

Final Evaluation

**Livelihoods Recovery for Flood Affected Populations in Sindh &
Punjab, Pakistan**

For: Concern Worldwide Pakistan

Submitted by: Ideas for Life Trust

March 2012

1 Contents

1	Contents.....	2
2.	Acknowledgements.....	4
3.	List of Abbreviations.....	5
4.	Basic Information of the Project.....	7
5.	Executive Summary.....	8
6.	Background and the Context.....	11
6.1	Concern’s Interventions in the Project Districts.....	11
6.2	Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation.....	12
6.3	The Evaluation Methodology.....	12
6.3.1	Selection of Study Sample.....	12
6.3.2	Data Collection Tools and Techniques.....	13
6.3.2.1	Secondary Data Gathering.....	13
6.3.2.2	Primary Data Collection.....	13
6.3.2.3	Sampling Criteria for Beneficiary / Respondents’ Selection - FGDs.....	14
6.3.2.4	Key Respondents.....	14
7.	Evaluation Findings & Analysis.....	14
7.1	Relevance, Appropriateness and Timeliness.....	14
7.2	Quality, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Impact of the Response.....	19
7.3	Connectedness and Coherence.....	25
7.4	Relevance of Concern’s Systems to Cope with Emergencies - HR, Finance, Procurement and Logistics System.....	27
7.5	Incorporation of Lessons or Recommendations from previous Emergencies into the Response.....	29
8.	Lessons Learnt.....	31
9.	Recommendations.....	33
10.	Annexes.....	34
10.1.	Evaluation TORs.....	34
10.2.	The Evaluation Team.....	37
10.3.	Declaration of the independence of the Evaluation Team from the Programme Team.....	38

10.4.	Evaluation Schedule	39
10.5.	List of Persons Interviewed and Sites Visited.....	40
10.6.	Documents Consulted	41
10.7.	Data Collection Tools.....	43

2. Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank the Concern Worldwide Pakistan Country Office team, Mubashir Ahmad, Sherzada Khan, Himatullah, Ayesha Nadeem Malik, Hamza Abbasi and Field staff in Multan & Hyderabad, for coordination and support during the final evaluation of Livelihoods Recovery for Flood Affected Populations in Sindh & Punjab.

We would like to thank the members of the Village Committees, male and female beneficiaries of Income Generation, Agriculture and Livestock Support activities for providing us valuable feedback on project interventions. The team would also like to thank the stakeholders at the district level, the implementing partners, district line department for taking the time to meet us and share their valuable views and expertise.

We would also like to thank our field team, Sadia Pervaiz, Shaista Urooj Mughal, Faisal Khan (Dadu & Jamshoro, Sindh) and Sehresh Mazhar and Shafique Ahmad (Ranjanpur, Punjab) for their efforts and hard work. We would also like to thank our colleague at Ideas for Life Trust, Sadaf Raza for backhand help and support during the evaluation.

Luqman Ahmed - Dr Farman Ali - Zulqarnain Malik

3. List of Abbreviations

ACO	Assistant Coordination Officer
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CBHA	Consortium of British Humanitarian Agencies
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CFW	Cash for Work
CWW	Concern Worldwide
DAP	Di-Ammonium Phosphate
DCO	District Coordination Officer
DDMA	District Disaster Management Authority
DFID	Department for International Development
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECHO	European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office
EMMA	Emergency Market Mapping Analysis
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership
HHs	Households
HR	Human Resource
I/NGO	International/Non Government Organization
IPs	Implementing Partners
LFA	Log Frame Analysis
NDMA	National Disaster Management Authority
NIC	National Identity Card
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PDMA	Provincial Disaster Management Authority

PEFSA	Pakistan Emergency Food Security Alliance
PKR	Pak Rupees
TORs	Terms of Reference
TRDP	Thardeep Rural Development Programme
UCs	Union Councils
UN	United Nations
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme

4. Basic Information of the Project

Name of project:	Livelihoods Recovery for Flood Affected Populations in Sindh & Punjab, Pakistan
Name of organization	Concern Worldwide Pakistan
Local NGOs (IPs)	Root Work Foundation - Dadu District Pakistan Fisherfolk Forum - Jamshoro District Research & Development Foundation - Dadu Help Foundation - Rajanpur District Awaz Foundation - Rajanpur District
Project cost (in £)	Total Project Cost in pounds sterling £ 3,000,000 Funding by DFID £ 3,000,000
Problem addressed	The proposed project intended to address the time critical early recovery needs of flood affected populations in Rajanpur (Punjab) and Dadu & Jamshoro (Sindh) districts - enabling the affected communities to return to their normal lives and livelihoods through the revival of income generation opportunities, revitalization of small communal infrastructure and restoration of agriculture & livestock based livelihoods.
Project summary	To assist 269,063 flood-affected persons in Rajanpur (Punjab) & Dadu & Jamshoro (Sindh) districts in their early recovery through the revival of income generation opportunities, revitalization of small communal infrastructure and restoration of agriculture & livestock based livelihoods by the end of the project.
Duration of project	7 months (February to August 2011), further extended to nine and half months

5. Executive Summary

The 2010 floods in Pakistan affected more than 20 million people, with loss of lives and livelihoods, and the destruction of homes, basic infrastructure and standing crops. Sindh and Punjab were the most affected provinces, whereas according to the NDMA's ranking of the flood affected districts, District Dadu & Jamshoro in Sindh province and District Rajanpur in Punjab province had been categorized as 'severely affected' by the floods, requiring emergency and early recovery support on priority basis. In order to address the time critical early recovery needs, Concern implemented the project under evaluation, 'Livelihoods Recovery for the Flood Affected Populations in Sindh & Punjab'. The specific objective was to ensure that flood affected targeted populations have access to goods, services and support allowing for a return to normality. Upon completion of the Project, CWW engaged third party external evaluators to evaluate the project with particular emphasis on appropriateness, timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of the interventions.

Both primary and secondary data collected during the course of evaluation in Sindh and Punjab revealed that all the Union Councils targeted under this intervention by CWW and its IPs were severely affected by the 2010 floods and communities in all the sample villages were not prepared for such a disaster. CWW and its IPs were quite successful in identifying and plugging the gaps in this overall effort by the humanitarian community. The evaluation team also didn't come across any major duplication in the target areas sampled for this study. The overall assistance was highly relevant to the needs of the affected population that needed immediate support to rebuild their lives. Shelter remained one of the most primary unmet needs of the communities, which was in some cases met to a very limited extent by other agencies. It was a highly effective design as the project supported communities engaged in both on-farm and off farm livelihoods. The targeting was also well focused as the assistance was provided to both men and women in each village. Each beneficiary farmer was provided with crop inputs for 2 acres of land. Each package included 50KG rice seed, 2 bags of DAP (50KG each) and 4 bags of Urea (50KG each). Small farmers were provided with grain storage bins to be able to store their seeds and grains throughout the year. Vegetable seeds and fertilizers for kitchen gardens were provided to women in each target village. Each goat-beneficiary woman was provided with a pregnant goat and each poultry-beneficiary woman was provided with 1 male and 5 female birds. Small farming households were also provided with fodder seed and fertilizer to meet the fodder needs of their livestock retained by them. Artisan toolkits were provided to skilled artisans in each village. Conditional cash grants were provided for the revival of small enterprises in each village. Unconditional cash grants were provided to most vulnerable persons in the affected villages including disabled, widows and elderly. Each unconditional cash grant was of 10,000 rupees. Beneficiary men and women were also engaged in Cash for work schemes aimed at repairing small scale community infrastructure. Each beneficiary was provided with 10-20 days of labour with a daily rate of PKR 350.

All the assistance provided under this intervention, as described above, was found to be appropriate in terms of the needs and the local context except for goat and poultry breeds which were reported inappropriate to the local context and had faced mortality resulting into beneficiaries' dissatisfaction. Discussions with CWW and IPs' senior programme management teams reveal that there was an urgency to devise this intervention and seek funds from donors on the earliest so that the assistance could be delivered on time. This made it very difficult for CWW and IPs to conduct detailed studies and consider all the specific details in such a short time. Bulk procurements and rejection of goods below standard delayed the delivery of some inputs including poultry, which reached to the target areas in extreme hot temperatures hence caused high mortality in poultry. All the assistance was channelled through the village committees which took lead in identification and selection of beneficiaries and monitoring project activities in each village. In most of the cases Village Committees were dominated by one group within each village and hence all decision making regarding collective village matters was done by these dominant groups. Other committee members and office bearers were not that active and mostly remained at the receiving end. Female committees were not aware of their role and details of project inputs and were not even active. Those who received the inputs were mostly selected as per the general criteria agreed. Farmers received the agriculture and livestock support as per the established quantities and specifications and those associated with off-farm livelihoods received income generation support as per the set criteria and standard. Most importantly unconditional cash grants were provided to disabled and widows and conditional cash grants were given to small entrepreneurs. CWW team and its IPs were committed to the accountability and complaint mechanisms and the committee office bearers and beneficiaries were aware of the complaint system.

The overall impact of this assistance in the two Provinces is very positive as it has built a very positive image of the humanitarian community in the target areas. Agriculture support had a huge immediate impact on the beneficiary households who were able to revive their agriculture through the assistance provided under this project. Cash for work turned out to be a highly successful activity which provided labourers with skilled and unskilled labour at their door step and a decent daily wage rate. Livestock and poultry couldn't show any significant immediate impact due to substantially high mortality rate in poultry and goats, particularly in the sample villages. Provision of conditional cash grants for revival of small enterprises also had a significant impact in most of the cases where the beneficiary households had a monthly increase of PKR 6000 to 7000, thereby allowing them to buy food for the household. The recipients of the unconditional cash grants were highly vulnerable persons who were able to meet immediate health and food needs of their household with the help of this assistance.

Some of the key lessons learnt include, *Bottom up planning is extremely important; Opinions of beneficiaries in planning and execution is of paramount importance; In-depth livelihoods assessment / baseline is highly essential in order to understand priorities and underlying issues; More donor focus and investment is required on HAP and community mobilization / organization and impartiality which will allow a greater impact; Fewer inputs and huge difference between various packages encourages favouritism within the communities.* Key recommendations are: CWW is strongly recommended to provide technical assistance to IPs in community organization and mobilization; There is a clear need to set-up improved Monitoring and review

systems which allow CWW teams to regularly assess the processes along with output tracking; It is advisable that the procurements should be done from the target Districts if the capacity exists, as it will strengthen the local economy; CWW is suggested to try Village Fairs and Cash Vouchers in future which may be more effective in supporting the local economy and providing more choice to the beneficiaries; It is recommended that Cash Transfer mechanisms through banks should be further improved keeping humanitarian imperative as a priority over cost to transfer money; Livelihoods recovery should continue in the target communities; CBDRM needs to be initiated in all affected areas.

