

## **Terms of Reference**

End of Programme Independent Evaluation of DFID GPAF007 Programme:  
**“Mitigating the impact of the economic downturn on vulnerable groups”**

18<sup>th</sup> July 2011

### **1. Background**

The Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD) is the official development and humanitarian relief agency of the Catholic Church in England and Wales. CAFOD's mission is to promote human development and social justice in witness to Christian faith and gospel values by supporting long-term development, advocacy and humanitarian relief.

DFID's Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) was launched on 27 October 2010. It is a demand-led fund supporting projects focused on poverty reduction and pursuit of the MDGs through **tangible changes to poor people's lives including through: service delivery, empowerment and accountability and work on conflict, security and justice**. Projects were selected on the basis of demonstrable impact on poverty, clarity of outputs and outcomes, and value for money.

CAFOD received a grant of £609,719 for a programme running from 01/10/2010 to 30/09/2011. The programme is regional and based in Kenya and Zimbabwe.

### **2. Programme purpose and objectives**

The programme has been designed to protect vulnerable groups affected by the economic downturn through increasing food security and the provision of social based safety nets. The purpose of the programme is increase access to food and agricultural production for approximately 32,000 poor and marginalised people, including children.

#### **Kenya**

In Kenya the funding from DFID-GPAF is supporting ongoing work in the dioceses of Kitui and Isiolo, where it contributes towards wider CAFOD-funded programmes on Food Security, Sustainable Livelihoods and Disaster Risk Reduction. These are 5 year programmes initiated in 2009 to enhance food security, secure basic livelihoods and increase household incomes for target communities. The DFID-GPAF funded activities are targeted at vulnerable rural populations and focused on increasing agricultural yields and improving access to water for agricultural purposes. Important activities include the provision of drought tolerant seed, fertilizers and training for vulnerable farmers, as well as the construction of small scale water infrastructures, including drip irrigation systems and the of training farmers on post harvest food management. CAFOD's implementing partners in Kenya are the Dioceses of Isiolo and Kitui.

#### **Zimbabwe**

In Masvingo and Gweru CAFOD is using DFID-GPAF funding to provide wet feeding for schools, establish school nutrition gardens and support teachers with food supplies. CAFOD and its partners have been implementing a long term livelihoods programme in Zimbabwe since 2005 and have also run school feeding activities as part of a 2009 Emergency Food Security Programme, which took place in 8 dioceses including Masvingo and Gweru. An emergency relief and early recovery programme between July 2010 and April 2011 also contained components of targeted feeding for the vulnerable households in these two dioceses, as did a CAFOD feeding programme supported by the Canadian Food Grains Bank between October 2010 and April 2011.

CAFOD is also contributing to the Protracted Relief Programme (PRPII) supported by DFID and other donors, but the provision of agricultural inputs under the PRP is complementary to, and not duplicated by, CAFOD's DFID-PAF activities. CAFOD's implementing partners in Zimbabwe are the Dioceses of Gweru and Masvingo.

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

The specific purposes of this final evaluation are to:

- a) Identify the effectiveness and impact of the programme and recommend ways that this can be improved and sustained.
- b) Record and share lessons learned.
- c) Account to local stakeholders and funders for the programme's performance.
- d) Verify whether the funds were used effectively and efficiently to deliver results.
- e) Enable DFID to monitor and evaluate the overall performance of the GPAF fund, making sure that it is contributing to the reduction of poverty and demonstrating, for public accountability purposes, that the fund is an effective use of money.
- f) Identify, measure and record any distinctive or value-added contribution of CAFOD to the programme (beyond any CAFOD funding that was used).
- g) Assess the extent to which gender and HIV/AIDS have been considered and addressed by the programme.
- h) Assess the extent to which the programme targeted and met the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable.

## **3. Evaluation questions**

The following evaluation questions represent only an indicative list at this stage:

*3.1 Relevance:* Details of the programme's significance with respect to specific needs and its relevance to country poverty reduction priorities

- To what extent was the programme aligned with the needs and priorities of the target populations?
- How well did the programme relate to the country's poverty reduction plans and DFID's country assistance plan

- To what extent has the programme contributed to rights awareness, whose rights and what impact has there been?

*3.2 Equity:* Discussion of social differentiation (e.g. by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic group, disability, etc) and the extent to which the programme had a positive impact on people within the most disadvantaged or excluded groups.

- How did the programme actively promote gender equality?
- What was the impact of the programme on children, youth and the elderly, including how any protection requirements were met?
- How were the needs of excluded groups, including people with disabilities and people living with HIV/AIDS addressed?
- To what extent did the programme reach and benefit the very poorest and most disadvantaged in society?

*3.3 Participation:* How were the beneficiaries involved in the different stages of the programme, how effective was their participation and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with their involvement?

*3.4 Efficiency:* How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of results.

- How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
- How well did the financial systems work?
- Were the risks properly identified and well managed?

*3.5 Effectiveness:* Assessment of how far the intended outputs and results were achieved in relation to targets set in the original logical framework.

- How effective and appropriate was the programme approach?
- With hindsight, how could the implementers have done things differently?

*3.6 Value for Money:*

- What processes were put in place in order to ensure good value for money
- How could the funds have been used more efficiently?
- Were unit costs appropriate?
- What are the cost – benefit ratios in different country contexts and overall?

*3.7 Impact:* Details of the broader economic, social, and political consequences of the programme.

- What was the programme's overall impact and how did this compare with what was expected?

- Did the programme address the needs of the intended target group and what was the actual coverage?
- Who were the direct and indirect/wider beneficiaries of the programme?
- What difference has been made to the lives of those involved in the programme?
- Which of the Millennium Development Goals did the programme contribute to?
- Which of the GPAF fund's additional support areas did the fund contribute to?

