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MOH Ministry of Health
MDGs Millennium Development Goals
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NGOs Non Governmental Organizations
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OECD Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PDM Participatory Development Management
SA Sustainable Agriculture
SARD Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development
ToR Terms of Reference
TOT Training of Trainers
WATSAN Water and Sanitation
UNDP United Nations Development Programme
YTC Youth Training Center
ZOA An International Non Government Organization

“Anonymized” names of the three projects:

DTC  Diocesan Agricultural Training Project
Diocesan Project  Diocesan Rural Development Project
NGO project  NGO Rural Development Project

Responsible for the contents of this report are solely the consultants contracted by Misereor. The evaluation covered the operations of three partner organizations was conducted in five counties of Liberia, rural Montserrado, Bomi, Grand Cape Mount, Gbarpolu and Nimba counties. The evaluation team considered basis ethical measures during the reviews and data collection process. The evaluation TORs were explained to staff of partner organizations, evaluation team remain neutral and objectives and respected culture and tradition of communities’ members and consider Gender dimension and issues during the process.
1. Objectives, process and methods of the evaluation

1.1 Background and objectives of the program evaluation

Since the end of the Liberian civil war in 2003 Misereor has helped its partners shifting their work from emergency assistance towards longer-term development activities. An important sector of development work in Liberia supported by Misereor is Integrated Rural Development (IRD).

As the three rural development projects supported by Misereor had not yet been evaluated, it was decided to conduct a cross sector evaluation in order to allow for an overall analysis combined with a joint learning process on project achievements against the background of the post-war developments in the country and the difficulties deriving from the long phase of emergency assistance that preceded the development work.

Of the three projects that were evaluated two are part of Catholic Church development programmes and one is a non-religious, non governmental development project. For reasons of confidentiality in the following the names of the three evaluated projects will be anonymized and named by the following abbreviations:

- Diocesan Agricultural Training Project (DTC)
- Diocesan Rural Development Project (Diocesan project)
- NGO Rural Development Project (NGO project)

The purpose of the evaluation of the rural development projects commissioned by Misereor was to examine design, implementation strategies and achievements in order to allow for overall conclusions and recommendations. The specific objectives of the evaluation process to be achieved are:

1. Misereor and the implementing partners in Liberia know the effects of their projects and the factors promoting or hindering their achievement.

2. Misereor and the implementing partners in Liberia know the strengths and weaknesses of their engagement in rural development in Liberia which will help sharpening its future engagement in the sector.


For the sector analysis Misereor formulated the following key questions in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation (Annexe 1):

I. Which results of the evaluation of the three projects can be generalized? Which are common achievements and problems and which factors have promoted or hindered project achievements?

II. Which conclusions can be drawn and what are the recommendations for the future rural development work of Misereor and its partners in Liberia?

1.2 Evaluation methodology

The three evaluations were conducted using a participatory approach creating space for program stakeholders to freely contribute and ensure the full benefit from the experience gained during implementation. The process also involved the partner organizations, project
team, the beneficiaries and all other main stakeholders, allowing a maximum of ownership of the process.

The evaluation of the three individual projects included the following methodological elements:

- documentary review of relevant project resources,
- start-up workshop
- interviews with all staff of the three organizations, target groups and the representatives of other organizations working in the same geographic area
- focus group sessions with women, men and youth representatives in communities
- field visits selected according to mutually agreed criteria
- analysis of tendencies, review of matrix of indicators
- final debriefing workshop including the presentation of preliminary results of the evaluation

In the final workshop with representatives of all three implementing organizations and of the Ministry of Agriculture each project staff elaborated and presented an analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT Analysis) of the implemented projects. As “preliminary results” of the program evaluation the consultants presented a paper on “Common Achievements, Challenges and Lessons Learnt” (Annexe 3). After discussion of this paper the plenary was divided into three groups, each representing one of the implementing organisations. The groups worked with the table “Evaluation DAC Criteria” (Annexe 4), an instrument previously adapted to the evaluated projects by the consultants. In the plenary three key strategies common to all three evaluated projects were reflected: a) Animal production; b) a kind of Training-of-Trainers strategy and c) Marketing strategies.
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2. Common issues and differences of the three projects

2.1 Brief project descriptions

Of the three projects that were evaluated two are part of catholic church development programmes and one is a non-religious, non governmental development project. For reasons of confidentiality in the following the names of the three evaluated projects will be anonymized and named by the following abbreviations:

- Diocesan Agricultural Training Project (DTC)
- Diocesan Rural Development Project (Diocesan project)
- NGO Rural Development Project (NGO project)

The three evaluated projects are quite different in terms of budget (between 150.000 and 400.000 Euro for three years, personnel (5 to 16) and geographic area (two cover one county, one project works in 3 counties). The NGO project and the Diocesan project follow a common approach of Rural Development working with bigger numbers of selected farmers in selected districts. The Diocesan Agricultural Training Centre is a training institution, working with a small group of students and graduates.

The following table gives an overview on the 6 evaluated projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Title of ongoing Project</th>
<th>Duration of Project</th>
<th>Budget of Project (Euro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO Rural Development Project (NGO project)</td>
<td>Further strengthening of small-scale agricultural activities to support disadvantaged households in former conflict areas</td>
<td>03/2009 – 02/2011, 03/2011 - 02/2014</td>
<td>162,000.00, 149,789.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Agricultural Training Center (DTC)</td>
<td>Support for the Agricultural Training Centre</td>
<td>07/2007 – 06/2011, 07/2011 – 06/2014</td>
<td>150,000.00, 135,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Rural Development Project (Diocesan Project)</td>
<td>Rural Development and Sustainable Agriculture Project</td>
<td>07/2007 – 03/2011, 04/2011 – 03/2014</td>
<td>380,000.00, 400,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overview projects of Rural Development in Liberia supported by Misereor

The focus of the Diocesan Agricultural Training Center is training young women and men of upper Nimba County on good agricultural practices.