6. Background and the Context

The 2010 floods in Pakistan affected more than 20 million people, with loss of lives and livelihoods, and the destruction of homes, basic infrastructure and standing crops. The death toll from the floods stood at 1,985 with 2,946 people injured and 1.74 million houses damaged or destroyed¹. Across Pakistan, 78 districts were affected by the floods.

Sindh and Punjab were the most affected provinces, whereas according to the NDMA's ranking of the flood affected districts, District Dadu & Jamshoro in Sindh province and District Rajanpur in Punjab province had been categorized as 'severely affected' by the floods, requiring emergency and early recovery support on priority basis².

Concern carried out joint rapid need assessment exercises along with its local NGO partners in the affected areas of these districts before the start of the project, to assess the damages caused by the flood and identify the priority needs of the survivors. Findings had also been considered from assessments carried out by other agencies. Secondary data was obtained from UN Agencies, local NGOs and district administration officials. The information was also collected and validated through Concern's participation in Government, UN coordination, Humanitarian Clusters and Pakistan Humanitarian Forum meetings.

Based on the primary information collected during the need assessments, the priority needs were identified, requiring urgent support in the assessed districts³, as water had receded from the majority of the flood affected areas, and people had returned to their places of origin, there was an immediate need to initiate early recovery activities to support the spontaneous recovery efforts at the community level.

6.1 Concern's Interventions in the Project Districts

Concern responded to the urgent humanitarian and early recovery needs of the affected population, in 2010 floods, and targeted more than two million people through its relief and recovery projects in the sectors of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), Health, Shelter, Agriculture & Food Security and Livelihoods support across the country.

In order to address the time critical early recovery needs, Concern implemented the project under evaluation, 'Livelihoods Recovery for the Flood Affected Populations in Sindh & Punjab'. The overall objective of the project was 'to provide an integrated response and assistance to the needs of affected population in Pakistan'. The specific objective was to ensure that flood affected targeted populations have access to goods, services and support allowing for a return to normality. The specific objectives of the project were:

- To ensure that targeted households have increased levels of self-subsistence livelihood support through income generation;

¹ NDMA situation report, 20 December 2010

² NDMA, List of Flood Affected Districts

³ At proposal stage, assessments have been completed for one district in Sindh and one district in Punjab (Dadu and Rajanpur)

- To ensure that targeted households have increased levels of self-subsistence agricultural support;
- To ensure that targeted households have increased levels of self-subsistence support for livestock.

6.2 Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

As per TORs, the overall purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the project with particular emphasis on appropriateness, timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of the interventions carried out and to extract the lessons/recommendations to enhance the quality of on-going early recovery and future programming by Concern and its partners.

The objectives of the evaluation were to assess relevance, quality, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the response by Concern, the connectedness and coherence in the response, and the relevance of Concern's systems to cope with an emergency, in terms of its HR, Finance, Procurement and Logistics systems, the extent to which lessons or recommendations from previous emergencies were incorporated into this response, and to identify lessons to be learned to inform the future emergency responses of Concern.

6.3 The Evaluation Methodology

6.3.1 Selection of Study Sample

The evaluation team selected sample areas based on the presence of a variety of beneficiaries of different components of the project intervention. The team based the selection of villages on purposive and proportionate sampling techniques in a multi-stage sampling manner. Sampling was based on the lists of beneficiaries and target villages and their demographic variables. A list of sample villages was developed which was shared with the project team for verification and finalization.

The evaluation team used the proportionate sampling technique at the first stage to select villages. This sampling was done on the basis of list of target villages provided by CWW; the list contained demographic information of each target village and the total number of beneficiaries in each village; in some villages there was a bigger proportion of beneficiaries than those in others, hence more villages with a higher concentration of beneficiaries of the project were selected in order to make the results more accurate and facilitate effective interaction with them considering time constraints.

At the second stage, the evaluation team used the purposive sampling technique to prioritize villages further. This was done based on the list of villages shortlisted at the first stage. This sampling technique allowed choosing villages from those selected in the first phase to ensure presence of all types of beneficiaries for various interventions in order to grasp a comprehensive picture of the project, while staying within the limited resources.

While selecting the sample villages due consideration was also given to accessibility in terms of remoteness of each sample village from central locations in each District; safety and security within these areas also determined feasibility with regards to accessibility and remoteness of sample villages.

Table 1: Break-up of sample villages against locations and partners

S#	District	Implementing Partner	Sample Villages
1	Dadu	Root Work Foundation	1. Hashim Khan Rustamani 2. Pir Bux Solangi
2	Jamshoro	Pakistan Fisherfolk Forum	1. Unhar Pur 2. Gharibabad Mori
3	Dadu	Research & Development Foundation	1. Kumbh Chandio 2. Thalho
4	Rajanpur	Help Foundation	1. Khooh Rindan 2. Khooh Mochiwala
5	Rajanpur	Awaz Foundation	1. Dhora Hajana 2. Doulat Wala

6.3.2 Data Collection Tools and Techniques

The evaluation team employed participatory qualitative methods for the evaluation, which helped in gathering data, and facilitated comprehensive reflection and analysis. The information was drawn both from secondary sources and by using primary data collection methods.

6.3.2.1 Secondary Data Gathering

The evaluation commenced with review of relevant project documents as outlined in the Annex. These documents included Project proposal, LFA, budget, reports by the partners, etc. The evaluation team met with Concern focal lead and other relevant staff to seek further information and clarifications.

6.3.2.2 Primary Data Collection

The evaluation is based on qualitative data collection methods, such as focus group discussion, case studies, transect walks and direct observations. For focus group discussions, beneficiaries were divided into 4 subgroups targeted by different activities. While case studies focused on the project activities around Income generation, agriculture and livestock support.

1. Qualitative Methods

- a. Focus Group Discussions - FGD Guides were developed to facilitate discussions with
 - i. Male Beneficiaries
 - ii. Female Beneficiaries
 - iii. Village Committee Members
 - iv. Non Beneficiaries
- b. Case Studies
 - i. Income Generation Support

- ii. Agriculture Support
- iii. Livestock Support

c. Transect walks & Direct Observations

6.3.2.3 Sampling Criteria for Beneficiary / Respondents' Selection - FGDs

- Up to 12 Male respondents (beneficiaries of *Income Generation support* , *Agricultural support and livestock support*) selected using simple random sampling technique from each sample village using beneficiary lists provided by CWW / IP;
- Up to 12 Female respondents (beneficiaries of *Income Generation support* , *Agricultural support and livestock support*) selected using simple random sampling technique from each sample village using beneficiary lists provided by CWW / IP;
- All available members of Village Committees from each sample village;
- Male and female respondents (non-beneficiaries) available in each sample village.

6.3.2.4 Key Respondents

The key respondents interviewed during the final evaluation are:

1. Village Committees;
2. Direct Beneficiaries (Both Male & Female);
3. CWW & Partner Project Staff;
4. Non Beneficiaries;
5. Local authorities
 - a. District management (DCO / ACO / DDMA)
 - b. Agri & Livestock officers
6. INGOs / UN Agencies;
7. CBHA/PEFSA.

7. Evaluation Findings & Analysis

7.1 Relevance, Appropriateness and Timeliness

Targeting of Affected Areas

Both primary and secondary data collected during the course of evaluation in Sindh and Punjab revealed that all the Union Councils targeted under this intervention by CWW and its IPs were severely affected by the 2010 floods and communities in all the sample villages were not prepared for such a disaster. They had to evacuate their dwellings and sought shelter on high grounds. Their houses were damaged, crops destroyed and livestock swept away. For several weeks they were forced to live with poor conditions in spontaneous camps away from their villages along highways and raised grounds and protection bunds. Upon their return they had a daunting task of rebuilding their lives from scratch. Discussions with the communities suggested that though there were several organizations that flooded the devastated area and provided relief to the affected population as the flood water receded and people started returning home

but very few stayed and considered supporting the communities in their recovery. Concern Worldwide and its IPs continued their assistance and targeted the most urgent needs of the affected population in resettling and restoring their lives and livelihoods.

A quick analysis of the 3 W matrices developed under various coordination mechanisms suggests that a large number of organizations were present in the flood affected areas providing relief and early recovery assistance to the affected populations in various sectors such as WASH, Shelter and On Farm / Off Farm Livelihoods but CWW and its IPs were quite successful in identifying and plugging the gaps in this overall effort by the humanitarian community. The evaluation team also didn't come across any major duplication in the target areas sampled for this study. It was observed that CWW and its IPs focused on livelihoods early recovery in these villages while other agencies such as Qatar Charity and TRDP provided very limited shelters in some of the villages sampled for this evaluation study.

Prioritization of Needs

A general consensus reached by all the respondents in various villages, targeted by CWW and its IPs in Punjab and Sindh, included in this evaluation study, suggests that the overall assistance was highly relevant to the needs of the affected population that needed immediate support to rebuild their lives. From the discussions with the affected population in sample villages in both Provinces, the evaluation team learnt that shelter remained one of the most primary unmet needs of the communities, which was in some cases met to a very limited extent by other agencies.

Discussions with CWW and its IPs' staff also suggest that CWW also provided some shelters funded by other donors to the flood affected populations in areas not included in this DFID project. As mentioned above other organizations had initiated shelter assistance in these Union Councils hence CWW had to continue its shelter assistance in other areas to avoid duplication.

The respondents expressed their gratitude towards the implementing organizations and CWW who supported affected persons in these villages. They believed that it was a highly effective design as the project supported communities engaged both in on-farm and off farm livelihoods and the targeting was also well focused as the assistance was provided to both men and women in each village.

Achievements

The evaluation team was able to verify and validate the provision of inputs to flood affected population as under:

Agriculture Support

Farmers in Sindh who needed assistance in cultivating their crops were provided with rice seed, fertilizers and agriculture toolkits. It was a crucial assistance which allowed them to grow their crops, their economic mainstay. Each beneficiary farmer was provided with crop inputs for 2 acres of land. Each package included 50KG rice seed, 2 bags of DAP (50KG each) and 4 bags

of Urea (50KG each). Small farmers were also provided with grain storage bins to be able to store their seeds and grains throughout the year if needed.

Vegetable seeds and fertilizers for kitchen gardens were provided to women in each target village. The inputs were aimed at allowing women to grow their own vegetables and be able to meet household food requirements.