**3.8 Sustainability:** Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved and of the delivery mechanisms, following the withdrawal of external support.

- What are the prospects for the benefits of the programme being sustained after the funding stops? Did this match the intentions?
- How has/could collaboration, networking and influencing of opinion support sustainability?
- How was the exit strategy defined, and how is/was this managed at the end of the funding period?

**3.9 Replicability:** How replicable is the process that introduced the changes/had impact? Refer especially to innovative aspects which are replicable.

- What aspects of the programme are replicable elsewhere?
- Under what circumstances and/or in what contexts would the programme be replicable?

**3.10 Lessons:** Key lessons identified, which can be utilised to guide future strategies, projects or agencies working in development. These should be divided into project, sector and broader developmental lessons.

- Were there any significant changes in the programme design or the programme context? What were the reasons for these and can any useful lessons be learned from this for application elsewhere?
- How did the programme engage with poor and marginalised groups and support their empowerment most effectively?
- For whom could these lessons have relevance?
- How do the lessons relate to any innovative aspects of the programme that were highlighted in the programme proposal?
- How has the design of the programme been amended as a result of lessons learned during implementation?

**3.11 Innovation:** Key aspects of the initiative which appear innovative in the context; why they are seen as innovative. What potential is there for disseminating and /or scaling up the innovative aspects and who the audiences would be?

*3.12 Recommendations:* Recommendations for improvements based on observations during the evaluation process (e.g. for sustainability, future programme design and management).

#### **4. Methodology**

Interested parties will be asked to tender a short outline methodology of how they would tackle this evaluation, both on a theoretical and practical basis. This should include:

- A desk review of programme information including the key documents listed in these terms of reference.
- Interviews with programme managers and partners to collect information on achievements and impact and difficulties faced by the programme including the management aspects of work.
- Interviews with beneficiaries (including those who might normally be excluded), to discover what impact (if any) the programme has had on their lives.
- Interviews with key programme stakeholders to include questions on the degree to which programme has had the intended impact; and what could have been done differently or better, so that the lessons can be learned.
- Presentation of preliminary findings to the CAFOD programme teams in-country; this will allow for the incorporation of their comments and feedback before preparing the draft evaluation report.
- Submission of the draft evaluation report to the CAFOD evaluation coordinator for consultation and written comments before finalising the report.
- The selected consultant(s) will be expected to work collaboratively with CAFOD to refine their methodology and develop a detailed evaluation plan.
- If more than one consultant is selected, one consultant must fulfil the role of evaluation team leader/lead evaluator. The consultant or team leader/lead evaluator will report to Owen Beaton, CAFOD's evaluation coordinator for this programme.

The final evaluation schedule, including site visits, will be organised by CAFOD's evaluation coordinator in consultation with the evaluation consultant(s) and the CAFOD programme staff in Kenya and Zimbabwe. This schedule will include the finalised methodology and agreed timescales.

An indicative evaluation timescale is laid out in section 5.

#### **4. Outputs from the Evaluation**

Required outputs include:

- An evaluation plan
- A presentation detailing initial evaluation findings, for face-to-face discussion with a group of key CAFOD staff
- A first draft report submitted to the CAFOD evaluation coordinator for consultation

- A final evaluation report of publishable quality. The report should be written in Plain English and in such a way that it is accessible to non-specialists, including UK tax-payers and CAFOD supporters.

The final evaluation report should be no more than 30 A4 pages long plus appendices (in Microsoft Word using Arial font, 12 point). The report should include the following sections:

- Title Page
- Contents page
- Abbreviations and acronyms page
- Executive summary (1 A4 page maximum)
- Completed Achievement Rating Scale (5 A4 pages maximum - see template in Annex 3). Please note that the overall achievement rating should have a score and a comment only.
- A short introduction to the programme
- The evaluation methodology
- Full evaluation of programme: Findings from the evaluation in relation to the final agreed evaluation questions.
- A summary of recommendations
- A one page summary of lessons indicating with whom and how lessons should be shared
- The final terms of reference for the evaluation must be included as an annex, as well as names and contact details of the evaluators along with a signed declaration of their independence from CAFOD and its programme partners.
- Other annexes should include the evaluation schedule, people met, documents consulted, and statistical data on baselines and end of programme surveys. Note that the original and final logical framework (if different) must also be included.

While it is anticipated that the evaluation will begin in mid-August 2011, some elements of the indicative timeline below will be refined by CAFOD's evaluation coordinator in collaboration with the selected consultant(s) and CAFOD programme staff in Kenya and Zimbabwe.

## 5. Indicative evaluation timeline

|   |                                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Tender bids received by:                                    | 25 July 2011 (midday)                |
| Consultant Interviews:                                      | Week starting 1 <sup>st</sup> August |
| Refine methodology; finalise planning:                      | By 8th August 2011                   |
| Evaluation visits undertaken:                               | late Aug-early/mid Sep 2011          |
| Presentation of initial findings to CAFOD in-country staff: | Aug and Sep 2011                     |
| Near final draft due:                                       | 18 Sep 2011 (midnight)               |
| CAFOD feedback on nearly final report                       | 20 Sep 2011 (midnight)               |
| <b>Final evaluation report submitted to CAFOD:</b>          | <b>25 Sep 2011 (midnight)</b>        |

*(CAFOD management response completed: 30 Sept 2011)*

*(Evaluation report published online along with any agreed ancillary products: Dec 2011)*

## **6. Skills and competencies of evaluator/s**

CAFOD are looking for a lead evaluator with a strong record in conducting evaluations as well as direct programme interventions. The lead evaluator will need to carry respect and credibility within the development field and have an excellent knowledge of evaluation and monitoring in theory and in practice.

