



## Icelandic CSO Evaluation: ICA Support in Ethiopia

Final Report

Cecilia M Ljungman

Gemeschu Desta

*With contributions from:*

Bjarni Gíslason

Selma Sif Ísfeld Óskarsdóttir

8 January 2018

**Contents**

- Abbreviations and acronyms ..... 3**
- Executive Summary ..... 4**
- 1. Introduction ..... 7**
  - 1.1 Development assistance through Icelandic civil society ..... 7
  - 1.2 Icelandic CSO evaluation ..... 7
  - 1.3 ICA..... 8
  - 1.4 Evaluation process and methodology ..... 8
  - 1.5 Limitations ..... 9
- 2. The project..... 10**
- 3. Outcomes and impact..... 13**
  - 3.1 Women’s empowerment and gender relations..... 13
  - 3.2 Community organisation ..... 15
  - 3.3 Natural resources and environmental management ..... 16
  - 3.4 Agriculture and livestock..... 16
  - 3.5 Time saving ..... 17
  - 3.6 Behavioural and attitudinal changes ..... 17
  - 3.7 Contributing factors..... 18
  - 3.8 Constraining factors..... 20
- 4. Efficiency ..... 21**
- 5. Sustainability..... 23**
  - 5.1 Maintenance ..... 23
  - 5.2 Local ownership..... 24
  - 5.3 Relations with local government ..... 24
  - 5.4 Exit strategy and sustainability challenges ..... 25
- 6. Relevance of the project..... 26**
  - 6.1 Needs of the target population..... 26
  - 6.2 Relevance to Icelandic development policies ..... 26
  - 6.3 Government policies ..... 28
- 7. Relevance and added value of support through ICA ..... 29**

<b>8. Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>31</b>
8.1 Conclusions .....	31
8.2 Recommendations.....	32
<b>Annex 1 – Evaluation Framework – ICA – Ethiopia and Uganda.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Annex 2 – List of persons met .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Annex 3 – Documents reviewed .....</b>	<b>41</b>

## Abbreviations and acronyms

CAHW	Community Animal Health Workers
CDF	Community Development Facilitator
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DRS	Developing Regional States
ICA	Icelandic Church Aid
Iceida	Iceland International Development Agency
IceCross	Icelandic Red Cross
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
FTC	Farmer Training Centre
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs
RACOBABO	Rural Action Community Based Organisation
RBM	Results-based Management
SÍMAH	Association of Icelandic NGOs that work in development cooperation and humanitarian assistance
UNU-GEST	United Nations University Gender Equality Studies Training Programme
UNU-LRT	United Nations University Land Restoration Training Programme

## Executive Summary

Since 2008 ICA have supported LWF's livelihood project, Jijiga District Integrated Community Development Project (later the Jijiga District Food Security and Livelihoods Project) in Jijiga, which is in the Somali Regional state of Ethiopia – one of the country's least developed regions. The support developed out of the recognition that the cyclical pattern of drought, which led to the need for recurrent emergency food assistance, required a response that strengthened the preparedness and resilience of communities.

The purpose of the project has generally been to improve the economic and social wellbeing of the targeted communities by enhancing their coping capacity and increasing their access to food and social services. In the current phase, the objective of especially working to empower women through improved control and decision-making power over productive resources has been made explicit. The project is in its third phase, with the fourth phase expected to start in 2018. Each phase has focused on between eight and fourteen kebeles (villages), and catered to between 35,000-75,000 people. Key activities have included:

1. *Water development* – building of birkas,<sup>1</sup> hand-dug wells, sanitation awareness and forming of water committees;
2. *Crop development* – introduction of improved seeds, new vegetables (like onion, peppers, beans), bullocks for the most vulnerable women, donation of mechanical threshers, provision of farm tools, support to district farmers' training centres;
3. *Livestock production* – training of Community Animal Health Workers (CAHW), introduction of poultry rearing, drug and equipment support to district veterinary services, training in forage development;
4. *Income generating activities* – establishment of women's groups who receive access to a revolving fund and training in income generation;
5. *Environment protection* – training in natural resources & environmental protection, tree seedling production.

The ICA-MFA funded LWF project in Jijiga has, during its three phases, made substantial transformational change among the kebeles that were targeted. Clean and closer water, greater food security, improved diets, better sanitation, higher income (and thus better beds, clothing, and kitchen utensils), saved time, and more children attending school have effectively

---

<sup>1</sup> A birka is a surface water fed pond.

changed the lives of many people in the 20 kebeles that received support over the years. Furthermore, the communities are farming with better tools and using new techniques and crops that have produced better harvests. They have healthier animal stocks and raising poultry for the first time.

In addition to making important socioeconomic differences to communities served, the support has also led to psycho-social changes. Many of the women have become self-confident, are active in their communities, have been exposed to the world outside the kebele, and are enjoying an improved status in the communities through the respect they have gained. Moreover, community dynamics have changed in a positive way as a result of the support – including gender roles and democratically-run, well-attended, respected and active community organisations.