Concern appears to have achieved all the targeted outputs. Discussions of the evaluation team with the male and female beneficiaries revealed a high level of validation of the above mentioned interventions in the sampled areas. Seed for rice crop was not distributed in Punjab as it is not cultivated in the areas targeted under this intervention. Vegetables' seed for kitchen gardening distributed among beneficiaries was much appreciated as most farm families in the project areas have always grown some vegetables for meeting the household needs. The activity is redefined with respect to gender and appeared to have gradually shifted into the domain of women. Apart from food supplement, its impact on women with respect to income generation - though nominal at the moment - is clearly that of paving way for women empowerment in the area. The evaluation team validated the activities carried out for organizing DRR sessions for households to have basic understanding on disasters and disaster management at the community and local Government level. These were one off sessions which were delivered to the beneficiaries in the target areas. The evaluation team learnt that the beneficiaries had retained some basic knowledge from these sessions and required further sessions to establish thorough understanding of various risk reduction measures that could be initiated at the local level. Agriculture tools package was designed in consultation with local community and was thus equally appreciated.

Provision of grain storage bins (by virtue of their size) was the most visible intervention in the area as these bins silently greeted evaluation team almost everywhere in the surveyed villages. There were few whispers around storage bins' resale in some cases in Sindh indicating other preferences but the majority of the beneficiaries found the bins highly relevant and appropriate.

Livestock Support

Livestock and poultry are an essential asset for the flood affected population and women traditionally take care of livestock in these villages. Through this assistance women were provided with goats and poultry birds to rebuild their assets and contribute to their diet thereby improving household nutrition. Each goat-beneficiary woman was provided with a pregnant goat and each poultry-beneficiary woman was provided with 1 male and 5 female birds.

Small farming households were also provided with fodder seed and fertilizer to meet the fodder needs of their livestock retained by them.

The evaluation team through FGDs found evidence of validity of the aforementioned activities being implemented in the study areas. The livestock mortality was reported to have declined due to vaccination and de-worming carried out in the area. The goat population was steadily growing in the area. In a few places the goats distributed were not found to be of appropriate breed and/or in healthy conditions, but in most places their growth was found fairly good, milk

yields were better than before, and the income from sale of goats and their products were also fairly good. Poultry package was equally admired as far as distribution was concerned. Mortality rate was, however, reported on a higher side.

Beneficiaries were rather talking high of the quality of fodder reported to have yielded two harvests. Participants were inclined to cultivate the same type of fodder again and were requesting the evaluation team to help provide fodder seed again. In few cases, however, fodder seed germination rate was not satisfactory due to heavy rains following its cultivation. The beneficiaries' perception on relevance, timeliness, adequacy, and quality of the interventions concerned was quite positive.

Income Generation Support

Artisan toolkits were provided to skilled artisans in each village. Since they had lost their tools in the floods the toolkit allowed them to revive their livelihoods utilizing their skills and using the tools. Each kit was designed on the basis of the need and type of skill.

Conditional cash grants were provided for the revival of small enterprises in each village. Each small scale entrepreneur was provided with cash grant in one or two instalments depending on the size of the grant which was determined on the basis of the need. Conditional cash grants were provided to both men and women in each target village.

Unconditional cash grants were provided to most vulnerable persons in the affected villages including disabled, widows and elderly. Each unconditional cash grant was of 10,000 rupees.

Beneficiary men and women were also engaged in Cash for work schemes aimed at repairing small scale community infrastructure. Each beneficiary was provided with 10-20 days of labour with a daily rate of PKR 350. Small bridges, culverts, feeder roads and several other community schemes were repaired which highly benefitted the communities.

As evident by the evaluation team's validation results this component was quite successfully carried out by Concern / IPs which provided materials / money to deserving families for rebuilding their sources of income. Implementation of this intervention was validated by participants of the FGDs and majority of households including non beneficiaries. The evaluation team's assessment is that all the entitled families within the targeted limits got this aid package. All of the village groups and households considered this programme very relevant to their area's needs, and most of them declared it timely, beneficial, and of good quality. The team's assessment is positive both on validation and the impact side. The trade specific tools were quite diverse in nature and were reflecting the heterogeneous trade activities in the sampled areas. Beneficiaries of trade specific tools talked high of the transparency in identification of the deserving people and usefulness of the tools. Restoration of affected small enterprise was one of the commendable and highly positive interventions. The shops/premises were reported to have built and stocked with merchandise better than before. The variety of merchandise is much greater and quality is better than before. Recipients of enterprise restoration grants reported to be making good progress. The restored business activity in the area is much more brisk than the pre-flood period. The restoration of on and non-farm infrastructure undertaken by local

people under the cash for work intervention has too, yielded considerably. The man-days of employment thus generated and ensuing cash earned were in high thousands. Restoration of on and non-farm infrastructure appears to have created many more jobs as well. As a secondary impact of job creation coupled with the money injected as unconditional grants by the programme into the area some further job creation has taken place in the target villages and outside resulting into relatively more secured livelihoods of the people concerned.

Appropriate and Timely Inputs

All the assistance provided under this intervention, as described above, was found to be appropriate in terms of the needs and the local context except for goat and poultry breeds which were reported inappropriate to the local context and had faced mortality resulting into beneficiaries' dissatisfaction. Except for fertilizers in some cases, all the assistance provided under this intervention was timely which benefitted the communities. Provision of rice seeds and fodder seeds was highly effective as it was provided in a timely fashion and the beneficiaries were able to sow it on time.

Challenges

Though CWW and its local IPs couldn't manage to carry out an in-depth baseline study in the nick of time, but continued data gathering during their relief interventions and carried out preliminary assessment and registration processes in the post relief phase and also relied on other assessments such as NDMA Sitreps, PDMA Updates, McRAM, EMMA. Though this helped them in determining the local priorities and designing relevant, appropriate and timely early recovery assistance, specific details regarding the livelihood analysis couldn't be focused which might have resulted into some of the challenges faced. A brief analysis of these challenges is presented below:

Detailed Needs Assessment

CWW IPs selected a significant number of villages from each target UC on the basis of discussions and data collection in the post relief phase. A quick exercise was conducted in Punjab which focused on the priority needs and wealth ranking but the selection of villages remained a challenge as it was difficult to prioritize villages without an in-depth livelihoods assessment coupled with secondary stakeholder consultation. During the evaluation exercise the evaluation team came across non-beneficiaries from adjacent villages in both Sindh and Punjab who questioned the processes of village selection and required justifications for being denied assistance by CWW IPs in their respective areas. Discussions with CWW and IPs' senior programme management teams reveal that there was an urgency to devise this intervention and seek funds from donors on the earliest so that the assistance could be delivered on time. This made it very difficult for CWW and IPs to conduct detailed studies and consider all the specific details in such a short time.

Delayed Procurements

Discussions with CWW teams suggest that the project involved huge procurements and the volume of this procurement didn't match the capacity of vendors present in the target Districts hence CWW had to initiate the process at the national level in Islamabad. Efforts to procure in bulk for various recovery interventions going on parallel with the project under study and save significant amount of funds that could be utilized for reaching more beneficiaries resulted in delays and hence it took a great deal of time to move the inputs to the target areas. More delays occurred when low quality supplies were rejected from IPs' warehouses upon delivery as CWW and its IPs continued monitoring the quality and carried out spot checks at the warehouses. This is one of the contributing factors to high mortality rate especially in poultry which reached to the target areas in extreme hot temperatures. Price fluctuation and unavailability of Urea also caused delays in providing fertilizer to farmers on time.

7.2 Quality, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Impact of the Response

Village Committees

The discussions with the beneficiaries, village committees and project staff within CWW and its IPs suggest that upon return of the affected people to their villages CWW and its IPs had initiated relief activities and had established first contact with most of these communities. At the initiation of the early recovery phase IPs held broad based community meetings and invited the communities to form village committees in order to roll out this intervention. Efforts were made to form male and female village committees who were tasked to monitor and execute project implementation in each village. During visits to the sampled villages and discussions with beneficiaries and village committees, the evaluation team learnt that all the assistance was channelled through the village committees who took lead in identification and selection of beneficiaries and monitoring project activities in each village. It was observed that the village committees were mostly (in 8 out of 10 sampled villages) represented by one male individual or a dominant group / tribe within the village who was responsible mainly for decisions regarding selection of beneficiaries. As per the local norm, all decision making regarding collective village matters was done by these dominant groups in these villages who were also affected by the floods. Other committee members and office bearers were not that active and mostly remained at the receiving end as the entire village had benefited from at least one of the project inputs. Female committees were not aware of their role and details of project inputs and were not even active. They were engaged only in distribution of goods to female beneficiaries. They had almost negligible role in decision making.

Beneficiary Selection Criteria

Beneficiary selection was done on the basis of specific selection criteria designed for each input in order to include maximum number of deserving affected persons in this assistance and avoid duplication. This allowed CWW and its IPs to have a control over the delivery of inputs to various flood affected households. This mechanism was discussed and agreed among all the partners during an initial training exercise organized by CWW in Hyderabad. During this training

CWW and its IPs established specific criteria and modalities particularly for Cash Transfer components to ensure standardization across five IPs in two provinces. Technical experts within CWW in consultation with IPs in Punjab and Sindh developed guidelines to ensure smooth execution.

The evaluation team learnt during the course of evaluation that except for a few odd cases in Sindh, those who received the inputs were mostly selected as per the general criteria agreed. Farmers received the agriculture and livestock support as per the established quantities and specifications and those associated with off-farm livelihoods received income generation support as per the set criteria and standard. Most importantly unconditional cash grants were provided to disabled and widows and conditional cash grants were given to small entrepreneurs.

The discussions with the beneficiaries and village committees revealed that the committees selected beneficiaries based on the number of each input made available by the IPs. Since the Village Committee was being lead by the influential persons in each village hence the communities in some cases didn't question the decisions and accepted whatever was being offered. Some complaints were raised regarding nepotism by the village committees in both Sindh and Punjab but no concrete evidence could be provided and none of the complainants or those not satisfied with the village committees were not willing to testify. Most satisfactory selection process appeared to be carried out for the beneficiaries of unconditional cash grants and distribution of rice seeds and fertilizers. The evaluation team noted dissatisfaction among beneficiaries of poultry and goat packages and those of kitchen gardening inputs that were not clear why they were not selected for conditional cash grants for small enterprises or unconditional cash grants.

Standardization

Uniformity within the cash transfer component couldn't be achieved as anticipated and planned as the needs and local context were different from case to case basis. This was noticed particularly in case of transferring money to the beneficiaries of cash for work schemes. Payments were made to CFW beneficiaries both through cheques and in cash at a later stage.