Successful consultants will be able to demonstrate the following skills and experience:

- Demonstrable experience of producing high-quality, credible evaluations (an example will be required with the tender)
- Familiarity with different participative methodologies for evaluation
- Demonstrable experience of working with/evaluating civil society work
- Demonstrable understanding of participatory methodologies
- Familiarity with 2 or more of the following programme areas: a) livelihoods b) school or vulnerable group feeding programmes c) food security interventions d) development agriculture
- Experience of relevant evaluation/development interventions in Kenya and/or Zimbabwe
- Good understanding of NGO finance and audit – particularly of DFID guidelines and requirements (specialist finance qualifications not essential)
- Experience of managing evaluation teams, and the capability to handle necessary logistics and, if required and agreed, sub-contracting.
- Ability to produce concise, readable and analytical reports
- An understanding of public communications
- Excellent English written and verbal communications skills
- Experience and understanding of faith-based organisations (desirable)

## **7. Tender process**

CAFOD invites bids from organisations, individuals or a team of individuals with the experience and skills described above.

By way of indication, initial tenders should include:

1. A cover letter introducing the evaluator/s/organisation and how the skills and competencies described above are met, with concrete examples.
2. A two-page outline of the proposed evaluation process, including
  - proposed outline methodology
  - management arrangements
  - a clear indication of availability / dates
3. A 1 page budget covering all major costs, and clearly identifying daily rates charged on any consultancies.

4. A CV for each member of the evaluation team (if there is more than one consultant in the bid).
5. One example of a relevant previous evaluation (one each in the case of joint bids)

**8. Criteria for selection will be**

- Clear, credible, structured proposed methodology
- Ability to meet the criteria described in 'Skills and Competencies,' section 6 above
- Ability to manage the totality of the evaluation, including logistics, recruitment and management of other team members (where relevant)
- Commitment to availability in the critical periods
- Value for money

**9. Further information**

Owen Beaton, CAFOD's Evaluation Coordinator for this programme, is leading this process for CAFOD. Please submit your initial tender to him by email. ([obeaton@cafod.org.uk](mailto:obeaton@cafod.org.uk)).

**Annex 1: Logical Framework**

|   |  |  |                    |                    |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>PROJECT TITLE</b>  | <b>Mitigating the impact of the economic downturn on vulnerable groups in Kenya and Zimbabwe</b> |  |                    |                    |  |  |  |
| <b>GOAL</b>   | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline + year</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b>   |  |  |
| Protect the poorest in the downturn through improved food security and social based safety nets | <b>Zimbabwe :</b><br>Proportion of rural population who are food insecure                        | Zimbabwe: 18% rural population estimated to be food insecure (2009/10 consumption year)<br><br>Zimbabwe: 8% rural population have food entitlement gap for at least 7 months (2009/10 consumption year)  |                    |                    |  |  |  |
|   |  | <b>Source</b>  |                    |                    |  |  |  |
|   |  | ZimVac Rural Household Livelihoods Survey (October 2009):<br><a href="http://www.sadc.int/fanr/aims/rvaa/Documents/Zimbabwe/ZimVac%20Rural%20Household%20Livelihoods%20Survey%20-%20October%202009%20Report.pdf">http://www.sadc.int/fanr/aims/rvaa/Documents/Zimbabwe/ZimVac%20Rural%20Household%20Livelihoods%20Survey%20-%20October%202009%20Report.pdf</a> |                    |                    |  |  |  |
|   | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline + year</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b>   |  |  |
|   | <b>Kenya :</b><br>proportion of rural population who are food insecure                           | Kenya: Food production in cereal yields at 1322kg / ha (2009/10)<br><br>Kenya: Access to water for agriculture at  |                    |                    | Kenya: food production at household level allows for cereal yields at 5% increase per hectare<br><br>Kenya: Access to water for agriculture in target areas increases by 10% |  |  |

|   |  |                                   |  |  |                        |  |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|--|
|   |  | rural level for 49% of population |  |  | with target population |  |
| <b>Source</b>   |  |                                   |  |  |                        |  |
| World Development Report (Kenya) 2009<br>Institute of Economic Affairs (2007) |  |                                   |  |  |                        |  |

| PURPOSE   | Indicator  | Baseline + year  | Milestone 1  | Milestone 2 | Target + year   | Assumptions   |
|---|--|--|--|-------------|---|---|
| Increase access to food and agricultural production for 32,143 poor and marginalised people including children who have been affected by the economic downturn in Kenya and Zimbabwe thus contributing to achieving MDG 1(target 3) and MDG 2 | Zimbabwe : Children's consumption of food in target schools<br><br>Zimbabwe: Teachers consumption of food in target schools<br><br>Zimbabwe : Production of food in target schools | Zimbabwe : Number of meals consumed by children before and during school day = 1 or less (October 2009)<br><br>Zimbabwe : Income of teachers =/>>\$150 (£96.15) per month (October 2009)<br><br>Zimbabwe: Number of schools with | 11,806 children receive at least one meal per day at school<br><br>337 teachers and support staff in 30 target schools receive a food hamper estimated value of £3.39 per month for 12 months<br><br>25 target schools have established nutrition gardens which have been fenced and planted and producing harvest by the end of the project period. |             | Zimbabwe : Number of meals consumed by children before and during school day is at least 1 (September 2011)<br><br>Zimbabwe : Income of teachers supplemented with food hamper – hampers to a value of £3.39 per month per teacher (September 2011)<br><br>Zimbabwe: 80% of targeted schools have nutrition gardens | Zimbabwe & Kenya: Access / availability of inputs or ability to import food is retained<br><br>Zimbabwe: Change in policies, particularly in regards to food aid, are implemented by the government<br><br>Kenya: |