The NGO rural development project includes agricultural extension service for farmer groups, water and basic sanitation on farm.

The Diocesan Rural Development Project has a very similar approach as the NGO project, but has additional components like introduction of rubber and pineapple and support to town development committees.

Besides these differences the three projects have a lot in common, not only the fact that they are all supported by Misereor:

- Their target group are small scale farmers in rural areas of Liberia;
They all selected as overall strategy the concept of “Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development” (SARD), with focus on soil fertility;

All three projects have a component of animal husbandry;

They provide some kind of agricultural extension service;

All want to introduce new agricultural techniques;

They use some kind of “Training-of-Trainers strategy”;

There target group is organized in Kuu groups.

All project teams have good motivated agricultural technicians with a good relationship to their target group.

2.2 Brief description of the implementing organizations

While the Diocesan project and the Diocesan Agricultural Training Centre are “indigenous” Liberian organizations, the NGO project is part of a Pan-African Organization with projects in 13 African countries, conceived in 1986 at the United Nations (UN) General Assembly Special Session.

2.3 Brief description of the target groups

The target group of all three projects are small scale farmers with farm sizes ranging between 0.5 and 2.5 hectares in rural areas of Liberia that were affected by the war. While the Diocesan and the NGO rural development project work with larger groups of farmers, the direct beneficiaries of the Diocesan Agriculture Training Center are only around 20 persons per year, half of them “on campus” and half on their own farms. All three projects have the objective to reach indirect beneficiaries by a kind of “Training-of-Trainer” approach (ToT) or “Model farmers”. But in all evaluated projects the impacts for these indirect beneficiaries are not as expected and numbers are quite low. Main reasons for the limited impact are that the ToT strategies are not yet well outlined and there are no clearly defined incentives for “trainers”.

While the target group of Diocesan Agriculture Training Center is quite young (medium age is 22.6 years), the medium age of Caritas Monrovia and Africa 2000 Network projects are both over 50 years – a challenge for the future work of both projects.

All three projects have a good gender balance of their target group with a ratio of 35% to 45% women.

---

1 Kuu is developed from traditional farming system in Liberia practiced by mainly small-scale subsistence farmers, who work or provide labour force by working together in large groups usually for a day or two to assist individual farmer/household to brush, felt trees, plant crops and harvest farms. The host household is responsible to feed and provide drinks for the workers, and absolutely no compensation is provided for work as this is a form of building community solidarity.

2 All three projects use the expression „TOT Approach“ although no clear concept could be presented how this should work in practice. The expectation is that framers trained by the project may train other farmers of their communities on farm, using Kuu groups. One limiting factor is that trainers get no visible incentive for training others, neither by the project nor by trainees.
3. Common findings on relevance

In the following chapters general findings of the three project evaluations according to the criteria on independent evaluations, established by the Development Co-operation Directorate of OECD, the so-called DAC-Criteria³ are presented.

All three projects obtained good results on relevance in the evaluation. The following graphic gives an overview⁴:

Graphic 1: Comparison on relevance

The graphic shows that two of three evaluated projects achieved 50% or more on relevance. The three projects focus on rural development, which is of extreme importance for the rural areas in Liberia that are just recovering from the impacts of the armed conflict. The training and extension service provided by all projects was highly appreciated by the interviewed target group.

All evaluated projects define as objective attending the main problem of the rural families in the project area, absolute poverty based on small farm scales low productivity and difficulties in marketing. This is the main reason for extreme low incomes in all project reasons. These core problems of the target group problems were tackled mainly by training, extension service, distribution of seeds and the introduction of animal husbandry.

The interviews and farm visits showed that the work of all projects was centred on the ten principles of the so-called “Sustainable Agriculture”⁵, focusing on soil fertility. These “Ten principles are: (1) Compost, (2) Mulching, (3) Liquid manure, (4) Intercropping, (5) Minimum tillage, (6) Crop rotation, (7) No burning, (8) Erosion control, (9) Use of leguminous and (10) Planting permanently. But soil fertility is not really a core problem of the target group of any

³ For more details see the DAC homepage: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/16/37/50584880.pdf
⁴ The graphic only shows the results of the evaluation done by the consultants. Graphics with detailed information as per project are presented in the individual evaluation reports.
⁵ What is called „Sustainable Agriculture“ by the SARD consultant of Misereor and the project teams is widely identical with the concept of „Conservation Agriculture“, developed in Latin America and Europe around 1980. For details see http://www.fao.org/ag/ca/doc/Kenya_casesudy.pdf or http://conservationagriculture.mannlib.cornell.edu/
of the projects and consequently ownership of the target groups is not always the highest. Only when the ten principles were combined with a clear strategy on increased income from farming (as in the case of the diocesan rural development project) the project activities had real relevance for the farmers and a high degree of ownership was achieved.

Drinking water is of high relevance in the two projects with a related component. But in most communities there is a general need of drinking water nearby the family homes. Water on farm was not a real priority of the target group.

The components “10 principles of SA” and “Drinking water on farms” are two examples of an approach that does not take sufficiently into account potentials, interests, priorities and needs of the target group.

4. Common findings on outcome and impact

All evaluated projects show positive impacts for the target group. No negative impact was observed, but without attending the challenge of land use security in areas with rubber plants there is a risk of conflicts arising on ownership about these farms.