Accountability and Complaint Mechanism

CWW team and its IPs were committed to the accountability and complaint mechanisms and the committee office bearers and beneficiaries were aware of the complaint system. The evaluation team learnt from the beneficiaries that the implementing partners had displayed contact numbers for senior management officials within CWW and its IPs during the course of project execution in each village and the beneficiaries were briefed about how the complaint mechanism worked. There had been complaints in both Sindh and Punjab particularly by the beneficiaries of poultry, goat and kitchen gardening and non beneficiaries which were seriously pursued by the CWW Punjab team and the country office programme team supporting this intervention.

One of the office bearer from the village committee in village Dhora Hajan, UC Kotla Mughlan in Tehsil Jampur District Rajanpur said, “The Social Mobilizer from Awaz Foundation told us that the project team was there to seek guidance from the village committee in determining priorities and taking decisions. This was highly encouraging as we had never thought that this organization will take our approvals, as no one had ever taken approvals from us”.

It was also observed that communities in most of the cases were not aware of the overall assistance provided in each village, particularly at the initial stages, which upon further inquiry turned out to be part of the strategy adopted by the partners to avoid conflicts and favouritism. Female committees were also unaware of the project details and beneficiary selection criteria, which indicates their limited involvement in decision making due to the local norms.

Effectiveness of the Assistance

Based on the analysis of information gathered from various ends, it will be safe to say that the overall assistance has been highly effective in providing a kick start to the recovery process of flood affected populations in the target areas. Approaches and modalities adopted have been reasonably successful in ensuring the communities receive inputs that have triggered early recovery of their livelihood activities. Farmers were able to cultivate their crops and initiate recovery of loss faced due to the floods. Provision of rice seed and fertilizer was highly effective as the farmers who received assistance would have missed the sowing season and would not be able to cultivate their fields. Agriculture inputs including cash for land preparation and toolkits was instrumental in reviving their source of income. Provision of fodder seed was also highly effective as it helped the communities in feeding their existing and new livestock which remains the most valuable asset whose breeding and growth is mostly dependent on fodder. Unconditional cash grant support to most vulnerable was also the most effective way of ensuring the inclusion of most vulnerable and marginalized sections of the community who deserved this assistance the most giving them the opportunity to survive and in some cases sustain themselves with dignity. Provision of inputs to women allowed them to initiate rebuilding of assets which itself indicates a positive growth at the household level. Artisans and small entrepreneurs were also able to restart their income generation which was halted by the floods.

Some concerns still need to be addressed such as instances of impartiality noticed within the village committees and lack of processes to ensure quality and accountability which play a crucial role in achieving the impact. The evaluation team is of the view that such processes can only be developed and ensured once the communities are active and have been effectively engaged through the process of mobilization which needs fair bit of time. Short term relief and recovery projects like the one under study do not allow enough time for setting up such mechanisms. CWW's Emergency Response and Preparedness Strategy for Pakistan provides a crucial plug-in in this scenario, which allows CWW and its IPs to engage with such communities in peace times. Detailed analysis over this is presented later in this report.

Impact

The overall impact of this assistance in the two Provinces is very positive as it has built a very positive image of the humanitarian community in the target areas. The approach and modalities adopted in delivering inputs to the flood affected populations, involvement of the communities in decision making and specific targeting of flood victims based on a range of criteria has provided an opportunity to these impoverished communities to set up impartial structures and support the most vulnerable members of the community.

Agriculture support had a huge immediate impact on the beneficiary households who were able to revive their agriculture through the assistance provided under this project. They were not forced to seek more loans or sell remaining assets and were able to cultivate their lands once again, though the profits were split between several priorities such as repair of shelter and return of existing loans.

Cash for work turned out to be a highly successful activity which provided labourers with skilled and unskilled labour at their door step and a decent daily wage rate. Income generated from this activity allowed them to buy food and meet other necessities of life especially health care. Quick Impact Study conducted by CWW in Sindh Province after the completion of project, during the month of January 2012 also suggests that the money earned by the labourers was utilised to meet their immediate household needs, including food and health care and was sufficient for a household in meeting food needs as per the WFP Food Basket standards. In return critical community infrastructure was repaired in most of the cases which will have long term impact over the communities if properly maintained. The impact may have been greater if the assistance had reached the calculated number of beneficiary labourers rather than a bigger number as the beneficiaries in Punjab didn't continue their work and were replaced in the middle of the repair work by new beneficiaries.

Livestock and poultry couldn't show any significant immediate impact due to substantially high mortality rate in poultry and goats, particularly in the sample villages. Nevertheless there were several instances in both Punjab and Sindh where women shared that their household assets and nutrition had a clear improvement after receiving goats and in a few cases poultry. Quick Impact Study also suggests that a large number of goats were pregnant and eventually gave birth to at least one kid. The families were found benefitting from the milk which provided a healthy contribution to the household nutrition.

Provision of conditional cash grants for revival of small enterprises also had a significant impact in most of the cases where the beneficiary households had a monthly increase of PKR 6000 to 7000, thereby allowing them to buy food for the household. This was also evident from the review of Quick Impact Study conducted in Sindh.



Zarina Bibi, a flood affected mother who lost her shop along with other assets in 2010 floods, belonging to Village Dhora Hajana, UC Kot Mughlan, Tehsil Jampur is grateful to CWW and AWAZcds for providing conditional cash grant. Through this little shop in her house she can earn some money and cover food and health needs of her household.

Zubaida, mother of 8 children, belonging to Village Hashim Khan Rustamani in District Dadu used to make floor mats using local straws before the 2010 floods. She received conditional cash grant of PKR 12,000 from Root Work Foundation, CWW's IP in Dadu to restart her enterprise. She shared that with this assistance she was able resume her work even on a bigger scale than before hence her income had also increased.



Most significant immediate impact was of the unconditional cash grants provided to most vulnerable households within each village, represented by physically challenged persons, widows, elderly etc. They were able to lead their lives with dignity as the

assistance allowed them to repair their shelters and revive their source of income. It also allowed the community to recognize their challenges and their existence and importance within the villages. Post Intervention Assessment conducted by CWW in Punjab towards the end of 2011 reveals that the recipients of the unconditional cash grants were highly vulnerable persons who were able to meet immediate health and food needs of their household with the help of this assistance. Quick Impact Study conducted in Sindh also suggests that the beneficiary selection was appropriate and the beneficiary households were able to meet their immediate food needs through this assistance.

Salma, 10 years old from Village Pir Bux Solangi was suffering from acute Thelacemia and required frequent blood transfusions. She belonged to an impoverished flood affected household and all her family income was spent on her treatment. Her family was given unconditional cash grant of PKR 10,000 with the help of which she was able to start her treatment.



Challenges

Contextual Analysis

These communities in the two provinces are impoverished and mostly landless merely surviving on subsistence basis. Agriculture and livestock is the mainstay of their economy which is dependent on loan mechanism where farmers take loans from the landlords and middle men and buy seeds and fertilizers and return these loans upon harvesting. Flood had devastating impact upon their lives and livelihoods and whatever assistance was provided, most of the communities willingly accepted. Since the committees were influenced by the local power holders, the communities didn't want to challenge their decisions. In this scenario the CWW and

its IPs were not in a position to challenge the local power structures. Since the relation between communities and the local IPs and CWW is a rather new arrangement hence it is very difficult to ensure impartiality within the village committees without proper time investment in community mobilization and organization. Short term relief and early recovery interventions do not allow such processes to take due time and course and minimum costs are spared for such activities which in fact form the foundations for neutral and impartial structures that allow correct targeting as per the criteria agreed achieving anticipated impact.

Beneficiary Selection

To avoid conflicts and as a mitigation strategy, the partners designed a multi phase approach on the basis of which small packages were distributed among beneficiaries first, while they took more time in verification of beneficiaries for cash grants. The partners adopt this approach to avoid community conflict and minimize influence by the local influential groups, which turned out to be successful to a limited extent.

Cash Transfer Mechanism

Problems related to accessing cash remained a challenge that resulted in beneficiaries leaving cash for work schemes. CWW and its IPs explored several options for smooth, transparent and dignified cash transfer mechanisms but eventually had to stick to a slightly less costly banking transfer system. The beneficiaries were given cheques which carried names of the beneficiaries and their NIC numbers. The banks would hand over the cash to the beneficiaries upon verifying the beneficiary name from the NIC. This required smooth and effective planning in order to allow a convenient system for the beneficiaries to access cash. Since the rush to meet the targets couldn't allow the IPs to spend more time in planning and the banks had a poor capacity to deal with such scale of visitors to the banks, beneficiaries greatly suffered in en-cashing their cheques. Repeated visits to the banks in case of expired NICs and confusions related to next of kin and long queues outside the banks discouraged the beneficiaries to continue cash for work schemes. Hence the CFW package designed for one household in some cases was split between two households, both in Sindh and Punjab. This compromised the anticipated impact as half of the total amount per beneficiary in such cases reached the intended beneficiary. In some other cases more than one male worked over cash for work schemes from the same household but shared an individual labourer's labour. This allowed the males of the household to continue other affairs of the household along with cash for work labour. This was approved by the implementing partners as the cash remained within the same household and two males from such household got the opportunity to get involved in the project activities.

Aid agencies have tried several cash transfer mechanisms within their livelihoods recovery programming across Pakistan in the past, using Pakistan Postal Services, Transfers through Mobile Phones, Banks, Vouchers etc. Disaster affected populations in most of the cases have difficulty in accessing cash from banks, hence mobile banking though a bit costly, but perhaps would be the safest, transparent and most dignified way of transferring cash to the beneficiaries.

7.3 Connectedness and Coherence

The discussions with the communities and IPs suggest that CWW has been quite successful in initiating recovery process in flood affected areas where it carried out relief operations together with its implementing partners. Nevertheless more efforts will be required to mobilize and organize communities and encourage them to take a leading role in continuing their recovery process.

As far as CWW and its IPs programme coverage are concerned it is always a challenge to cover all the needs and target all the affected population with such limited resources, even within a village. CWW and its IPs intended to target the most vulnerable and impoverished communities who had suffered in the 2010 floods. Such scenario raises a key question as to whether the aid agencies should strive to provide blanket assistance in each affected area, thereby targeting all the villages and all the households as all of them have been affected by the floods or ignore the rest and reach out only to the most vulnerable communities. This decision is only possible when the agencies have enough time to carry out detailed analysis and in the utmost commitment to the principles of accountability share the prioritization mechanism with the communities and secondary stakeholders for their buy in.