|  |   |   |                    |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--------------------|--|---|---|
| (target 1).                                  |   | established nutrition gardens less than 5 (August 2010)   |                    |  | functional (September 2011)   | Quality seed and farm inputs will be readily available  |
|  | <b>Source</b>   |   |                    |  |   |   |
|  | Caritas Zimbabwe Food and Livelihood security assessment (November 2009)<br>Zimbabwe Food Security Outlook update (June 2010) – <a href="http://www.fews.net/zimbabwe">www.fews.net/zimbabwe</a><br>Caritas Gweru and Caritas Masvingo statistics |   |                    |  |   |   |
|  | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline + year</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Target + year</b>  |   |
| Kenya: Food production in target communities | Kenya: Drought tolerant and horticultural crops harvested per acre (cereals 20 bags, pulses 8 bags, tomatoes 30 tonnes, onions 15 tonnes, Kale 500kg) (August 2010)   | Kenya: 5200kg of drought tolerant crop seeds planted per acre<br><br>Kenya: 1950kg of horticultural crop seedlings planted per acre |                    | Kenya: Crop yield of drought tolerant and horticultural crops increased by 2-3 bags per acre per harvest (September 2011)                  | Kenya: 8 additional water facilities available with total estimated storage capacity of 88,880M <sup>3</sup> . (September 2011) | Kenya: target areas will not experience serious drought during the project period<br><br>Kenya: absence of conflict amongst beneficiary communities |
| Kenya: Access to water for agriculture       | Kenya: number of water facilities available and their storage capacity – 123 developed  | Kenya: 8 additional water facilities constructed<br><br>Kenya: 80 silos constructed each with capacity of 270kg.                    |                    | Kenya: 80 silos storage facilities available and under use in target communities with total storage capacity of 21,600kg. (September 2011) |   |   |
| Kenya: Post harvest management               |   |   |                    |  |   |   |

|   |  |  |                                       |  |                       |  |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
|   | within communities   | water sources in Isiolo (36% operational in dry seasons), 500 dams in Kitui. (August 2010)<br><br>Kenya: 1000 metal silos available and under use in target communities. (August 2010) |                                       |  | 2011)                 |  |
| <b>Source</b>   |  |  |                                       |  |                       |  |
| Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) website 2010.<br>International Water Management Institute - Working Paper 106 'Assessing Water Availability under Pastoral Livestock Systems in Drought Prone Isiolo District. 2006.<br>CRS and KARI Post Harvest Storage Practices and Techniques, 2007.<br>CRS Annual Report 2009. |  |  |                                       |  |                       |  |
| <b>INPUTS (£)</b>   | <b>DFID (£)</b>  | <b>Govt (£)</b>  | <b>Other (£)</b>                      | <b>Total (£)</b>   | <b>DFID SHARE (%)</b> |  |
|   | Total: £560,806<br><br>Kenya: £240,947.71<br>Zimbabwe: £283,230.46 |  | Zimbabwe: £958,000<br>Kenya: £474,659 | Kenya: £715,606.71<br>Zimbabwe: £1,241,230<br>Total: £1,956,836.70 | <b>29%</b>            |  |
| <b>INPUTS (HR)</b>  | <b>DFID (FTEs)</b>   |  |                                       |  |                       |  |
|   | Kenya: 2.4 FTE   |  |                                       |  |                       |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| per partner<br>Zimbabwe: 1.7<br>FTE per partner |  |
|---|--|

| OUTPUT 1   | Indicator   | Baseline + year                                  | Milestone 1  | Milestone 2  | Target + year  | Assumptions  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Zimbabwe:<br>All children in selected schools receive a daily ration                   | Number of children at target schools receiving daily rations  | Number of meals per child per day is >1.5 (2009) | 11806 school children in 30 schools receive at least 1 meal per day at school for 50 school days in Term 3<br><br>6030 Male children<br>5776 Female children | 11806 school children in 30 schools receive at least 1 meal per day at school for 58 school days in Term 1<br><br>6030 Male children<br>5776 Female children | 11806 school children in 30 schools receive at least 1 meal per day at school for 178 school days in total school year (Sept 2010)<br><br>6030 Male children<br>5776 Female children | Schools and local education authorities willing to participate |
|  |   | <b>Source</b>                                    |  |  |  |  |
|  | Caritas Zimbabwe Food and Livelihood security assessment (November 2009)<br>CAFOD data collection with Caritas Masvingo and Caritas Gweru |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline + year</b>                           | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Target + year</b>   |  |
| Number of children enrolled in and attending school                                    | 11806 children are regularly attending school   |  | School drop outs remain less than 8%   | School drop outs remain less than 8%   |  |  |
|  | <b>Source</b>   |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAFOD data collection with Caritas Masvingo and Caritas Gweru<br>Target school records |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>IMPACT WEIGHTIN</b>   | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline + year</b>                           | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Target + year</b>   |  |

|                    |                     |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>G</b>           |                     |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
| 25%                |                     |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
|                    |                     | <b>Source</b>   |                  |                  |                       | <b>RISK RATING</b> |
|                    |                     |                 |                  |                  |                       | Low                |
| <b>INPUTS (£)</b>  | <b>DFID (£)</b>     | <b>Govt (£)</b> | <b>Other (£)</b> | <b>Total (£)</b> | <b>DFID SHARE (%)</b> |                    |
|                    | £156,258            |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
| <b>INPUTS (HR)</b> | <b>DFID (FTEs)</b>  |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
|                    | 1.7 FTE per partner |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |

| <b>OUTPUT 2</b>  | <b>Indicator</b>                          | <b>Baseline + year</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Target + year</b>   | <b>Assumptions</b>                          |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Zimbabwe: All teachers in target schools receive a monthly food hamper | Number of teachers receiving food hampers | Income per teacher per month is \$150 (£96.15)  | 293 teachers + 44 support staff receive a monthly hamper for 4 months (Term 3)<br><br>189 Male teachers & support staff<br>148 Female teachers & support staff | 293 teachers + 44 support staff receive a monthly hamper for 4 months (Term 1)<br><br>189 Male teachers & support staff<br>148 Female teachers & support staff | 293 teachers + 44 support staff receive a monthly hamper for 12 months (3 terms total)<br><br>189 Male teachers & support staff<br>148 Female teachers & support staff | Teachers do not go on strike for fairer pay |
|  |   | <b>Source</b>   |  |  |  |   |
|  |   | Caritas Zimbabwe Food and Livelihood security assessment (November 2009)<br>CAFOD assessment with Caritas Masvingo and Caritas Gweru<br>Project and partner reports<br>School records and registers |  |  |  |   |

|                         |                                   |   |                    |                    |   |                    |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|
|                         | <b>Indicator</b>                  | <b>Baseline + year</b>                                      | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b>                        |                    |
|                         | Number of teachers attending work | 270 (80% of teachers targeted schools)                      |                    |                    | 320 (95% attendance in 30 targeted schools) |                    |
|                         |                                   | <b>Source</b>   |                    |                    |   |                    |
|                         |                                   | Project and partner reports<br>School records and registers |                    |                    |   |                    |
| <b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b> | <b>Indicator</b>                  | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target (date)</b>                        |                    |
| 10%                     |                                   |   |                    |                    |   |                    |
|                         |                                   | <b>Source</b>   |                    |                    |   | <b>RISK RATING</b> |
|                         |                                   |   |                    |                    |   | Medium             |
| <b>INPUTS (£)</b>       | <b>DFID (£)</b>                   | <b>Govt (£)</b>   | <b>Other (£)</b>   | <b>Total (£)</b>   | <b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>                       |                    |
|                         | £13,698                           |   |                    |                    |   |                    |
| <b>INPUTS (HR)</b>      | <b>DFID (FTEs)</b>                |   |                    |                    |   |                    |
|                         | 1.7 FTE per partner               |   |                    |                    |   |                    |

|   |   |  |  |                               |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>OUTPUT 3</b>                               | <b>Indicator</b>                            | <b>Baseline + year</b>                                   | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>            | <b>Target + year</b>   | <b>Assumptions</b>                                 |
| Zimbabwe: All target schools have established | Number of nutrition gardens established and | 40% school gardens are partially operational (Sept 2010) | 100% (25) target gardens are fenced and planting commenced | 100% (25) gardens are planted | 25 schools have fully functioning and productive gardens (Sept 2011) | Schools and local education authorities willing to |
|   |   | <b>Source</b>  |  |                               |  |  |

|                         |   |  |                    |                    |  |   |
|-------------------------|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| nutrition gardens       | functioning   | CAFOD assessment with Caritas Masvingo and Caritas Gweru<br>Project and partner reports            |                    |                    |  | participate<br><br>There is no drought that would limit garden production |
|                         | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline + year</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b>   |   |
|                         | Quantity of food produced on each garden  | 5 out of 25 school gardens produce on average 600 kgs of various vegetables per year (August 2010) |                    |                    | 25 target gardens produce 8100 kg of produce per year (2011) |   |
|                         | <b>Source</b><br>School records<br>Caritas Gweru and Caritas Masvingo field reports |  |                    |                    |  |   |
| <b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b> | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target (date)</b>   |   |
| 15%                     |   |  |                    |                    |  |   |
|                         |   | <b>Source</b>  |                    |                    |  | <b>RISK RATING</b>  |
|                         |   |  |                    |                    |  | Medium  |
| <b>INPUTS (£)</b>       | <b>DFID (£)</b>   | <b>Govt (£)</b>  | <b>Other (£)</b>   | <b>Total (£)</b>   | <b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>  |   |
|                         | £56,142   |  |                    |                    |  |   |
| <b>INPUTS (HR)</b>      | <b>DFID (FTEs)</b>  |  |                    |                    |  |   |
|                         | 1.7 FTE per partner   |  |                    |                    |  |   |

|                 |                  |                        |                    |                    |                      |                    |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>OUTPUT 4</b> | <b>Indicator</b> | <b>Baseline + year</b> | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b> | <b>Assumptions</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|

|   |  |   |  |                    |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------|--|---|
| Kenya:<br>Increased food production in target communities | Number of people accessing agricultural inputs and drought tolerant seeds  | 43% poor and vulnerable people in target communities accessing agricultural inputs and drought tolerant seeds   |  |                    | 1300 poor and vulnerable farmers (households) accessing agricultural inputs and drought tolerant seeds (at least 10% increase) | Communities willing to participate<br><br>Communities have access to land<br><br>Minimal to no conflict in the participating communities<br><br>Adequate rainfall for crop production |
|   |  | 35% of farmers in target areas are consuming own produce  |  |                    | 50% of target farmers are consuming own produce by end of year.  |   |
|   | <b>Source</b>  |   |  |                    |  |   |
|   | International Development Research Centre<br>FEWS Net 2010                 |   |  |                    |  |   |
|   | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline + year</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b>   |   |
|   | Number of acres of farm land conserved and productive                      | Limited acreage of farm land conserved and productive in target area (no baseline data available).              | 98km of terracing on farm land constructed.  |                    | 98 hectares of farm land conserved and productive  |   |
|   | Number of farmers trained on crop husbandry and integration of environment | Number target farmers using crop husbandry and environment conservation strategies (no baseline data available) | 50% target farmers knowledgeable on crop husbandry and environment conservation strategies |                    | 800 target farmers using crop husbandry and environment conservation strategies  |   |
|   | <b>Source</b>  |   |  |                    |  |   |
|   | Catholic Diocese of Kitui  |   |  |                    |  |   |