The following table gives an overview on the main outcome, impacts and challenges of the projects, projects, related to the core problems of the target group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area / Priority of Target Group</th>
<th>NGO rural Development project</th>
<th>Diocesan Agriculture Training Center</th>
<th>Diocesan rural development project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased agricultural production and productivity</td>
<td>Project was long time too much focused on soil fertility. Since 2011 farmers are supported in enlarging their farms and in swamp development. Seeds were distributed too late and not always of good quality.</td>
<td>Project is too much focused on soil fertility, thus limiting project impacts and participation of trainees. Swamp development had positive impacts on farmer’s income and food security. ATC has big potential to test improved seeds and agricultural methods.</td>
<td>Good impact as project has a good combination on soil fertility and extension service for farmers. Local priorities capacities and knowledge are not taken sufficiently into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better marketing opportunities</td>
<td>Project team started to link framers with buyers and had some good initial impact like better access to market and increased income.</td>
<td>Recently the topic got more importance in curriculum and farm monitoring, but still room for improvement. Interest of students and graduates in marketing is big.</td>
<td>Project team started to link framers with buyers and had some good initial impact. A clear outlined marketing strategy, focusing on strengthening of target group is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>Some cases of increased income can be observed but project attendance</td>
<td>Some farmers managed to increase farms and income, especially those in</td>
<td>Most farmers are still extremely poor but those that benefitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was too irregular to achieve more visible impacts.

well working Kuu groups. Missing capital for basic investment is biggest limiting factor.

from distribution of rubber plants and pineapple are already starting to increase their income. Impact of rubbers is expected to increase income after 8 years.

Access to save drinking water

Impacts on communities by promoting wells and pumps in the first phase were big.

Drinking water on farm is no priority of the target group and will have only positive impacts for very few farmers.

No project component.

Impacts on communities by promoting wells and pumps in the first phase were big as these measures reduced distances for fetching water and reduced waterborne diseases.

Drinking water on farm is no priority of the target group and will have only positive impacts for very few farmers.

Land use security

Not yet a project component.

Land rights are mentioned in curriculum. The topic should be extended, especially in areas of high income production (rubber, palm oil, pineapple etc.).

Land rights are discussed in TDC meetings but do not yet get the needed attention by the project.

Community development

TDCs are still concentrated on organizing themselves and only small impacts can be observed (example conflict mediation).

No project component, but some Kuu groups have visible impacts on self-organization of communities.

Extremely good impacts in some communities (school and town hall construction, saving and credit schemes, conflict mediation and others). Good experiences should be shared with other communities.

| Table 2: Comparison outputs and impacts related to priorities of target group |
5. Common findings on effectiveness

All evaluated organizations implement their projects seriously and focus on the achievement of the defined objectives, results and indicators. Nevertheless, the results on effectiveness of the three evaluated projects are quite mixed. The NGO rural development project made some advancements but ownership of the target group is too low to achieve the ambitious objectives. But with changes in the project strategy it will be possible to achieve at least 50% of the defined indicators. The Diocesan rural development project achieved already most of the indicators and has good chances to achieve the others until project end. The effectiveness of the Diocesan Agricultural Training Centre is quite low and it not realistic to achieve the defined indicators of this project phase without a general change in project strategy and management.

DTC and the NGO project were planned without real involvement of the target group and thus did not sufficiently take into account the needs and interests of the target group. Consequently ownership and participation of the target group in project activities is low. As the achievement of the expected impacts in both projects highly depends on the participation of the target group, effectiveness in both projects is generally low.

6. Common findings on efficiency

The following graphic shows that the NGO project and the Diocesan project achieved good results on efficiency while the result of DTC is unacceptable. DTC urgently has to review project concept and management to improve efficiency.

![Comparison Efficiency of Misereor project partners (by consultants)](image)

Graphic 2: Comparison on efficiency

The cost/benefit ratio of the evaluated project is between good (Diocesan project), medium (NGO project) and negative (DTC). Without changes in the general project strategy the DTC project is too expensive for the low number of students and graduates and the achieved impacts.

All three organizations have gained capacities in project planning. The quality of the project proposals is acceptable but the organization of the Logical Frameworks is confusing. The often missing link between objectives and indicators makes it quite difficult to implement an
adapted monitoring system and sometimes even project staff has problems to understand the logics.

Monitoring is generally too much oriented towards activities and not sufficiently towards objectives, indicators and impacts. The Diocesan project and the Training Centre have elaborated some good templates for data collection on yield, re-investment, quantity of sold products and income. But these instruments are not yet used to create valuable data on achieved impacts that would allow a reflection on the effectiveness of used strategies. The NGO project is the only organization with a real and updated database but the number of farmers is not sufficient to allow common findings.

None of the three organizations really invested in learning material for staff or the target group. This is partly due to the fact that the Ministry of Agriculture offered this kind of material previously but stopped during the civil war.

Visibility of all three projects is extremely weak. The only project with a certain visibility was the Diocesan project, but all plates found date back to earlier projects.

7. Common findings on sustainability

The sustainability of the different types of capacity building provided by the project is generally guaranteed by the interest of the target group in improved production methods. But the trainings and extension work should not focus on pre-defined “principles” but on the real needs and interests of the target group, like farm enlargement, swamp development and marketing of agricultural products. Already existing (traditional) knowledge should be integrated into training concepts. The target groups should be more involved in project planning.

The target group of all evaluated projects is likely to continue using the learned production methods, wherever these are applicable and promise higher yield and income.

All three implementing organizations managed the difficult transition from emergency to development, but are currently working with only one back donor: Misereor. The dependency on only one back donor is a risk for institutional sustainability. All organizations should have an outlined sustainability strategy that includes alternative revenues.

A training institution like DTC needs a “phasing out” strategy for the time after external financing. This strategy could be based on cooperation with the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Agriculture.

8. Conclusions and recommendations

8.1 Main conclusions

The Misereor focus on Rural Development with three projects in war affected parts of Liberia is highly relevant for the country, the target groups and the implementing organizations. The relevance can even be higher if future project planning focuses more on local potentials, needs and priorities of the target than on pre-defined principles.

The concept of SARD followed by the three projects was too narrow. Components like small scale irrigation that did not fit into the concept of “Sustainable Agriculture” were neglected with the argument that Misereor would not finance such investments.