The humanitarian community and its coordination mechanisms including UN Cluster system and the local authorities also need to consider another challenge here faced by such communities and local IPs who directly interact with communities where assistance reaches to some in each village / UC and others are denied. In our attempt to target ONLY the most vulnerable communities due to our limited resources there is a risk that we deprive affected communities of aid coming from other agencies which would prefer to divert their assistance to other areas in order to avoid duplication or will be advised to do so by the humanitarian coordination mechanisms or local authorities. This further necessitates the need for detailed assessments / baselines to make sure that specific gaps are identified and covered. Such mechanisms are required where local authorities could ensure that gaps are filled and donors encouraged, to support agencies in plugging the gaps.

The evaluation team met with the key stakeholders including the district authorities, district line officers, Coordinators of alliances and consortia in Pakistan, the representative of UNDP and lead coordinator of community restoration cluster in Pakistan and found the coordination between the Concern and the government agencies and clusters and alliances as good. The community restoration cluster coordinator in Islamabad pointed out that it is better to consult the relevant cluster at the proposal development stage avoid any duplication in the project area. He was pleased to note that Concern has recently shared the proposal with the cluster before finalizing. The same is also reflected by the evaluation team's discussion with the District Coordination Officer Rajan Pur, who also emphasized the need to coordinate at the initial level, perhaps at the time of need assessment to focus on priority needs of the affected communities.

The Government and the UN cluster are promoting the complementarity of different NGOs working in a particular area. Concern Worldwide has also attended the meetings of UN clusters regularly. It has coordinated with the district government, on interventions in the project area. The cluster defined a mandatory format with key data to be filled by all organizations working in the sector.

Concern also joined the agricultural/ livelihood working group, chaired by the district government was established. Concern and its partners have used the UN clusters as a platform i.e. to agree on modalities such as wage to be paid for Cash for work interventions. So the coordination mechanism in place is a good platform to provide feedback to the district government on their policies and programmes.

On the other hand, it was observed that training and orientation could be done to facilitate the communities in a better way, as shared by Dr. Sikandar Ali, Poultry Development Officer at Dadu that there was no training component in the project for handling of the poultry. A basic information package could be extended in 1 to 2 hours session to the beneficiaries, where they could be told to vaccinate their poultry, identify symptoms of disease and administer basic medicine.

On the similar note, Dr Habibullah Jamali, District Livestock officer, in the same district was of the view that extensive collaboration is required on the local implementing partners and the International NGOs working in the district with the relevant government departments to facilitate the community. This would, according to him, ensure that no duplication is done and utilize the resource more efficiently and on the basis of immediate need of the community. When told about the breed of goats provided in Dadu in the project under evaluation, Dr Jamali said that the breed is not suitable to acclimatize to the local extreme weather condition, and is also vulnerable to contract fatal infections easily during pregnancy, as compared to cross breeds like Kamori. He further said that vaccination programmes run by government should be considered to provide long term linkages to the community. Commenting on the trainings, Dr Jamali mentioned that trainings should include components on how to mitigate risks of losing live stock during a disaster and how to rescue those during the rescue operation. This might also focus on storage of special fodder, to help the livestock to survive.

The livestock department in both Sindh and Punjab were of the view that further collaboration could be considered through linking the staff of government department for the vaccination programme in the project UCs, directly with the beneficiaries. He said that Concern should support this in the future projects. Similarly, Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed, District Livestock Officer, Jam Pur, Rajan Pur shared with the evaluation team the importance of coordination among the communities supported by Concern and its partners and the district line department. He mentioned that the department conducts farmers' days in the field. Perhaps the communities where Concern and its partners have distributed the livestock and poultry could be facilitated through the association with the department. He further said that the DRR sessions should focus on how to save livestock.

In Rajan Pur, the evaluation team also met with representative of district management, Agha Hussain Shah, District Officer Coordination, and found that Concern's partner here has close

liaison with the district administration. Most NGOs relied on district administration's data on need assessment. The district administration coordinated the efforts and facilitated inter-coordination between various NGOs/Departments. It has played an important part in overseeing how to reduce the occurrences of overlapping. It has also focused on sharing the information, and recourse on gaps identified by the NGOs in the coordination. He pointed out that there are some NGOs which do not engage the district line departments at the planning stage. The local NGOs have advantage as they have liaison with the government line department. But the important point according to him is to take input at the planning stage.

Discussions with CWW management and review of project related documents suggest that CWW Livestock experts designed specific guidelines in order to facilitate implementing partners in designing and implementing livestock component of the project. These guidelines took into consideration contextual analysis in terms of breed and livestock fodder and rearing needs in consultation with experts from local Government livestock departments and the communities in both the Provinces.

As far as future vulnerability of these communities is concerned, this DFID funded programme being evaluated has laid the foundation for an effective recovery of these communities through rebuilding their assets and reviving their income generation activities which will help these communities in building resilience against such disasters over the years to come. CWW with its commitment to support these communities in recovering from the effects of 2010 floods and reducing their future risks, has already initiated Community Based Disaster Risk Management programming in both Sindh and Punjab including the Districts targeted under this intervention. CWW and its IPs under this OFDA funded programme are working closely with a large number of communities who were affected by 2010 floods and aim to raise their awareness and capacity in local level disaster risk reduction and disaster management.

7.4 Relevance of Concern's Systems to Cope with Emergencies - HR, Finance, Procurement and Logistics System

CWW Pakistan Programme rolled out its Emergency Preparedness and Response Strategy in the country in 2006, which allowed CWW to identify disaster prone and vulnerable areas in the four provinces, establish linkages with local NGOs in such areas and initiate a capacity building effort in order to prepare and aware the communities for future disasters. CWW has signed MoUs with 36 local emergency partners across Pakistan including Sindh and Punjab and is providing support in mapping local hazards and risk reduction planning in disaster prone areas of Pakistan, including the Districts targeted under this initiative. Based on this Strategy CWW has established its programme support systems to facilitate local partners in managing disasters in a timely and effective manner.

The evaluation team feels that CWW and its IPs didn't have enough time particularly in Sindh Province to establish an effective relationship in order to streamline the processes and achieve the results and the immediate impact as the presence of CWW programme team in Sindh is more recent. CWW has enhanced its capacity in livelihoods recovery programming over the

years but CWW Sindh programme still needs more time to transfer skills to their partners and benefit from the previous learning.

With its strategic vision and commitment to reduce risk and vulnerability of disaster prone and affected populations in Sindh and Punjab in an effective manner, CWW has invested tremendously over the years in building its internal capacity in key sectors such as Agriculture and Livestock, Cash Transfer Programming, Shelter and WASH. Hence now CWW has dedicated technical experts on board both at the Country Office in Islamabad and in the Regional Offices in Sindh and Punjab to provide technical assistance and backstopping to local implementing partners in emergency relief and recovery operations. During the execution of this project under evaluation, these teams also acted as a bridge between national and District level sectoral clusters and coordination mechanisms and between local authorities and CWW IPs in seeking technical advice on specifications and modalities from multiple sources within key sectors and based on their own technical expertise seeking consensus and ensuring standardization, addressing local challenges and enhancing quality across CWW programmes in the two Provinces.

These experts within CWW ensured that the agricultural inputs and fodder seeds provided by CWW and its IPs were as per the *Kharif* Package determined by the Agriculture and Food Security working group, validated by the evaluation team in the sampled villages. These experts were able to provide guidance to the IPs through the guidelines that they developed in consultation with local communities and authorities in effective execution.

As far as partnership is concerned, CWW has established partnerships with five local NGOs in the target areas under this project. As per CWW Partnership Policy, CWW strongly believes in working alongside emergent structures and processes to achieve benefits which continue after CWW's departure. CWW believes that partnerships help to develop strong local institutions which, representing to government the needs of extremely poor people, can be agents of long-term change within their own societies. With this understanding CWW invests in capacity building of its partners. CWW has been working with these IPs in the past, to some extent in response to the floods in 2010. Direct relationship with these partners under this project is a more recent phenomenon but CWW has already started building their capacity. Under this intervention partners were involved in bulk procurements handled by CWW at the National and Provincial level. Each partner was represented in the procurement committees to ensure transparency and provide learning opportunity to these partners. Apart from this CWW technical and sector specialists provided hands on support to IP staff on ground which was quite effective.

Currently CWW is engaging the same partners to continue CBDRM in the same and adjacent communities which will further refine their mutual understanding and this relationship where CWW will transfer technical and management skills to these local IPs in a more effective manner.

7.5 Incorporation of Lessons or Recommendations from previous Emergencies into the Response

A few models were evolved in Pakistan, to respond to emergency and recovery needs of the affected populations. An overview is given here to assess the extent to which the lessons or recommendations from these models are incorporated into the response, in the project under evaluation.

The CBHA consortium: The CBHA consortium in Pakistan has 6 affiliated agencies⁴ which were funded by the DFID, for the implementation of an early recovery programme. The programme started in December 2010 and ended in August 2011.

Alliance 2015: The alliance was formed in 2000 among 7 European NGOs⁵ The 5 members of the alliance 2015 (Welthungerhilfe, Concern Worldwide, ACTED, People in Need, Cesvi), with their Country Offices in Pakistan proposed a joint proposal to ECHO who funded 3 Alliance 2015 emergency or early recovery multi sector projects.

Pakistan Emergency Food Security Alliance (PEFSA): ECHO led 6 European NGOs⁶ for the emergency response, for a funding of USD 20 M. The alliance was coordinated through a coordinator hosted by Oxfam GB. This ECHO funded emergency operation has been followed by an early recovery operation implemented under the same alliance model (PEFSA II). A third phase of the alliance (PEFSA III) is shortly due.

It was noted during the implementation of the CBHA project that due to limitation of inputs, many deserving communities had to be excluded. It was also observed that the targeted beneficiaries didn't quite match eligibility criteria. While the inputs based on straight forward criteria such as agriculture inputs seem to have been more accurately targeted.

The beneficiaries targeting remained an issue in the project under evaluation, due to limitation of the inputs, leading to conflict within the community at some places over the distribution of agri and livestock inputs.