In terms of sustainability, there is evidence from the kebeles that LWF worked in during the earlier phases that communities continue to organise themselves, maintain assets, and engage in livelihood activities introduced by LWF. The communities feel a strong sense of ownership, responsibility, and accountability to one another. The local authorities express significant moral support for the project, but there is little evidence of them undertaking follow up support after LWF has moved on.

The support is relevant in several ways. First, LWF has provided multi-dimensional livelihood support within a scope that corresponds to its areas of proficiency and which responds to critical needs of the community. Second, it is highly relevant to Iceland's priorities of reducing poverty, promoting gender equality, and the sustainable use of natural resources. While the support does not purport to strengthen civil society or human rights, to a lesser extent it also contributes to these priorities as well. Third, the support is well aligned with the priorities of the Ethiopian government and the Somali Regional State.

LWF is a professional and cost-conscious organisation with considerable experience and well developed tools and approaches. The support has been efficiently managed by LWF, reaching most targets successfully within the timeframes set. Good communications and trustful relationships have also contributed to efficiency. This includes between LWF and ICA; between LWF and relevant government authorities; as well as between LWF and the communities it serves. The project has furthermore benefitted from the long-term financial support it has received from Iceland, as well as a relatively high level of continuity among staff and local government counterparts.

The many years of support has allowed LWF to reflect on results and adjust the support in the subsequent phase. The lessons learnt, however, have not always been fully documented. Furthermore, while LWF pays visits to kebeles from the earlier phases, it has not documented the post implementation situation in these communities. Doing so, and analysing the factors that contribute/constrain continued effects, could provide useful input for the proposed upcoming phase.

LWF staff show strong commitment, technical knowledge, and skills. They are, however, over-stretched, due to staffing shortages, resulting in work-life imbalance. These shortages are largely caused by external factors. First, the Ethiopian government's 30/70 directive forces LWF to broaden the job descriptions of staff so that one staff member covers many functions. Second, the regional government insists that vacancies are filled by ethnic Somali staff, but identifying qualified candidates from the region is highly challenging. Hiring female staff has been particularly difficult. There are currently no female project staff, despite the project's strong focus on women.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE THROUGH ICELANDIC CIVIL SOCIETY

Icelandic Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) constitute a channel for Icelandic development cooperation and humanitarian assistance. Icelandic development cooperation via CSOs is guided by *Iceland's Strategy for Development Cooperation* (2013) as well as the *Guidelines for Cooperation with Civil Society* (2015).

According to Iceland's Guidelines for support via CSOs, the intent of channeling support via Icelandic CSOs is:

“to utilise the expert knowledge of the organisations, their willingness, ability and social networks to successfully reach Iceland's developmental objectives. The operations of civil society organisations are suitable to strengthen the grassroots and support democracy in the receiving states, as well as being the grassroots at home and gathering support for their cause and increasing interest among the public in Iceland.”

The principal objective of the civil society support is to contribute to an independent, strong and diverse civil society in low income countries that fights against poverty and safeguards democracy and human rights of poor and marginalised populations.

## 1.2 ICELANDIC CSO EVALUATION

Iceland's Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) has commissioned an evaluation of the support to Iceland's two most internationally active CSOs that also have the largest development cooperation projects – namely, Icelandic Church Aid (ICA) and the Icelandic Red Cross (IceCross). The evaluation has the following purposes:

- Assessment of the performance and results on the ground achieved by four projects in four countries;
- Provide general lessons for MFA's support to other CSO; and
- Raise the monitoring and evaluation capacity of MFA and the two CSOs by including representatives on the evaluation team and conducting a participatory process.

The four projects selected for evaluation by MFA and the CSOs represent two projects focusing on a few specifically targeted persons/households (Belarus and Uganda) and two community development projects (Malawi and Ethiopia). The projects have all been finalised, and most of them have fed into the design of new initiatives or new phases.

The evaluation is presented in five separate reports, one per project/country and one overall assessment. This evaluation report covers the support to LWF's livelihood project in Ethiopia's Somali State.



### 1.3 ICA

Icelandic Church Aid (ICA) was founded in 1970 by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland, the National Church to initiate and coordinate relief/development work on behalf of the Icelandic clergy and congregation. It supports people in need in Iceland and abroad, regardless of race, faith, nationality or political ideas.

ICA is an independent foundation within the National Church of Iceland, governed by a council of representatives (63 in 2017) from different regions of the country. Each Parish can appoint its representative to the council of representatives, which in turn selects a three-member board of directors and two proxies, to take responsibility for the daily running of the institution. A director is employed by the board to run the institution with additional staff.