The (re-)introduction and strengthening of Koo groups in all three projects was a success in terms of people working together, especially with regard to land clearance. Here some Kuu
members (mostly women) benefit from the group work on their farms (done mostly by men). For the transformation of knowledge the selected Kuu group approach is not the best as women are too often reduced to preparing food and fetching water for the group. Even when they participate in farm work like mulching the impact on their knowledge is generally quite limited. Here all projects should adopt their strategy in order to increase learning by doing. A clearly defined ToT-strategy could be a good start to achieve this.

Animal production was introduced in all projects to increase availability of dung for liquid manure tanks. But many farmers are interested in animal husbandry as additional income resource, which is so far neglected by the projects.

Misereor provided the partners with regular trainings and monitoring visits that helped strengthen the institutional capacity. Consultancies were too much focused on technical aspects and did not cover enough institutional aspects and weaknesses in Project Cycle Management.

8.1.1 Common achievements
Most of the common achievements were already discussed under topic 4 of this report. Some additional common achievements are:

- Most good agriculture practices introduced by the projects are carried out by the local farmers but the degree of acceptance varies, depending especially on the external conditions like availability of needed material:
  
  1. Compost is widely accepted but due to limited availability of animal dung in most regions, quality of compost is often poor.
  2. Mulching is only applied on small areas, often less 10% of cultivated area: a major obstacle is distance between mulching grass and farms.
  3. Liquid manure has little importance for the target group; most liquid manure tanks visited had been prepared especially for the evaluation.
  4. Intercropping is widely accepted, but knowledge on best combination of cultures is limited.
  5. Minimum tillage is poorly accepted by the target group; many farmers doubt it works on their farm.
  6. Crop rotation is practiced mostly by more experienced farmers; knowledge about best sequence is limited.
  7. No burning is practiced by about 50% of the visited farmers; others are convinced that the principle does not work on their farm.
  8. Erosion control is not a real challenge in the project regions and had no importance in trainings.
  9. The advantages of the use of leguminous are known by most farmers but only about 40% already apply it.
  10. Planting permanently is practiced only by about 20% of the visited and interviewed farmers.

- All projects introduced permanent cultivation instead of shifting cultivation. This lead to reduced work and use of land for agriculture, thus preserving woods and contributing to a healthy environment.

- All projects contribute to food security of the target groups and surrounding communities.

- The projects lead to intensified cooperation between farmers and the reduction of conflict potential.
β All organizations managed to maintain their projects working even in an extremely difficult environment.

β All projects have some model farmers that are successful and make good money with agricultural production.

8.1.2 Common Challenges

β Organizations are currently dependent on one single donor.

β Still no partner has an effective monitoring system, especially when come to objectives, indicators and impacts.

β Many farmers are not prepared for the effective use of the introduced record keeping system.

β No effective TOT strategy yet in place.

β As the number of farms to be attended is big, distances are big and roads are bad, the number of field staff is quite small to attend all farms regularly.

β Although the gender balance is relatively good, fewer women than men are active in Kuu groups and Town Development Communities.

β All projects have much more male staff than women. Especially for field activities they face difficulties to contract women.

β No implementing organization makes adequate use of hand outs or training manuals.

β A viable strategy on animal husbandry with transparent and clear rules for revolving scheme or support of students is still outstanding.

β No organization realizes regular assessments of staff.

β The fact that ongoing projects do not foresee increase in staff salary during project implementation has negative impacts on staff motivation.

8.1.3 Important lessons learnt

a) It is important for every project to set priorities, especially in the wide field of Rural Development. But a too narrow approach does not give enough flexibility to adapt the project to the local circumstances, focusing on the real needs, priorities and potentials of the target group. The concept of “Conservation Agriculture”\(^6\), especially when reduced to its “ten principles”, is a good tool for guiding project activities in the important topic of soil fertility. But it is a too narrow approach for projects that aim on Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development.

The following graphic, elaborated together with participants of the final workshop with A2N, may illustrate the difference between Rural Development, Sustainable Agriculture and Conservation Agriculture.

\(^6\) What is called „Sustainable Agriculture“ by the SARD consultant of Misereor and the project teams is widely identical with the concept of „Conservation Agriculture“, developed in Latin America and Europe around 1980. For details see [http://www.fao.org/ag/ca/](http://www.fao.org/ag/ca/) or [http://conservationagriculture.mannlib.cornell.edu/](http://conservationagriculture.mannlib.cornell.edu/)
A too narrow concept does not allow orienting project planning to the real priorities of the target group. That’s one of the main reasons why the NGO project and DTC have so many difficulties to “win” the target group. This becomes very clear when members of the target group share they would have liked to introduce small scale irrigation but were not allowed as this was not part of the “Sustainable Agriculture”.

The Diocesan project shows that Conservation Agriculture can be a successful approach when it is combined with activities that create income on short term (example pineapple) and on long term (example rubber).

b) The best solutions in agricultural production often come from “traditional wisdom” or from farmers that try new methods or seeds. The most illustrative example is the illiterate woman (member of the NGO project) that saw a bigger type of pepper on the market, bought some fruits, dried the seeds and then experienced the production on a small part of her own farm.

There is an enormous potential of good practices still unused in all three projects, especially when exchange of experiences between the organization works well.
c) Even in the difficult context of Liberia it is possible to build / strengthen local institutions like Town Development Communities. These guarantee a high degree of ownership of the target group and the sustainability of the measures initiated by the project.

d) Revolving schemes in animal husbandry are a difficult approach and (at least in Africa) not too many success stories can be seen. They only have a chance for success if ownership is well defined and when the rules of the revolving scheme are clearly defined, known by everybody and local an institution responsible for close monitoring and sanctioning.

8.1.4 Positive examples from the projects (good practice)
The distribution of rubber plants in combination with training on bud grafting was the key for getting the target group really interested in the Diocesan project. With pineapple production farmers already started to increase their income and will leave poverty in the forthcoming years. But: as all success stories also this involves the risk that others want to take part and question the land ownership. To minimize the risk of land conflicts it will be necessary to strengthen work on land rights.

