mahmood	30	Cereal	21		21		
		34	Sultan	23	Cereal	23		23		5
		35	Basir	23	Cereal	22		22		1
		36	Shinkai	22	Cereal	20		20		2
	Shikhani	37	Shah Zaman	24	Cereal	16		16		5
		38	Ab.Wahid	24	Cereal	17		17	4	2
	Qurotak	39	Falak Naz	30	Cereal	27		27		13
		40	Saifudeen	27	Cereal	24		24		15
	Qazi Khil	41	Nasimullah	20	Cereal	14		14		3
		42	H.M.Rasool	25	Cereal	17		17		8
		43	Delawar	20	Cereal	15		15		15
	Treenan	44	Safullah	26	Cereal	21		21		16
		45	Noor Rahman	20	Cereal	20		20		17
		46	Aslam Khan	20	Cereal	20		20		20
		47	Noor .M	20	Cereal	20		20		14
	Dow Aba	48	Hashim	25	Cereal	25		25		15
		49	Azimullah	23	Cereal	15		15		6
	Bagh Attak	50	Gul Wazeer	26	Cereal	21		21	3	1
	Shikhani	51	Noorudeen	17	Legume	12		12		8
		52	Hafizullah	19	Legume	11		11	5	6
		53	Nasim Khan	19	Legume	14		14		1
		54	Wali .M	13	Legume	10		10		3
		55	Rahmatullah	24	Vegetable	12		12	9	7
		56	M.Haroon	24	Vegetable	18		18	16	14

Ebadullah

		57	Maheer	22	Vegetable	21		21	19	16
	Bar Kakrak	58	Akbar Khan	30	Cereal		30	30		
	Koz Kakrak	59	M.Yunus	31	Cereal		31	31		20
	Qazi Khil	60	Zabihullah	20	Cereal		20	20		7
Mohammad Jamil (31 Groups)	Shamshapoor Mrarkazi	61	Tariq	23	Cereal	17		17		3
		62	Ab.Jamil	19	Cereal	15		15		3
		63	Zainulabudeen	17	Cereal	14		14		6
	Qala Dost	64	Mira Jan	34	Cereal	21		21		1
	Sultan Poor Ulia	65	Nazeer	14	Cereal	11		11		1
		66	M.Asif	21	Cereal	14		14		2
		67	Abdullah Jan	19	Cereal	13		13		2
	Bazeed Khil	68	Jafer Khan	27	Cereal	18		18		
	Narang Bagh	69	Khoja Raza	23	Cereal	13		13	5	3
		70	Noor Agha	26	Cereal	11		11	5	
	Adam Khil	71	Noorullah	28	Cereal	17		17		2
		72	Gharibullah	36	Cereal	24		24		1
		73	M.Hussain	24	Cereal	19		19		
	Saidan Foladi	74	Said Rasool	25	Cereal	14		14		
	Dand Barakat Khan	75	Nangiali	27	Legume	18		18		2
	Qala Jamal	76	Zelmai	34	Cereal		34	34		
		77	M.Afzal	34	Cereal		34	34		
	Tatang Qala Shahi	78	M.Waris	31	Cereal		31	31		
		79	Kuchi	26	Cereal		26	26		
	Shamshapor Bala	80	Shireen Agha	22	Cereal		22	22		1
81		Noor Agha	20	Cereal		20	20		2	
Saidan Foladi	82	Ab.Aziz	25	Cereal		25	25			

M.Jamil

		83	Pacha	26	Cereal		26	26			
	Banda Mir Alamgee	84	Usman	9	Cereal		9	9			
	Sultan Poor Ulia	85	Mirza Jan	15	Cereal		15	15			
	Narang Bagh	86	M.Rahim	27	Cereal		27	27	7		
	Dand Barakat Khan	87	Shah Swar	27	Legum		27	27			
		88	M.Zaher	27	Legum		27	27			
		89	Delawar	25	Legum		25	25			
	Shamshapor Deh Bala	90	M.Haider	24	Legum		24	24			
		91	M.Yunus	13	Vegetable		13	13			
Azizudeen (33 Groups)	Bagh Bani	92	H.Shamsul Rahman	30	Cereal	8		8			
	Kar Swar	93	Azizullah	33	Cereal	25		25		2	Aziz
	Char Bagh	94	Ab.Basir	31	Cereal	17		17			Yadgaree
	Ganda cheshma	95	Khan Zaman	22	Cereal	20		20			
	Char Bagh Safa	96	Abdul Razaq	18	Cereal	13		13			
	Charbagh	97	M.Hanif	18	Legume	15		15			
	Ganda cheshma	98	Sefat Khan	22	Legume	18		18			
	Amarkhil	99	Assadullah	27	Legume	16		16			
	Khair Abad	100	Abdul Zahoor	23	Cereal		23	23	3	5	Azizudeen
		101	Habib Rahman	20	Cereal		20	20			
	Daryab	102	H.Babarak	30	Cereal		30	30	4	4	
		103	Azizullah	30	Cereal		30	30	4	4	
	Koz Kakokhil	104	Abdull Qudus	28	Cereal		28	28		2	
Bala Kakokhil	105	Sardar	30	Cereal		30	30				
Markazi Balabagh	106	Nabi	27	Cereal		27	27		3		
Maiwand Balabagh	107	Saidullah	27	Cereal		27	27		3		