Similarly, the livestock distribution and particularly poultry distribution had not been a great success, under the CBHA. Mortality was high during and after transport for most agencies. This led to serious issues with the sustainability of the activity. On the similar note, the beneficiaries in the project under evaluation mentioned to the evaluation team many instances of high mortality among their livestock (both goats and poultry), in Punjab and Sindh. While livestock was vaccinated and quarantined, prior to distribution both in Punjab and Sindh by the implementing partners in the project under evaluation, to avoid any widespread epidemic. But

⁴ The 6 agencies in the CBHA consortium in Pakistan were Action Against Hunger, CARE International, Concern Worldwide, International Rescue Committee, Oxfam and Save the Children

⁵ These 7 NGOs are Cesvi, Concern Worldwide, Welthungerhilfe, Hivos, IBIS, People in Need and ACTED

⁶ The NGOs in the PEFSA alliance are Save the Children, ACF, CARE International, IRC, ACTED and Oxfam

due to project being in the early recovery stage, trainings were hardly taken on safe keeping of the livestock. This could also be one of the reason, the poultry and goats were not able to survive, at some places.

It was further noted in the activities under the CBHA, that a majority of direct beneficiaries were male, and they received a greater amount of resources since women have generally been targeted by lower value transfers. It was suggested to innovate the activities to include women, but this has not brought any major difference in approach in the project under evaluation. Women were targeted in kitchen gardening activities, unconditional grants and distribution of livestock goats and poultry. While they could not be included in large numbers in the conditional grants, cash for work activity and restoration of small businesses, at the community level.

Another shortcoming during the earlier response and recovery phase by humanitarian actors in Pakistan was the dearth of quality needs assessment done by agencies, to which the scale of the disaster, and the urgency to quickly deliver assistance limited the agencies to focus on needs assessment. While baseline reports could prove very useful tool to evaluate programme outcomes and establish clear and immediate needs the project under evaluation could not carry out a detailed needs assessment and a baseline at the start of the project. This posed challenge in measuring the programme outcomes, in the absence of benchmarks.

The cash transfers, cash for work, etc. under the CBHA were appreciated widely, due to the flexibility. The same was also applied in the project under evaluation as the cash based interventions, such as cash for work, conditional and unconditional grants were much appreciated by the beneficiaries, as these contributed to cover the immediate needs of the beneficiaries. Moreover, the field data suggested that small business development grants have effectively supported to resume small non agri-based businesses, such as barbers, small retailers businesses, etc. at the local level.

8. Lessons Learnt

Some of the key lessons learnt are as under:

- *Bottom up planning is extremely important. Opinions of beneficiaries in planning and execution is of paramount importance*

The evaluation team is of the opinion that programme development is a process that involves buy in from the communities and local authorities. This intervention under study was designed after a very useful consultation with various stakeholders at the local level. Hence the overall frame of programme is highly relevant and appropriate to the context. It appears that time constraints made it very difficult for CWW and its IPs to carry out a thorough planning process with the involvement of local level primary and secondary stakeholders. This is where some challenges were met during the course of implementation. In the emergency context it becomes very difficult to strike a balance between the degree of participation of the programme participants and timely delivery of key inputs in order to achieve effective outputs.

- *In-depth livelihoods assessment / baseline is highly essential in order to understand priorities and underlying issues*

Baselines and detailed assessments are the foundation of programming, ideally the first step in the programme cycle. In order to set benchmarks for assessing outcome and impact, the project must build a baseline at the outset of project designing. Detailed assessments, particularly livelihoods analysis in this case becomes extremely important to understand local preferences and priorities and underlying logic behind these preferences. This is easier said than done, particularly in an emergency context where huge procurements are involved and delivery of inputs is often bound by the local seasonal calendars. The evaluation team understands that in this context there is a huge responsibility upon the local Government to work more closely with the local civil society in establishing the baselines and detailed needs assessments and support the affected communities in drawing their own recovery plans. UN Clusters and INGOs need to provide technical and coordination support to such processes in order to utilize time and resources in an efficient manner and ensure timely completion of this crucial process which then may trigger recovery programming. Donors need to support such processes which would result in setting up realistic targets and benchmarks, leading to more measurable and sustainable impact upon the achievement of each recovery plan at the community level.

- *More investment is required on HAP and community mobilization / organization and impartiality which will allow a greater impact*

The evaluation team understands that early recovery involves processes which are often not considered in a purely relief setting. These processes are put in place to ensure quality and accountability into programming which eventually allows achieving intended impact. Since early recovery programming is also significantly time pressed, hence initiation of such processes is crucial but must not hinder the quick delivery of inputs that are urgently required by the end user within a specific timeframe. The evaluation team feels that INGOs and Donors need to invest

more on exploring ways to ensure that fast track systems are in place which satisfy processes that do not compromise timely delivery of inputs in a post disaster early recovery setting. An innovative communication strategy within the programme frame would be one such investment that may guide the implementation teams in adopting various ways to sensitize and mobilize communities and seek quick consensus from a just representation of the communities who may be able to take on the execution of these processes themselves in a transparent way while staying accountable to the local authorities. The other investment is clearly the process outlined in CWW's Emergency Preparedness and Response Strategy that suggests pre-emptive measures such as preparedness for an effective response and early recovery in multiple sectors in most vulnerable disaster prone areas.

- *Fewer inputs and huge difference between various packages encourages favouritism within the communities*

The evaluation team is of the view that aid organizations such as CWW and local civil society are caught up in a situation where coverage, broad beneficiary base and per beneficiary cost become significant criteria in order to deliver a cost effective intervention as well as attempting to cover all realistic and dire needs of the communities. This results into trade-offs between the two and eventually agencies target fewer households in more villages and more Union Councils. This creates pressures particularly upon the local implementing organizations and village committees to meet the expectations of the communities, in cases where everyone is disaster affected. Beneficiary selection criteria are developed to streamline and justify the delivery but since early recovery programming doesn't have enough time and resources to put in extra efforts in community mobilization, hence communities' expectations remain high resulting into conflicts or manipulation, particularly when one input is more attractive than the other. This requires a much better understanding of the donors and needs effective planning and geographic coordination among humanitarian actors and local authorities to make sure that such assistance covers the needs of the communities as per the village recovery plan, without leaving huge gaps.

9. Recommendations

1. CWW is strongly recommended to provide technical assistance to IPs in community organization and mobilization.
2. There is a clear need to set-up improved Monitoring and Review systems which allows CWW teams to regularly assess the processes along with output tracking.
3. It is advisable that the procurements should be done from the target Districts if the capacity exists, as it will strengthen the local economy.
4. CWW is suggested to try Village Fairs and Cash Vouchers in future which may be more effective in supporting the local economy and providing more choice to the beneficiaries.
5. It is recommended that Cash Transfer mechanisms through banks should be further improved keeping humanitarian imperative as a priority over cost to transfer money.
6. Livelihoods recovery should continue in the target communities.
7. CBDRM needs to be initiated in all affected areas.

10. Annexes

10.1. Evaluation TORs

Terms of Reference

Final Evaluation of Concern's Livelihoods Recovery Project for Flood Affected Populations in Sindh & Punjab, Pakistan Funded by UK Department for International Development (DFID)

1. Background

Concern Worldwide is an international, non-governmental, humanitarian organization dedicated to the reduction of suffering and working towards the ultimate elimination of extreme poverty in the world's poorest countries. Concern has been operational in Pakistan since 2001, when it initiated an emergency response programme to address the Afghan refugee crisis on the border with Afghanistan. Concern later moved into long-term development programming in the provinces of Balochistan, Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) Province. Over the last ten years, apart from the Afghan refugee influx, Concern has responded to a range of disasters, such as the 2003 and 2004 earthquakes in the Northern areas/KPK, repeated flooding in Balochistan and Sindh, the massive earthquake in KPK/Kashmir in October 2005 and the 2009 Conflict/IDPs crisis in KPK and the devastating floods of 2010 and 2011. Concern has strategically committed itself to effectively responding to emergencies both within and outside our main areas of operation, especially where there is a shortfall in the overall level of response to extreme need. In 2007, Concern developed an Emergency Preparedness and Response Strategy for Pakistan. Under this strategy, Concern selected local NGOs in hazard prone districts of Pakistan as emergency response Partners. Concern has provided relevant capacity building support to these Partners in conducting rapid needs assessments, disaster management, implementing Sphere Standards and strengthening systems (finance, logistics etc.). This strategy is a central pillar in Concern's ability to leverage emergency response in Pakistan and has proven to be an effective approach to rapid emergency response on the ground.

Concern Response to the Pakistan 2010 Floods: Since the onset of the floods in July 2010, Concern has responded to the urgent humanitarian and time critical early recovery needs of the flood affected population. Concern has targeted over two million people through its relief and recovery projects in the sectors of Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), Health, Shelter, Agriculture & Food Security and Livelihoods support in the worst affected districts of KPK, Punjab, Sindh and Baluchistan Provinces.

Aiming to address the time critical early recovery needs, Concern implemented a Livelihoods Recovery Project (March – December 2011) for the Flood Affected Populations in Sindh & Punjab, Pakistan. The overall objective of the project was *“to provide an integrated response and assistance to the needs of affected population in Pakistan”*. The specific objective was *to ensure that flood affected targeted populations have access to goods, services and support allowing for a return to normality*. The specific objectives of the project were:

1. To ensure that targeted households have increased levels of self-subsistence livelihood support through income generation;
2. To ensure that targeted households have increased levels of self-subsistence agricultural support;
3. To ensure that targeted households have increased levels of self-subsistence support for livestock.

Concern implemented this project in partnership with five local NGO Partners; Research and Development Foundation (RDF), Root Work Foundation (RWF), Pakistan Fisher Folk Forum (PFF), Awaz Foundation and Help Foundation.

As set out in the agreement with the DFID, and in line with Concern's own policy to promote accountability for performance, an end of project evaluation has been planned to evaluate the project and extract the key lessons to improve the quality of future emergency programming.

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to evaluate the early recovery response project with particular emphasis on appropriateness, timeliness, efficiency and effectiveness of the interventions carried out and to extract the lessons/recommendations to enhance the quality of on-going early recovery and future programming by Concern and our partners.

Following are the main questions to look into throughout the evaluation;

2.1 Relevance

- Did we choose the right response in the right areas and in the right way?
- Were there areas – geographic or programmatic – that were not covered by others?
- Were the most vulnerable and poorest targeted appropriately?
- Was the targeting criteria communicated and understood by all members within the community?
- To what extent were targeted households and communities involved in the needs assessment, design, and implementation of the response? How satisfied are the communities with the response?
- How well have we worked with our local NGO partners? What were the challenges encountered?
- How well did the project integrate with and gain advantage from the pre-floods and relief programme capacity and knowledge?