|                         |   |                 |                    |                    |                       |                    |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
|                         | nt conservatio<br>n strategies<br>and<br>implementi<br>ng these<br>strategies |                 |                    |                    |                       |                    |
| <b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b> | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target (date)</b>  |                    |
| 25%                     |   |                 |                    |                    |                       |                    |
|                         |   | <b>Source</b>   |                    |                    |                       | <b>RISK RATING</b> |
|                         |   |                 |                    |                    |                       | High               |
| <b>INPUTS (£)</b>       | <b>DFID (£)</b>   | <b>Govt (£)</b> | <b>Other (£)</b>   | <b>Total (£)</b>   | <b>DFID SHARE (%)</b> |                    |
|                         | £34,130   |                 |                    |                    |                       |                    |
| <b>INPUTS (HR)</b>      | <b>DFID (FTEs)</b>  |                 |                    |                    |                       |                    |
|                         | 2.4 FTE per partner   |                 |                    |                    |                       |                    |

|   |  |   |   |                    |  |  |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------|--|--|
| <b>OUTPUT 5</b>   | <b>Indicator</b>                                       | <b>Baseline + year</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b>   | <b>Assumptions</b>   |
| Kenya:<br>Increased access to water for agricultural use by | Number of water structures constructed or rehabilitate | 123 functioning water sources available in target communities | 7 additional functioning water sources constructed in target communities<br><br>1x water piping |                    | 7 water structures constructed / rehabilitated and fully functioning | Agreement with local authorities<br><br>Communities willing to |

|                           |   |   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
|---------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|--|-------------|--|
| targeted communities      | d   |   | system laid for irrigation       |                    | 1x water piping system laid and utilised for irrigation                                      | participate |  |
|                           |   | <b>Source</b>   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
|                           |   | International Water Management Institute                          |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
|                           | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline + year</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>               | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target + year</b>   |             |  |
|                           | Number of water user associations / groups trained and active | No existing water user associations for planned water structures. | 4 water user associations formed |                    | 4 water user associations trained on water management<br><br>4 functioning water user groups |             |  |
|                           | <b>Source</b>   |   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
| Catholic Diocese of Kitui |   |   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
| <b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b>   | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>               | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Target (date)</b>   |             |  |
| 15%                       |   |   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
| <b>Source</b>             |   |   |                                  |                    | <b>RISK RATING</b>   |             |  |
|                           |   |   |                                  |                    | Medium   |             |  |
| <b>INPUTS (£)</b>         | <b>DFID (£)</b>   | <b>Govt (£)</b>   | <b>Other (£)</b>                 | <b>Total (£)</b>   | <b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>  |             |  |
|                           | £121,160  |   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
| <b>INPUTS (HR)</b>        | <b>DFID (FTEs)</b>  |   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |
|                           | 2.4 FTE per partner   |   |                                  |                    |  |             |  |

| OUTPUT 6  | Indicator  | Baseline + year   | Milestone 1  | Milestone 2  | Target + year  | Assumptions   |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Kenya:<br>Improved community capacity for post harvest management | Number of crop and harvest storage systems established and functioning   | 1000 existing metal silo storage facilities in target area      | 40 metal silos or storage facilities constructed to store at least 50,000kg of seed / grain by mid-project | 80 metal silos or storage facilities constructed to store at least 50,000kg of seed / grain by end project | 80 metal silos or storage facilities constructed and storing at least 50,000kg of seed / grain   | Communities willing to participate<br><br>No crop disease or crop pest outbreak |
|   |  |   | 21,600kg of grain storage facilities constructed and made available.                                       |  | 40 farmers groups storing seed or harvested grain for at least 2 planting seasons using silos  |   |
|   |  | <b>Source</b>   |  |  |  |   |
|   | Catholic Relief Services Annual Report 2009                              |   |  |  |  |   |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline + year</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Target + year</b>   |   |
|   | Number of farmers trained in, and using, post harvest management options | 41% famers using post harvest management options in target area | 40 farmers groups trained on post harvest management options   |  | 40 farmers groups trained on post harvest management options<br>230 groups storing seed or harvested grain for at least 2 planting seasons using silos |   |
|   | <b>Source</b>  |   |  |  |  |   |
|   | CRS and KARI Post Harvest Storage Practices and Techniques, 2007.        |   |  |  |  |   |
| <b>IMPACT WEIGHTING</b>   | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Target (date)</b>   |   |

|                    |                    |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 10%                |                    |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
|                    | <b>Source</b>      |                 |                  |                  |                       | <b>RISK RATING</b> |
|                    |                    |                 |                  |                  |                       | High               |
| <b>INPUTS (£)</b>  | <b>DFID (£)</b>    | <b>Govt (£)</b> | <b>Other (£)</b> | <b>Total (£)</b> | <b>DFID SHARE (%)</b> |                    |
|                    | £12,020            |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
| <b>INPUTS (HR)</b> | <b>DFID (FTEs)</b> |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |
|                    | 2.4 FTE per pt     |                 |                  |                  |                       |                    |