Baghbani	108	Gul Zaman	38	Cereal	38	38			
Daryab	109	Ghulam Nabi	36	Cereal	36	36		2	
Miran	110	Said Asif	18	Cereal	18	18			
	111	H.Khan .M	16	Cereal	16	16			
Daronta	112	Bashir Ahmad	21	Cereal	21	21			
	113	Abdul Rauf	25	Cereal	25	25			
Charbagh	114	Abdul Wakil	20	Legume	20	20			
Daronta	115	H.Khorshid	25	Legume	25	25			
	116	Wahidullah	23	Legume	23	23			
	117	Ab.Wahab	11	Legume	11	11			
	118	Shah Mahmood	23	Legume	23	23			
	119	Aminullah	23	Legume	23	23			
	120	Abdul Raqib	17	Legume	17	17			
	121	Jalat Khan	20	Legume	20	20			
	122	Ehsanullah	25	Legume	25	25			
	123	Najibullah	20	Legume	20	20			
	124	Saidullah	18	Legume	18	18			
Total	124		2990		1312	1209	2521	178	378
							469	Left the group	

Yadgaree

## Annex 10. Project's Deliveries (Agricultural Inputs) to CIGs

Agricultural inputs, package cost (project financed), selling price to CIGs, % discount

District	Date	Items	Unit	QTY	Price/ Unit (USD)	Total Price (USD)	Package Price (USD)	Selling Price (USD) to CIGs	% Discount
Surkhrod (124 CIGs)	1-July-2011	Cauliflower	Kg	12,2	290	3538	16040	15233	5%
		Radish	Kg	87,5	16	1400			
		Spinach	Kg	262,5	3,8	998			
		Coriander	Kg	350	2,9	1015			
		Urea	Mt	8,108	510	4135			
		DAP	Mt	4,3	1152	4954			
	1-Sep-11	Wheat (PBW-154)	Mt	30	710	21300	152800	129880	15%
		Wheat (Ghori-96)	Mt	20	710	14200			
		Urea	Mt	100	573	57300			
		DAP	Mt	50	1220	61000			
	1-March-2012	Karella	Kg	93	115	10695	18243	14595	20%
		Okra	Kg	255	2,1	536			
		Green Bean	Kg	198	7,3	1445			
		Urea	Mt	5,325	529	2817			
		DAP	Mt	2,663	1034	2754			
	1-May-2012	Maize (Sharq-08)	Mt	13	580	7540	64702	51762	20%
		Urea	Mt	46,5	530	24645			
		DAP	Mt	32,55	999	32517			
	1-July-2012	Cauliflower F1	Kg	5,5	950	5225	29487	23589	20%
		Cauliflower	Kg	5,0	307	1535			
		Coriander	Kg	340	5	1700			
		Spinach	Kg	400	4	1600			
		Radish	Kg	198	14	2772			
		Onion	Kg	560	11	6160			
Urea		Mt	10,0	530	5300				
DAP		Mt	5,2	999	5195				
1-Nov-12	Wheat (Ghori-96)	Mt	8,4	650	5460	21756	17405	20%	
	Urea	Mt	16,8	480	8064				
	DAP	Mt	8,4	980	8232				
1-Dec-12	Tomato	Can	339	48	16238	37578	30063	20%	
	Karella	Kg	63	180	11340				
	Pepper	Kg	5	316	1580				
	Squash	Kg	1,6	157	251				
	Green Bean	Kg	81	6	486				

		Urea	Mt	6,75	580	3915			
		DAP	Mt	3,365	1120	3768			
Totals / Average							340607	282527	17%

Qarabagh (134 CIGs)	1-Apr-11	Sulfur Dust	Mt	102,5	399	40898	40898	34354	16%
		Lime	Mt	4	1000	4000	4000	4000	0%
	1-Jul-11	Urea	Mt	55	573	31515	31515	22691	28%
		Lime	Mt	3,5	1000	3500	3500	3500	0%
	1-Jun-12	Sulfur Dust	Mt	12	366	4392	4392	3601	18%
		Urea	Mt	95	468	44460	44460	37791	15%
	Sept 2012 - March 2013	Trellis complete installation (including poles)	No.	5040	17,295	87167	87167	21791,7	75%
	Totals / average							215931	127729