2.2 The quality, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the response

- Did the response achieve what it set out to do?
- Were humanitarian standards met? (Sphere, HAP, Codes of conduct)?
- Was the response timely, appropriate and cost effective? Were the operational systems put in place by Concern and Partners effective in ensuring this?
- Were affected communities able to participate in the design and planning of the interventions?
- Did interventions identify and target specific vulnerable groups (women, the disabled, and children)?
- To what extent are the interventions improving the condition of affected communities?
- How well did the response mainstream/integrate equality/equity, disaster risk reduction (DRR), HIV & AIDS, and the environment?
- To what extent was the 'accountability to the beneficiaries' promoted and what progress was made against the achievement of HAP (Humanitarian Accountability Partnership) principles/benchmarks. To what extent did we follow up with complaints?
- To what extent did Concern have the capacity, systems and procedures, sufficient human resources and appropriate level of preparedness to facilitate a rapid and appropriate response?
- Were the needs assessments, monitoring, evaluation systems and indicators used appropriate?

2.3 Connectedness and coherence

- Did the responses reduce future vulnerabilities?
- Did the short-term emergency activities take longer-term issues into account?
- Did the mid-term early recovery activities build successfully on the short-term emergency assistance programmes previously implemented by Concern and its Partners?

2.4 Relevance of Concern's systems to cope with a major sudden onset emergency – HR, Finance, Procurement and Logistics systems

- Was appropriate staff deployed in a timely manner?

- Were systems adaptable to an emergency of this scale - were the systems followed?

2.5 The extent to which ‘lessons’ or recommendations from previous emergencies were incorporated into this response

- Assess the extent and effectiveness of coordination between the Alliance2015 partners and other international NGOs, the relevant Consortium of British Humanitarian Agencies (CBHA), the UN system and government organisations.
- To what extent were the lessons identified from the previous emergency responses in Pakistan (EQ 2005, Floods 2007, and IDPs 2009) and elsewhere in the world applied to this response?

2.6 Identify lessons to be learned to inform the future emergency responses of Concern

- Identify examples of best practices in ‘what has worked well’ and ‘what has not worked well’.

3. Methodology

The evaluation methodology should include:

- Review of relevant secondary data – e.g. proposals, donor reports, and case studies. Meet and/or interview Concern’s key staff and local NGO staff.
- Use of appropriate tools and interview/focus groups discussions. The process should be participatory to the extent possible and should involve all stakeholders in the response.
- Field visits to target areas and collection of primary information. The evaluation should also look, where applicable, at the quality of the available data (baseline, end-line, progress reports). Given that this is an emergency project and in cases, where the secondary data, collected over the life of the project, is not available, the consultant has to adopt the methodology to take into account that factor as well.
- Debriefing and / or presentation to key staff on key findings and recommendations
- Submission of the draft evaluation report to Concern for feedback.
- Incorporation of Concern’s feedback in the draft report.
- Submission of the final report.

4. Outputs

The evaluation will produce 3 sets of outputs, as follows:

1. A meeting/presentation to disseminate key (draft) findings to Concern and its Partners.
2. A detailed report in hard and soft form (of no more than 30 pages, in Microsoft Word using Arial font 12). The report must include; Basic Information (1 page), Executive Summary (2-5 pages), Background/introduction (1 page), the evaluation methodology, Findings from the evaluation in relation to the issues noted under serial number 2 above, one page summary of recommendations/lessons indicating with how recommendations/lessons should be incorporated and with whom should be shared. The report should also consider the feedback provided on the draft report and feedback during the presentation of findings meeting. The recommendations from the final evaluation should be targeted.
3. The Annexes to be attached with the report; Evaluation ToRs, Names & contact details of the evaluators along with a signed declaration of their independence from the programme team, Evaluation schedule, List of persons interviewed and sites visited, Documents consulted, Data collection tools and raw data.

5. Duration

The consultant will complete the work over a period of twenty three (20) working days beginning with the acceptance of the final report.

Activity	Number of Days	
Initial meetings/briefing		2
Document review, meetings, data collection, travel		12
Analysis, Draft report, Final report, Debriefing		6

10.2. The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team comprised 3 core team members and 5 field staff members.

Luqman Ahmed, Evaluation Expert, led the evaluation team. His main responsibilities were to finalize the evaluation report, with the focus on feedback over achievement and quality of intervention from local authorities and stakeholders, effectiveness of coordination with the stakeholders, etc., understanding coherence and connectedness.

Dr Farman Ali, Agriculture & Food Security Expert, contributed toward evaluation of the project interventions, with the focus on Relevance, Appropriateness, targeting, community participation, inclusion of vulnerable, effectiveness, timeliness, impact, connectedness and coherence, incorporating lessons from the past, best practices.

Zulqarnain Malik, Recovery Programming Expert led on data analysis issues, including designing the tools, data analysis, training and coordination with the field teams, and drafting the report. His focus was mainly on project management, partnership, operational systems, adherence to standards, quality and accountability, Cross cutting themes and Relevance of Concern's systems.

A team of 5 field staff (3 female and 2 male) was engaged in Dadu & Jamshoro (Sindh) and Rajanpur (Punjab) for collection of field level data, through FGDs and SSIs. The field staff comprised **Sadia Pervaiz**, **Shaista Urooj Mughal**, **Faisal Khan** in Dadu & Jamshoro, Sindh and **Sehresh Mazhar** and **Shafique Ahmad** in Ranjanpur, Punjab.

10.3. Declaration of the independence of the Evaluation Team from the Programme Team

Declaration of the independence of the Evaluation Team from the Programme Team

It is certified that the evaluation team remained independent from the project management and implementation of project under evaluation. The evaluation team is free from influence, and has full authority to submit the evaluation findings to the commissioning agency.

It is further submitted that the evaluation team has independently evaluated the project as per scope, and contents in the terms of reference, and has also independently presented the evaluation report to the commissioning agency.

The evaluation team, led by the lead consultant has not been involved in policy-setting, design, implementation or management of the project under evaluation.

Luqman Ahmed

Lead Consultant

Ideas for Life Trust

10.4. Evaluation Schedule

EVALUATION SCHEDULE BY IDEAS FOR LIFE TRUST
Livelihoods Recovery for Flood Affected Populations in Sindh & Punjab, Pakistan

S#	Date	Task	Responsibility
1	08 / 03 / 2012 09 / 03 / 2012	Develop Draft Toolkit for data collection Share with Concern for finalization	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain
2	10 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Dadu	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain
3	10 / 03 / 2012	Training of the Evaluation Team at Dadu	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain
4	11 / 03 / 2012 To 14 / 03 / 2012	Data collection in Dadu & Jamshoro IPs & Communities	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain Field Team
5	11 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Dadu	Mr. Luqman
6	12 / 03 / 2012 13 / 03 / 2012	Data collection in Dadu & Jamshoro District Level Stakeholders	Mr. Luqman
7	12 / 03 / 2012	1) Meeting with Root Work Foundation 2) Meeting with Pakistan Fisher Folk Forum 3) Meeting with RDF	Zulqarnain
8	13 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Islamabad	Mr. Luqman
9	14 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Multan	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain
10	14 / 03 / 2012	Training of the Evaluation Team at Multan	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain
11	15 / 03 / 2012	Meet with Programme Team in Multan	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain
12	15 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Rajanpur – Kot Mithan	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain Field Team
13	15 / 03 / 2012	Meeting with CBHA / PEFSA Coordinator	Mr. Luqman
14	16 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Multan & onward to Rajanpur	Mr. Luqman
15	17 / 03 / 2012	Data collection in Rajanpur District Level Stakeholders	Mr. Luqman
16	16 / 03 / 2012 To 18 / 03 / 2012	Data collection in Rajanpur IPs & Communities	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain Field Team
17	18 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Islamabad	Dr. Farman Mr. Luqman
18	19 / 03 / 2012	1) Meeting with Help Foundation 2) Meeting with Awaz Foundation	Zulqarnain
19	19 / 03 / 2012	Travel to Islamabad	Zulqarnain
20	21 / 03 / 2012	Meeting with Concern Management to discuss Concern's Systems	Zulqarnain
21	21 / 03 / 2012 22 / 03 / 2012	Data analysis	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain

			Mr. Luqman
22	27 / 03 / 2012	Debriefing with Concern	Dr. Farman Zulqarnain Mr. Luqman
23	28 / 03 / 2012	Evaluation Report First Draft to be shared with Concern	Mr. Luqman
24	31 / 03 / 2012	Evaluation Report Second Draft to be shared with Concern	Mr. Luqman

10.5. List of Persons Interviewed and Sites Visited

S#	Date	Name of the Person	Organization /Community
1	12/03/2012	Dr. Sikandar Ali	Poultry Development Officer, Dadu
2	12/03/2012	Dr. Habib Ullah Jamali	District Livestock Officer, Dadu
3	13/03/2012	Mr. Dodo Khan Leghari	Executive District Officer, Agriculture, Jamshoro
4	13/03/2012	Dr. Sabir Hussain Shah	District Livestock Officer, Jamshoro
5	17/03/2012	Agha Hussain Shah	District Officer Coordination, Rajan Pur
6	17/03/2012	Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed	District Livestock Officer, Jam Pur, Rajan Pur
7	20/03/2012	Asma Kiran	CBHA Coordinator, PEFSA Coordinator, Oxfam GB
8	28/03/2012	Hidayat Ullah Khan	Community Restoration Coordinator, UNDP

10.6. Documents Consulted

- 1) Project Proposal
- 2) Partners Progress Reports
- 3) Beneficiary Details
- 4) Quick Impact Study Report by CWW – Sindh
- 5) Post Intervention Assessment Report by CWW – Punjab
- 6) Cash Transfer Guidelines
- 7) Guidelines for CFW
- 8) Guidelines for Agriculture activities
- 9) Guidelines for Livestock activities
- 10) Field Monitoring Visit Report
- 11) Review & Planning MoMs
- 12) Complaint Response Mechanism
- 13) CWW Partnership Policy
- 14) Agriculture & Food Security Working Group – Guidelines

10.7. Data Collection Tools

S#	Type of Tool	Type of Respondent	Number	Total
1	FGDs	Direct Male Beneficiaries	1 / Sample Village	10
2	FGDs	Direct Female Beneficiaries	1 / Sample Village	10
3	FGDs	Village Committees	1 / Sample Village	10
4	FGDs	Non Beneficiaries (Males)	1 / Sample Village	10
5	FGDs	Non Beneficiaries (Females)	1 / Sample Village	10
6	Case Studies	Direct Beneficiaries (Male or Female)	Income Generation Support Agriculture Support Livestock Support	5
7	SSIs	CWW Project Staff		7
8	SSIs	IP Project Staff		10
9	SSIs	DCO / ACO / DOC / DDMA		1
10	SSIs	Agricultures & Livestock officers		4
11	SSIs	CBHA / PEFSA		2

FGD Guide – Direct Male / Female Beneficiaries

Name of District / UC / Village:	Total No. of HHs in the village:
Total No. of Beneficiary HHs in the village:	

Participants:

1. Targeting, Relevance, Appropriateness & Timeliness

- a) Which UCs were severely affected by the flood? How and when was your UC and village affected?
- b) What were the immediate needs of the communities in the post flood situation prior to this project's implementation?
- c) Which agencies provided assistance in your village and what kind?
- d) To what extent were those needs met and by whom?
- e) What assistance was provided to your village by CWW / IPs under this Project?
 - i. How much cash was received by each beneficiary under CFW?
 - ii. How much cash was received by each beneficiary under restoration of small enterprises?
 - iii. How much cash was received by each extremely vulnerable / poor household / beneficiary under unconditional cash grant?
 - iv. What on & non farm community infrastructure schemes were restored?
 - v. What agriculture inputs were given to small landholders?
 - vi. What inputs were given for kitchen gardening?
 - vii. What inputs were given under livestock support?
- f) Was it according to the needs? Was this a timely assistance?
- g) Are you aware of any selection criteria developed for beneficiary selection? If yes, can you provide some of the basic details? Was it applied?
- h) Were the most vulnerable (Disabled, Poorest, Widows, Orphans, elderly people) targeted appropriately?
- i) How does the community view this project compared to other post floods interventions in the community?
- j) What in your opinion worked very well within this project and what should change about it and why?