The good relationship of the staff of the Diocesan project with the target group built the basis of the success in strengthening some already existent Town Development Committees (TDCs) and the creation of others in communities that did not have one. These were able developing activities like building town halls and schools together, set up saving & credit schemes (with focus on agricultural inputs and trade) or create a Town Development Fund by working together on community owned cassava farms.

The NGO project has some really successful farmers that can be used in an outlined ToT strategy. Experience could be shared with the other Misereor partners. The initial steps in swamp development are quite promising.

The NGO project has recruited well knowledgeable and trained young and motivated university graduates as technicians in the field. Field staff resides in the communities and have easy access to the farmers. Farmers have easy access to market for sale of farm communities and income generation. Some farmers carry on oil palm production, coal burning, etc. for supplementary income generation purpose.

Although none of the evaluated organizations has a clearly outlined and successful ToT strategy, experiences of DTC with some Kuu groups are quite promising and could be used as example for the other two projects. Here graduates managed to show other framers of their communities how to enlarge and design their farm, abandon shifting cultivation, plan all year cropping and use appropriate farming methods. In only three years the number of members in one of these Kuu groups increases from 4 to 28 in only three years.

8.1.5 Perspectives for networking of Misereor program partners
During the final workshop with all Misereor partners on Rural Development in Liberia it was common sense that the challenges for the institutions and project staff in project planning, monitoring and project strategies are easier to face working together.

The cooperation should concentrate on concrete issues rather than “just meeting to exchange experience”. These meetings should be well prepared, moderated and documented. To some meetings it would be useful inviting other organizations or ministries with experience in specific thematic areas.
The following topics could have priority when it comes to networking.

- Successes of the Diocesan project in income generation activities should be shared with other Misereor partners;
- The NGO project should share good practices like “big pepper” production. Promising new seeds could be tested on the DTC compound or by farmers trained at DTC;
- DTC should open the center for short term trainings for the NGO and the Diocesan project farmers as well as for other institutions;
- The Misereor partners should invite other organizations with experience on animal husbandry to reflect and strengthen their strategy, including rules for the revolving theme;
- The experience of other organizations in marketing (like German Agro Action) should be used for outlining an integrated marketing; Misereor partners and others could cooperate in attracting big buyers like supermarkets;
- Misereor partners should cooperate in creating simple leaflets on key strategies and on production methods;
- Partners should review the existing data sheets on activity-, resource-, output- and impact monitoring as well as the data bases of the NGO project and the Diocesan project;
- The positive experiences of the Diocesan project in promoting community development by strengthening Town Development Communities should be reflected and adapted to other projects.

8.1.6 Perspectives for promoting Rural Development in Liberia

During the evaluation an often heard comment was that rural youth in Liberia are only interested in “rapid money making” and not in agriculture. The evaluation showed that it is a real challenge for all three projects to attract young people (women and men). But the success stories of income generation of the Diocesan project, successful young farmers of the NGO project and innovative Kuu groups of DTC show that it is possible attracting young people with the right strategies.

Prices for agricultural products in general are quite high in Liberia. With good farm planning, production methods and marketing strategies even small scale farmers can make good money with agriculture, not only with rubber and palm oil. With a continuous growth of African and world population and regional food shortages it is likely that producer prices will keep on a high level in forthcoming years, with good perspectives for farmers.

Conflicts on land will get more frequent when yield of rubber starts in the project area of Caritas Monrovia. Farmers should be informed about the land right and how to defend their land in case of conflicts.

Horticulture production in most project areas is quite risky without irrigation. To reduce dependency on regular rainfalls farmers should be supported in swamp development and small scale irrigation (for example, with pedal pumps) in future projects.

The Ministry of Agriculture has just started to rebuild a basic extension service. It will take years until these efforts have a visible impact on district and community level. Until then
projects focusing on Rural Development and Sustainable Agriculture will play an important role in rural Liberia.

8.2 Recommendations

Recommendation for the individual projects have been formulated in the individual project evaluations. In the following only recommendations with regard to the sector funding policy on Rural Development in Liberia are mentioned:

8.2.1 Recommendations for the Misereor partner organisations in Liberia

- It is crucial to show partners perspectives on short and long term income generation. Only focusing on Sustainable Agriculture (Conservation Agriculture) is a too narrow concept and does not lead to brought acceptance by the target group. All evaluated projects should be reviewed in this context.

- Forming groups (Kuu) mainly consisting of women may be an additional strategy for higher learning effects in Kuu groups and to get more women actively involved in project activities. Most of the Kuu groups met in all three projects are not yet an appropriate strategy to achieve transformation of knowledge. More women should participate in each Kuu group and there must be more time for learning from each other.

- An integrated monitoring system is crucial for showing the degree of achievements (especially of indicators, outputs and impacts). Without such a system it is difficult to know where the project is going, reflect project strategies and to decide on “corrective action”. The three organizations should share their (partly good) monitoring sheets created and their initiatives to analyze the results in a kind of data base. At least every three months the degree of achievement of indicators should be reviewed and main project strategies should be reflected on the basis of the monitoring data and visits.

- Partners should cooperate in producing short leaflets on key project strategies (like animal husbandry and revolving scheme) and on “best agricultural practices”. These leaflets should be easy to understand even for people with only basically literate. Members of the Ministry of Agriculture showed interest in cooperating on such leaflets. This kind of material could also attract other potential donors.

- All three organizations should improve visibility on projects. This might be a combination of visibility with sensitizing messages on Sustainable Agriculture. Future project budgets should include a minimum of 1% for visibility.

8.2.2 Recommendations for Misereor

- Misereor should revise its policy on consultancies. Terms of Reference should be negotiated with partners for each consultancy visit and then partners and Misereor should search for a consultant (national or international) with the respective knowledge and experience.