### Activities Log

| <b>OUTPUT 1</b>   | <b>ACTIVITY 1.1</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>                                    | <b>Milestone 2</b>                                    | <b>Milestone 3</b>   | <b>Risks</b>  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Zimbabwe: All children in selected schools receive a daily ration | Wet feeding in 30 schools during for the school year (178 feeding days) | Wet feeding in 30 schools for 50 school days (Term 3) | Wet feeding in 30 schools for 58 school days (Term 1) | Wet feeding in 30 schools for total of 178 school days (school year) | Availability of CSB and ability to transport it into Zimbabwe and to the diocesan offices | Diocesan field officers<br>Diocese coordinators<br>CAFOD field officer |
|   | <b>ACTIVITY 1.2</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>                                    | <b>Milestone 2</b>                                    | <b>Milestone 3</b>   |   | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
|   | <b>ACTIVITY 1.3</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>                                    | <b>Milestone 2</b>                                    | <b>Milestone 3</b>   |   | <b>Monitoring</b>  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |                |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|
|  |  |  |  |  |  | <b>Officer</b> |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |                |

| <b>OUTPUT 2</b>  | <b>ACTIVITY 2.1</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Milestone 3</b>   | <b>Risks</b>  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Zimbabwe: All teachers in target schools receive a monthly food hamper | Provision of food hampers for 293 teachers and 44 support staff in 40 schools | 293 teachers + 44 support staff receive a monthly hamper for 4 months (Term 3) | 293 teachers + 44 support staff receive a monthly hamper for 4 months (Term 1) | 293 teachers + 44 support staff receive a monthly hamper for months (Term 2) | Teachers go on strike due to political pressure or ongoing union action | Diocesan field officers<br>Diocese coordinators<br>CAFOD field officer |  |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 2.2</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Milestone 3</b>   |   | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |   |  |  |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 2.3</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Milestone 3</b>   |   | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |   |  |  |

| <b>OUTPUT 3</b>   | <b>ACTIVITY 3.1</b>                              | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>                                     | <b>Milestone 3</b>   | <b>Risks</b>                                | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Zimbabwe: All target schools have established nutrition gardens | Establishment of nutrition gardens in 25 schools | 5 existing gardens are fenced (Sept 2010)<br><br>20 new gardens are identified | 25 gardens are prepared and fenced (Oct-November 2010) | 25 gardens are beginning harvest greens and leafy vegetables by January 2011 and tubers by | Drought or pests resulting in crop failures | Diocesan field officers<br>Diocese coordinators<br>CAFOD field officer |

|  |   |   |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
|  |   | and fenced (Sept 2010)  |   | April 2011  |  |  |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 3.2</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b>  | <b>Milestone 3</b>  |  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|  | Training, seeds and fencing materials provided for 25 school gardens        | Training provided for school groups in 25 schools in October 2010                                     | Fencing materials provided for gardens in 25 schools (October 2010)                                   | Seeds and other inputs provided and utilised in 25 school gardens (Oct – November 2010) |  | Diocesan field officers<br>Diocese coordinators<br>CAFOD field officer   |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 3.3</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b>  | <b>Milestone 3</b>  |  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|  |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| <b>OUTPUT 4</b>  | <b>ACTIVITY 4.1</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b>  | <b>Milestone 3</b>  | <b>Risks</b>   | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
| Kenya: Increased food production in target communities | Provide farmers with drought tolerant seed varieties, tools and fertilisers | Procurement and distribution of seeds, tools and fertilisers to 50% target communities by mid-period. | Procurement and distribution of seeds, tools and fertilisers to 50% target communities by end-period. |   | Communities are effectively mobilised<br><br>Adequate rainfall for crop production<br><br>Acceptable certified seeds and farm inputs are readily available | CAFOD livelihoods programme officer<br><br>CAFOD partner programme staff |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 4.2</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b>  | <b>Milestone 3</b>  |  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|  | Train farmers on crop and animal husbandry and                              | Identification and mobilisation of  | Conduct training for  |   | Minimal or no conflict in  | CAFOD livelihoods  |

|  |   |                             |                           |                    |               |  |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--|
|  | integration of environmental conservation strategies within farming including soil and water conservation and soil fertility improvement techniques | farmer groups for training. | identified farmer groups. |                    | project areas | programme officer<br><br>CAFOD partner programme staff |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 4.3</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>          | <b>Milestone 2</b>        | <b>Milestone 3</b> |               | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>                              |
|  |   |                             |                           |                    |               |  |

| <b>OUTPUT 5</b>  | <b>ACTIVITY 5.1</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b>  | <b>Milestone 3</b> | <b>Risks</b>                          | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|--|--|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Kenya:<br>Increased access to water for agricultural use by targeted communities | Construct small scale water infrastructure (sand and earth dams, water tanks, pipelines) | Identify 7 suitable water point sites in collaboration with local water authorities | Mobilise community members and technical support officers to construct water structures |                    | Communities are effectively mobilised | CAFOD livelihoods programme officer<br><br>CAFOD partner programme staff |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 5.2</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b>  | <b>Milestone 3</b> |                                       | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|  | Support farmers with drip irrigation systems   | Identify farms for irrigation systems   | Mobilise farmers in groups and engage technical expertise for                           |                    |                                       | CAFOD livelihoods programme officer                                      |

|  |  |   |  |                    |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------|--|--|
|  |  |   | installation of irrigation systems   |                    |  | CAFOD partner programme staff  |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 5.3</b>  | <b>Milestone 1</b>  | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Milestone 3</b> |  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>  |
|  | Train farmers on micro-irrigation and sustainable water project management | Form 4 water users associations for each constructed water structure. | Conduct training of 4 Water User Associations members on sustainable water resource management |                    |  | CAFOD livelihoods programme officer<br><br>CAFOD partner programme staff |