- k) Are you/other beneficiaries satisfied with the assistance provided? If not why and what would you recommend for future?
- l) Have you been able to spend more on basic needs for your household after engaging in cash for work activities?
- m) In case of restoration of on & non-farm infrastructure schemes, what type of construction material was used and how was it procured? Who gave technical assistance in designing and execution?
- n) What process was followed to implement these small scale schemes in your village?
- o) What was community's contribution?

2. Quality & Accountability, effectiveness, Immediate Impact & Sustainability

- a. How was Village Committee formed?
- b. What was the role of Village Committee in implementation of this project?
- c. Did Village Committee represent the entire village?
- d. Who decided that the assistance provided was community's priority need?
- e. What was the process for community input into decision making regarding need and assistance prioritization? What was women's involvement in prioritization? Were any considerations made to benefit vulnerable groups?
- f. Were any vulnerable individuals in the village involved in prioritizing community needs and type of assistance?
- g. Who selected the beneficiaries in your village? Was the community involved in beneficiary identification?
- h. Are you satisfied with the process adopted with need identification, prioritization of type of intervention and beneficiary selection? If not why and what would you recommend for future?
- i. Are you / other beneficiaries satisfied with the performance of Village Committee? Was there any manipulation in selection of beneficiaries or favoritism noticed?
- j. How was your community informed about this CWW / IPs implemented project?
- k. Did the project team provide details of assistance to the community, prior to its implementation?
- l. Were there any conflicts raised during project implementation?
- m. Do you know of any complaints by the community regarding project implementation? If yes, were they raised? If yes, with whom? Was any action taken? Was it satisfactory?
- p) Were any operation & maintenance trainings provided to the community? Is maintenance of community infrastructure schemes (restored under this project) being done? If yes, who is doing the maintenance?
- q) Do you think Village Committee will take ownership and responsibility for regular maintenance of these schemes in future?
- r) Has there been any immediate impact from this project in terms of improvement in income of individual households? (such as improved crops in case of restoration of irrigation channels or provision of inputs etc.)
- s) Did this project create any difference in reducing challenges to the affected populations in the post flood context and allow return to normality?
- t) Has cash assistance empowered women in the village?
- u) Did women utilize the money from CFW or unconditional cash grants, themselves or was it eventually in control of males of the household?
- v) Do you think the Village Committee will continue working in the collective interests of the community?
- w) Did the project facilitate establishment of linkages between Village Committees and Government Line Departments such as Agriculture Department, Civil Works, irrigation department, livestock department, while implementing this project? Will these continue to strengthen and benefit the community?

FGD Guide – Male / Female Non Beneficiaries

Name of District / UC / Village:	Total No. of HHs in the village:
Total No. of Beneficiary HHs in the village:	

Participants:

1. Targeting, Relevance, Appropriateness & Timeliness

- a) Which UCs were severely affected by the flood? How and when was your UC and village affected?
- b) What were the immediate needs of the communities in the post flood situation prior to this project's implementation?
- c) Which agencies provided assistance in your village and what kind?
- d) To what extent were those needs met and by whom?
- e) What assistance was provided to your village by CWW / IPs under this Project?
- f) Was it according to the needs? Was this a timely assistance?
- g) Are you aware of any selection criteria developed for beneficiary selection? If yes, can you provide some of the basic details? Was it applied?
- h) Why you were not selected for this assistance?
- i) Did you get assistance from other agencies? What and how much?
- j) Were the most vulnerable (Disabled, Poorest, Widows, Orphans, elderly people) targeted appropriately under CWW / IP implemented project?
- k) Are beneficiaries satisfied with the assistance provided? If not why and what would you recommend for future?

2. Quality & Accountability, effectiveness, Immediate Impact & Sustainability

- n. How was Village Committee formed?
- o. What was the role of Village Committee in implementation of this project?
- p. Did Village Committee represent the entire village?
- q. Are all members of the Village Committee, direct beneficiaries of the project?
- r. Who decided that the assistance provided was community's priority need?
- s. Were any vulnerable individuals in the village involved in prioritizing community needs and type of assistance?
- t. Who selected the beneficiaries in your village? Was the community involved in beneficiary identification?
- u. Are you satisfied with the process adopted with need identification, prioritization of type of intervention and beneficiary selection? If not why and what would you recommend for future?
- v. Are you / other beneficiaries satisfied with the performance of Village Committee? Was there any manipulation in selection of beneficiaries or favoritism noticed?
- w. How was your community informed about this CWW / IPs implemented project?
- x. Did the project team provide details of assistance to the community, prior to its implementation?
- y. Were there any conflicts raised during project implementation?
- z. Do you know of any complaints by the community regarding project implementation? If yes, were they raised? If yes, with whom? Was any action taken? Was it satisfactory?
- l) Has there been any immediate impact from this project in terms of improvement in income of individual households? (such as improved crops in case of restoration of irrigation channels or provision of inputs etc.)
- m) Did this project create any difference in reducing challenges to the affected populations in the post flood context and allow return to normality?
- n) Did women utilize the money from CFW or unconditional cash grants, themselves or was it eventually in control of males of the household?

FGD Guide – Village Committees

Name of District / UC / Village:	Total No. of HHs in the village:
Total No. of Beneficiary HHs in the village:	

Participants:

1. Targeting, Relevance, Appropriateness & Timeliness

- a) Which UCs were severely affected by the flood? How and when was your UC and village affected?
- b) What were the immediate needs of the communities in the post flood situation prior to this project's implementation?
- c) Which agencies provided assistance in your village and what kind?
- d) To what extent were those needs met and by whom?
- e) What assistance was provided to your village by CWW / IPs under this Project?
 - a. How much cash was received by each beneficiary under CFW?
 - b. How much cash was received by each beneficiary under restoration of small enterprises?
 - c. How much cash was received by each extremely vulnerable / poor household / beneficiary under unconditional cash grant?
 - d. What on & non farm community infrastructure schemes were restored?
 - e. What agriculture inputs were given to small landholders?
 - f. What inputs were given for kitchen gardening?
 - g. What inputs were given under livestock support?
 - h. Was it according to the needs? Was this a timely assistance?
 - i. Are you aware of any selection criteria developed for beneficiary selection? If yes, can you provide some of the basic details? Was it applied?
- f) Were the most vulnerable (Disabled, Poorest, Widows, Orphans, elderly people) targeted appropriately?
- g) What were the key challenges, gaps and risks with beneficiary targeting, how were those addressed and how should it be done in future?
- h) How does the community view this project compared to other post floods interventions in the community?
- i) Are you/other beneficiaries satisfied with the assistance provided? If not why and what would you recommend for future?
- j) What process was followed to implement project activities?
 - i. CFW
 - ii. Restoration of small enterprises
 - iii. Unconditional cash grant
 - iv. Restoration of on & non farm community infrastructure schemes
 - v. Provision of agriculture inputs
 - vi. Inputs for kitchen gardening
 - vii. Inputs for livestock support
 - viii. Trainings on DRR & Nutrition
- k) What was community's contribution in the above activities?

2. Quality & Accountability, effectiveness, Immediate Impact & Sustainability

- a. How was Village Committee formed?
- b. What was the structure of Village Committee?
- c. Are all members of the Committee direct beneficiaries of the project?
- d. Did Village Committee represent the entire village?
- e. Who decided that the assistance provided was community's priority need?
- f. What was the process for community input into decision making regarding need and assistance prioritization? What was women's involvement in prioritization? Were any considerations made to benefit vulnerable groups?
- g. Were any vulnerable individuals in the village involved in prioritizing community needs and type of assistance?
- h. Who selected the beneficiaries in your village? Was the community involved in beneficiary identification?
- i. Are beneficiaries satisfied with the performance of Village Committee? Was there any manipulation in selection of beneficiaries or favoritism noticed?

- j. What was the role of Village Committee in implementation of this project?
- k. How Village Committee monitored the project activities?
- l. Did Village Committee receive any training? What type of training was received?
- m. How was your community informed about this CWW / IPs implemented project?
- n. Did the project team provide details of assistance to the community, prior to its implementation?
- o. Were there any conflicts raised during project implementation?
- p. Do you know of any complaints by the community regarding project implementation? If yes, were they raised? If yes, with whom? Was any action taken? Was it satisfactory?
- q. Is maintenance of community infrastructure schemes (restored under this project) being done? If yes, who is doing the maintenance?
- r. Has the Village Committee been involved in any communal activities after the closure of the project, such as maintenance of any of the schemes?
- s. Do you think Village Committee will take ownership and responsibility for regular maintenance of these schemes in future?
- t. Has there been any immediate impact from this project in terms of improvement in income of individual households? (such as improved crops in case of restoration of irrigation channels or provision of inputs etc.)
- u. Did this project create any difference in reducing challenges to the affected populations in the post flood context and allow return to normality?
- v. Do you think the Village Committee will continue working in the collective interests of the community?
- w. Did the project facilitate establishment of linkages between Village Committees and Government Line Departments such as Agriculture Department, Civil Works, irrigation department, livestock department, while implementing this project? Will these continue to strengthen and benefit the community?
- x. What lessons did the Village Committees learn about working with the Government?