- Misereor should offer a training in participatory planning to all partner organizations in Liberia (not only Rural Development), if possible to be carried out in 2012.
Transfer of funds for very short periods out a lot of pressure on the implementing organization and should only be used in extreme situations. In general, transfer of funds should be according to the reporting period.

Misereor should consider contingencies in budget (example: increase in prices for gasoline and maintenance of motorbikes and vehicles).

Project budgets should allow increase of salaries during implementing period, contributing to a higher motivation of staff.

Misereor policy and approved budget should allow saving and credit schemes, helping farmers buy basic tools and watering machines.

Misereor should link the partners in Liberia with experienced partner organizations in Integrated Rural Development outside the country.
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Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the evaluation

2nd DRAFT (as of 08.12.2011)

Term of Reference

for a cross-section evaluation of 3 rural development projects in Liberia

1. Introduction

Since the end of the Liberian civil war in 2003 Misereor has helped its partners shifting their work from emergency assistance towards longer-term development activities.

The rural development work in Liberia has not been evaluated up to now. This evaluation shall therefore shed light on the project achievements so far against the background of the post-war developments in the country and the difficulties deriving from the long phase of emergency assistance that preceded the development work.

Last year an evaluation of all rural development projects in Angola has been carried out. These projects started from a similar situation as those in Liberia (post-war country) and the accompaniment by the consultant on rural development was analogous, although over a longer period. By comparing the results of both evaluations Misereor wants to learn whether the outcomes are similar or which factors have led to different results. Furthermore the evaluation will provide additional information for the currently ongoing sector evaluation of Misereor’s engagement in rural development worldwide.

The envisaged cross-section evaluation shall take into account three projects:
- Diocesan Agricultural Training Project (DTC)
- Diocesan Rural Development Project (Diocesan project)
- NGO Rural Development Project (NGO project)

2. Objectives of the evaluation

ý Misereor and the local partners know the effects of their rural development projects and the factors promoting or hindering their achievement.

ý Misereor and the local partners know the strengths and weaknesses of their engagement in rural development in Liberia which will help sharpening its future engagement in the sector.

ý A first exchange about lessons learnt and future strategies between the local partners and Misereor has been initiated.

3. Key issues

3.1 Issues relevant for all three projects

ý Overall project strategy and methodological approach
(1) Description of the context, the target groups, the implementing institution and its structure and of the project with its activities. The following points should be considered:

a. Is the project implemented following a clear strategy/concept? Which kind of concept? Is it adapted to the project context?
b. Who are the beneficiaries of the project? Does the number and the type of real beneficiaries differ from the planning? Was the selection of beneficiaries reasonable in view of the project context and was it in line with Misereor’s policies?
c. What are the major methodologies used?
d. What is the organizational setup and capacity of the partner institution/the project team in implementing a rural development project (including technical capacities)?
e. How is the relationship between the field staff/technical staff and the beneficiaries?
f. What is the relationship between the project and other stakeholders (governmental, non-governmental and private actors, including the respective other Liberian partners)?
g. How is the cooperation between the partner and Misereor, particularly taking into account the used consultancy approach?

Relevance

(2) Is the project relevant for rural development in Liberia and the project region?
(3) In how far is the project relevant for the target groups? Has it been planned in a participatory way, based on the priorities of the target groups?
(4) Are the project objectives still relevant?
(5) Are the project activities and the resulting outputs and services consistent with the formulated development goal and the project objectives? Will they lead to the expected results?

Outcomes and impacts

(6) How many people/families/groups/communities have been reached by the project?
(7) Which changes (positive and negative; direct or indirect) has the project brought about for the beneficiaries in terms of social, economic, political, cultural or ecological changes, taking into account the gender dimension?
(8) Special attention should be given to changes in the following areas:
   a. Level of adoption of innovations introduced by the project and where applicable part of farms on which they are adopted (e.g. mulching, use of compost).
   b. Soil fertility.
   c. Diversification.
   d. Farm sizes of the beneficiaries.
   e. Work force needed on the fields by targeted families/farmers for a certain output.
   f. Level of plant and animal production and income.
   g. Marketing of agricultural products.
   h. Investment of the targeted families on their farms.
   i. Initiation of group activities (e.g. jointly working on farms/revival of the Kuu-system, saving and credit groups, joint marketing).
   j. Water access, hygiene and sanitation.
   k. Road access (e.g. local bridges).

(9) To what extent can the observed changes be attributed to the project activities? Which other factors (e.g. the general recovery process from the civil war?) contributed to the changes that were generated?
(10) Has the real chain of causality been consistent with the chain of causality established at the planning stage? If not, what were the differences?

Effectiveness

(11) To what extent were the objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved?
(12) How do beneficiaries judge the effectiveness of the project activities (e.g. the promoted techniques) compared to their traditional practices or to possible innovations some of them might know/apply?
(13) What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
(14) Were the initial objectives realistic?

Efficiency

(15) Were the effects achieved at reasonable costs?
(16) Was the project implemented in an economically justifiable way under the given circumstances?
(17) Were the objectives achieved on time or will they be achieved on time?
(18) Have effective management and administration systems been in place and was there a suitable planning, monitoring and evaluation system?

Sustainability

(19) To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue once project support has ended?
(20) What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
(21) Is a suitable entry- and exit strategy in place for the work with the target groups?

3.2. Specific issues for NGO Rural Development Project (NGO project)

- For each of the three projects specific questions were formulated in the respective ToR!

3.3 Sector analysis

I. Which results of the evaluation of the three projects can be generalized? Which are common achievements and problems and which factors have promoted or hindered project achievements?
II. Which conclusions can be drawn and what are the recommendations for the future rural development work of Misereor and its partners in Liberia?
4. Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted in a participative way, permitting the sounding out of the stakeholders, ensuring in this way the full benefit from the experience gained during implementation. It will involve the implementing institution, the project team, the beneficiaries and all other main stakeholders, allowing a maximum of ownership of the process.