| <b>OUTPUT 6</b>  | <b>ACTIVITY 6.1</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Milestone 3</b>                | <b>Risks</b>  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>   |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Kenya: Improved community capacity for post harvest management | Construct food storage facilities, such as metal grain silos, at household and community level    | Identify recipients of storage facilities at community level | Procure materials and train artisans on manufacture of silos | Construct and distribute 80 silos | Communities are effectively mobilised<br><br>Minimal or no conflict in project areas<br>Adequate rainfall for crop production | CAFOD livelihood programme officer<br><br>CAFOD partner programme staff |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 6.2</b>   | <b>Milestone 1</b>   | <b>Milestone 2</b>   | <b>Milestone 3</b>                |   | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>   |
|  | Train farmers on post-harvest food management, utilisation of storage facilities and pest control | Identify farmers for training                                | Conduct training of farmers on post harvest management.      |                                   |   | CAFOD livelihoods programme officer                                     |

|  |                     |                    |                    |                    |  |                               |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------------------|
|  |                     |                    |                    |                    |  | CAFOD partner programme staff |
|  | <b>ACTIVITY 5.3</b> | <b>Milestone 1</b> | <b>Milestone 2</b> | <b>Milestone 3</b> |  | <b>Monitoring Officer</b>     |

**Annex 2: Available Documentation**

- Concept Note to DFID
- Full Proposal to DFID
- Budget & Revised Budget
- Log frame
- Contract & Revised Contract
- Quarterly Financial Reports to DFID
- Midpoint Narrative Reports from Partners to CAFOD
- Child Protection Policies (CAFOD and partners)

**Annex 3 - Summary of Achievement Against Logframe (Achievement Rating Scale) –Note if the original logframe is in excel it may be more appropriate to complete this in excel using the information in the template below.**

Purpose, outputs, indicators, baselines and targets should be taken directly from the most recent logframe.

The final indicator levels, achievement ratings and comments should be based on the evaluation results.

Indicator levels are set as follows:

- 1 = final target fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
- 2 = final target largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
- 3 = final target only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
- 4 = final target: very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
- 5 = final target not achieved

|                |  |                                      |                        |   |                                |
|----------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
|                | <b>LEAD ORGANISATION NAME:</b>   |                                      |                        |   |                                |
|                | <b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>  |                                      |                        |   |                                |
|                | <b>COUNTRY / IES:</b>  |                                      |                        |   |                                |
| <b>PURPOSE</b> | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline (+ date of baseline)</b> | <b>Target (+ date)</b> | <b>Final change achieved in relation to indicator</b> | <b>Achievement Score (1-5)</b> |
|                |  |                                      |                        |   |                                |
|                | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline (+ date of baseline)</b> | <b>Target (+ date)</b> | <b>Final change achieved in relation to indicator</b> |                                |
|                |  |                                      |                        |   |                                |
|                | <b>Justification of scoring – has the project achieved what it intended and where there any unintended</b> |                                      |                        |   |                                |

|                 |  |                                      |                        |   |                                 |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
|                 | impacts? If so, why / if not why not. Were the assumptions made relevant?  |                                      |                        |   |                                 |
| <b>OUTPUT 1</b> | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline (+ date of baseline)</b> | <b>Target (+ date)</b> | <b>Final change achieved in relation to indicator</b> | <b>Achievement Rating (1-5)</b> |
|                 |  |                                      |                        |   |                                 |
|                 | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline (+ date of baseline)</b> | <b>Target (+ date)</b> | <b>Final change achieved in relation to indicator</b> |                                 |
|                 |  |                                      |                        |   |                                 |
|                 | <b>Justification of scoring – has the project achieved what it intended and where there any unintended impacts? If so, why / if not why not. Were the assumptions made relevant?</b> |                                      |                        |   |                                 |
| <b>OUTPUT 2</b> | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline (+ date of baseline)</b> | <b>Target (+ date)</b> | <b>Final change achieved in relation to indicator</b> | <b>Achievement Rating (1-5)</b> |
|                 |  |                                      |                        |   |                                 |
|                 | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline (+ date of baseline)</b> | <b>Target (+ date)</b> | <b>Final change achieved in relation to indicator</b> |                                 |
|                 |  |                                      |                        |   |                                 |
|                 | <b>Justification of scoring – has the</b>  |                                      |                        |   |                                 |

|   |  |                        |                      |                              |                                 |
|---|--|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|   | project achieved what it intended and where there any unintended impacts? If so, why / if not why not. Were the assumptions made relevant?   |                        |                      |                              |                                 |
| <b>OUTPUT 3</b>   | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline + year</b> | <b>Target + year</b> | <b>Final indicator level</b> | <b>Achievement Rating (1-5)</b> |
|   |  |                        |                      |                              |                                 |
|   | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline + year</b> | <b>Target + year</b> | <b>Final indicator level</b> |                                 |
|   |  |                        |                      |                              |                                 |
|   | <b>Justification of scoring – has the project achieved what it intended and where there any unintended impacts? If so, why / if not why not. Were the assumptions made relevant?</b> |                        |                      |                              |                                 |
| <b>Please comment on the following:</b>   |  |                        |                      |                              |                                 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Relevance of the activities.</li> <li>b) Efficiency of the activities.</li> <li>c) Effectiveness of the activities.</li> <li>d) Was the original weighting given to outputs in the logframe appropriate? Provide an explanation.</li> <li>e) Where the Human Resources assigned appropriate? Provide an explanation.</li> </ul> |  |                        |                      |                              |                                 |