All three evaluations will start with a workshop where the ToR and the project concept are reflected and where the project team gives a first overview on the work progress and main challenges.

At the end of each project evaluation the interim results will be presented on half day workshop by the consultants and reflected with the project team, the implementing organization and main stakeholders, including representatives of the target group.

On February 6 a final workshop involving all three project teams and implementing institutions will be held. This workshop is meant to reflect on common lessons learnt and challenges as well as to initiate a discussion process on future strategies of Rural Development.

During the evaluation the following methods will be applied:

- Field visits to selected villages
- Open and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders involved, including beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
- Context analysis and impact analysis
- Observation of framework conditions and structures set up by the project
- Assessment and analysis of project reports and other relevant documents
- Final on-site discussions with project team and beneficiaries

The evaluation will be based on the standards of OECD Development Assistant Committee (DAC) [http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf) and its five evaluation criteria (impact, sustainability, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency) and on the standards of the German Association for Evaluation (DeGEval) [http://www.alt.degeval.de/calimero/tools/proxy.php?id=19084](http://www.alt.degeval.de/calimero/tools/proxy.php?id=19084).

5. Organization of the mission

The evaluation team will be composed of two members, one international consultant and one national/regional consultant.

The evaluation will take place in Liberia from January 4 until February 6, 2012. The provisory results of the evaluation will be presented on a workshop after each single evaluation. The final workshop with stakeholders of all three projects will take place on February 6, 2011.

6. Reports
A total of **five reports** will be produced:

- **For each project** the consultants will produce a report of 20 to 25 pages (3 reports). The three reports should take into account the following aspects:
  1. Executive summary:
     - short description of the project implementing organisation and the project itself;
     - objectives of the assignment and procedure(s) chosen;
     - the essential results/findings relating to the core questions of the Terms of Reference, including an overall assessment of the work appraised;
     - the most important recommendations.
  2. A brief description of the assignment and the approach and methodology used.
  3. A central part structured in chapters dealing with the questions and issues formulated in the terms of reference
  4. Conclusions, including an overall assessment of the work appraised and presenting the ‘lessons learnt’.
  5. Recommendations, prioritised and addressed to specific actors (Who should do what?).

- **In addition to the three individual reports the consultants will produce a summary report** of 15 to 25 pages, resuming common findings and lessons learnt (possibly comparing the results with the Angola evaluation on Rural Development) and pointing out perspectives for promoting Rural Development in Liberia;

- **The international consultant will produce an anonymized summary report of 3 to 4 pages in German for Misereor’s annual report on evaluations.**

The consultants will send the first draft of the evaluation reports to Misereor by March 9, 2012. The internal review at Misereor will be finalized by March 21, 2012. The second draft of the evaluation reports will be sent to the implementing partners and Misereor by March 30, 2012.

21.12.2011
Annex 2: Program and main results of Final Workshop with Misereor partners on Rural Development in Liberia

FINAL WORKSHOP WITH MISEREOR PARTNERS-LIBERIA

February 20, 2012

PROGRAM

1. Welcome and introduction
   (Participants see attachment)
2. TOR for: Sectoral Analysis
   • Common achievement
   • Common challenges
   • Common recommendation
3. a) SWOT Analysis: Presentation and Discussion
3. b) Auto evaluation and DAC
4. Reflection on key strategies
5. Reflection on cooperation with Misereor and conclusion
6. Networking of Misereor partners
7. Final steps

3.a) Presentation of SWAT analysis

   See attachments

4. Reflection on key strategies

   1. Animal production (example pig)

Criteria / Steps:
Training
Construction of local pig-pen
Feeding capacity
Share with program members
Sign MoU
Active members of program

Purpose of raising animals
Manure production
Income generation (NGO project and DTC)

Health care for animals
Medical plants (tifrosia, penicillin, paw-paw leaf etc.)
Clean pig-pen regularly
Bath pig regularly

2. ToT Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First group of trainees</th>
<th>Second beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β Design training manuals</td>
<td>β Community mobilization &amp; sensitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β Recruit and train during 6 months maximum (practical &amp; theory)</td>
<td>β Set criteria for selection (having access to farm land, being active farmer etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β Follow-up trainees</td>
<td>β Develop training manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β Farmers exchange visit</td>
<td>β Setup demonstration plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β Setting up of individual farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β Farmers exchange visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β Follow-up by M6E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Marketing strategies

Organizing farmers into an association
Basic record keeping training
Production timing for specific procedures
Market information
Link farmers to markets
And middle traders

Value addition
β Processing
β Packing
β Storage

Dialogue between traders and farmers for fair trade
β Value chain analysis

Agri trade fairs

5. Reflection on Cooperation with Misereor

β Transfer of funds should be according to reporting period
β Misereor should consider contingencies in budget (example gasoline and maintenance of motorbikes and vehicles); The reserve can only be used in extreme situations.
β Misereor budget should allow saving and credit schemes, helping farmers buy basic tools and watering machines
β Misereor should link partners with organizations outside Liberia

6. Reflection on Cooperation between Misereor Partners

β Successes of Diocesan project in income generation should be shared with other partners
β NGO project should share good practices like “big pepper” production
β DTC should open the center for short term trainings for NGO and Diocesan-project farmers; the campus also can be used for testing new production methods
β Share experience on animal husbandry
β Reflect on successes, lessons learnt and constraints
β Reflect on M&E system
β Reflect on land rights

7. Next steps
1. Consultants will produce 4 draft reports until April 15
2. Rainer will present main evaluation results at Misereor on April 19
3. All three partners will review draft report and send comments until April 30
4. Consultants will produce 4 final reports until May 15
Annex 3: Common Achievements, Challenges and Lessons Learnt

Evaluation Misereor - Common Achievements, Challenges and Lessons Learnt

• Common Achievements
  - SA agriculture practices are carried out by the local farmers
  - Certain degree of ownership of the target groups
  - All have some model farmers that are successful and make money

• Common Challenges
  - Single donor or funding source
  - No effective monitoring system especially when come to indicator and impact
  - Many farmers are not prepared for effective record keeping system
  - TOT strategy
  - Inadequate number of field staff
  - Less women active than man
  - No hand out on training manual
  - Bad road condition and long distances
  - No viable strategy on animal husbandry
  - No regular assessment of staff and no increase in staff salary during project implementation

• Lessons learnt
  - It is crucial to show partners perspectives on short and long term income generation. Only focusing on Sustainable Agriculture (Conservation Agriculture) is a too narrow concept and does not lead to brought acceptance by the target group.

  - Forming groups (Kuu) mainly consisting of women may be an additional strategy for higher learning effects in Kuu groups and to get more women actively involved in project activities.

  - An integrated monitoring system is crucial for showing the degree of achievements (especially of indicators, outputs and impacts). Without such a system it is difficult to know where the project is going, reflect project strategies and to decide on “corrective action”.

• Common Recommendations for all three projects and for Misereor
  - Discussion with partners during final workshop
Annex 4: Template for Evaluation of DAC Criteria

Evaluation of Three Rural Development Projects in Liberia for Misereor

DAC Criteria

January & February 2012

Implementing organization: NGO Rural Development Project (NGO project)

Name of the project: Small scale agricultural activities to support disadvantaged households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Relevance</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Consultant 1</td>
<td>Consultant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Are the project objectives relevant for the target group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Are the project objectives relevant for the implementing organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Are the project objectives relevant for Misereor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Are the project objectives relevant for Liberia?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Is Sustainable Agriculture (SA) relevant for the target group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Is marketing of agricultural products relevant for the target group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Is community development relevant for the target group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Is potable water relevant for the target group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Are the cross-cutting issues peace building, land rights, gender, HIV/AIDS relevant for the target group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Are the indicators clear and measurable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Are the objectives and indicators still relevant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Do the activities correspond with the main objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Are the project activities and the resulting outputs and services consistent with the formulated development goal and the project objectives? Will they lead to the expected results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Are the activities effective to achieve the immediate objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>The planned activities contribute to resolve the main problems of the target group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>The implemented activities contribute to positive changes in the project region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Do the planned activities contribute to resolve the main problems of the target group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Is the project design based on a baseline study, taking into account major problems, interests and potentials of the target group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Did the target group participate in the planning process of the projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Does the project address the poorest?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.21 Is gender balance taken into account?

1.22 The implemented activities did not have any negative impact?

1.23 Other positive aspects on relevance:

1.24 Other negative aspects on relevance: Average value

Points:

Percentage:

2. Outcome and impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No=0, Partially=1; Yes=2;</td>
<td>Consultant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Does the project contribute significantly to food security?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Will the project contribute significantly to food security in the next few years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Does the project contribute significantly to rural development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Will the project contribute significantly to rural development in the next few years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Does the project contribute significantly to income generation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Will the project contribute significantly to income generation in the next few years to come?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Does the target group adopt the innovations of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Does the project contribute significantly to strengthen rural communities and promote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Consultant 1</td>
<td>Consultant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Will the project contribute significantly to strengthen rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communities and promote community development in the next few years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to come?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Does the project contribute in strengthening the implementing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Does the project strengthen other actors of development in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>region?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Did the project make an analysis of the potential of the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the target group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13 Is the project management oriented on outputs and impacts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14 Other positive observations on output and impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 Other negative observations on output and impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Points:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Percentage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>No=0, Partially=1; Yes=2;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 90% -100% of the indicators were achieved or will be achieved until</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 70% - 90% of the indicators were achieved or will be achieved until</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>At least 50% of the indicators were achieved or will be achieved until project end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Is the strategy and implementation of WATSAN effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Is the strategy and implementation of animal husbandry effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Was the project planned in a logical manner with clear and measurable indicators?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Does a logical framework or another document exist that clearly outlines the logic of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Are there work plans developed and in use on a regular basis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Does the project have a detailed and realistic budget?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Does the project have instruments that allow regular budget monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Does the project have an efficient system on activity monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Does the project have an efficient system on output and impact monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Other positive observations on effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Other negative observations on effectiveness</td>
<td>Average value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points:**

**Percentage:**
### 4. Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Is the cost-benefit-ratio acceptable?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 Are the activities generally carried out as planned?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 Are the administrative costs acceptable?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 Is the financial management efficient?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5 Are the project strategies clearly defined and written?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.6 Is the project equipment adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.7 Are the staff generally well prepared for the tasks to accomplish?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.8 Is the director of the organization sufficiently qualified?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.9 Is the project coordinator sufficiently qualified?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.10 Are the supporting staff including finance, administration, logistics and M&amp;E sufficiently qualified?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.11 Are the technicians sufficiently qualified?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.12 Are responsibilities and tasks clearly defined in written form?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.13 Are the working conditions in the office safe, acceptable and conducive?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.14 Are the working conditions of field staff safe, acceptable and conducive?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.15 Is there regular communication in the implementing organization and with Misereor?

4.16 Other negative observations on efficiency

Average value

IV Percentage:

5. Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Is the implementing organization focusing on sustainability of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the target group participate sufficiently in the project activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Does the target group contribute sufficiently to reach the project objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Does the target group contribute sufficiently to benefits (services, tools, seeds, infrastructure etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Do the farmers have economical advantages in participating in project activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Do they reinvest at least 25% of their net income?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Does the project contribute to a healthy environment in Liberia?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Does the project contribute to social and political stability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 Are project staff aware of risks and threats of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 Does the project have a strategy</td>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to react on risks and threats?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Does the project have insurances against major risks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>Does the project promote the ownership of the target group?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Does the project promote the local and regional potential?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td><strong>Percentage:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>