In addition to the support from The Ministry for Foreign Affairs, ICA depends mainly on public contributions for its income. This includes regular supporters – such as members of the clergy and parishes, who pay a certain amount every year – and companies paying for ads in ICA’s newsletter published four times a year. Another means of income is the sale of outdoor candles, the so-called “lights for peace”. The greatest source of income comes from public fundraising campaigns, the largest being at Christmas.

ICA works in Iceland, India, Ethiopia, Uganda and Malawi (ended in 2014).

For its efforts abroad between 2007 and 2017, ICA received a total of ISK 374.400.000 from MFA for the following projects:

- Ethiopia 2008-2017, Jijiga District Food Security and Livelihood Project, ISK 243,700,000.
- Uganda 2007-2014, LWF Rakai (RACOB AO) and Sembabule Community Based Aids projects, Sembabule ISK 38,400,000 Rakai (RACOB AO) ISK 42,700,000, Total 81,100,000.
- Malawi 2007-2012, Chikwawa Sustainable Water Livelihood Project, ISK 49,600,000.

### 1.4 EVALUATION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

To ensure that i) the evaluation gave high utility for all key stakeholders – Icelandic CSOs, MFA’s CSO desk officers, MFA evaluation unit; and ii) that it served as a hands-on learning process for all key stakeholders to build monitoring and evaluation capacity; the evaluation process has been as participatory as possible.

The evaluation team started with a short electronic questionnaire to gauge the expectations, needs and knowledge of the Icelandic stakeholders. This served as input for a workshop with all the stakeholders in Iceland that covered monitoring and evaluation concepts and results based management. At the workshop, the evaluators facilitated the discussion among the stakeholders to enable them to come to similar understanding of the evaluation’s purpose and identify each stakeholder’s expectations and priorities.

The workshop was followed by a full day of collaborative working within two teams – an ICA team and a Red Cross team, each including a staff member from MFA and an evaluator. These teams, with the facilitation of the evaluators, identified and formulated the evaluation questions. Over the course of the following weeks, the teams jointly developed the evaluation frameworks for the project evaluations. This is included in Annex 1.

The teams also undertook document reviews and administered a SWOT survey (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) to the country level implementing partners. The itineraries for the country level visits were devised by the country level partners, in consultation with the evaluation teams.

In Ethiopia, the team met with target groups in six different kebeles. The itinerary was devised by LWF, based on the team's request to see a mix of communities from both earlier and later phases. In the kebeles, the team held separate focus group sessions for women and men, using open questions that were based on the evaluation framework. In the kebeles, the team also visited wells, birkas, fields, and a home. Government officials were also interviewed in Jijiga and Tuluguled, and the Farmers Training Centre was visited in Tuluguled. Throughout the visit, discussions were held with LWF staff throughout the week. At the end of the visit, the team debriefed with LWF in Jijiga and later in Addis Abeba.

The findings and conclusions have been discussed among team members and the report has been jointly developed, although the independent evaluator has had the final say in cases of differences of opinion. The final report has been edited by the evaluator.

## 1.5 LIMITATIONS

The evaluation team spent more time on assistance from the last phase. Thus, some of the activities from the earlier phases, such as HIV/AIDS awareness-raising, were not covered to the same depth.

## 2. The project

ICA have supported LWF's livelihood project, Jijiga District Integrated Community Development Project, in Jijiga since 2008 in the Somali Regional state of Ethiopia – one of the country's least developed regions. The support developed out of the recognition that the cyclical pattern of drought, which led to the need for recurrent emergency food assistance, required a response that strengthened the preparedness and resilience of communities.

The project is in its third phase, with the fourth phase expected to start in 2018. The earliest phase (2008-2010) focused on livelihood support to ten kebeles. Lessons learnt from the first phase included:

- Support to building birkas had to be accompanied with clearing of nearby marsh areas and other interventions around the birkas to mitigate mosquito breeding and subsequent health effects;
- Conflicts within target communities needed to be addressed first to allow for smooth implementation;
- Community participation in the development process was essential for the sense of community ownership. It also brought more resources to the project so that an extra birka could be constructed;
- Learning through exposure to other communities and observing their agricultural practices was an effective approach.

Phase 2 (2011-2013), which amounted to €651,171, widened the scope of the project geographically to include four more kebeles and some urban groups, resulting in a target population increase of about 20,000, to around 75,000. It also increased the scope thematically by including health and education-related components – consisting mainly of building a centre and a school and sensitising communities in relation to HIV/AIDS, testing for HIV/AIDS and the importance of school, especially for girls. The purpose of the project was to improve the economic and social wellbeing of the targeted communities by enhancing their coping capacity and increasing their access to food and social services. The objectives of the project included the following:

1. Access adequate potable water for human and livestock consumption;
2. Improved production and productivity of crops and livestock & better soil and water conservation practices;
3. Better maternity and community based primary health care services and enhanced awareness towards HIV/AIDS;
4. Women's economic empowerment and enhanced understanding of women's rights;
5. Improved access to basic education and enhanced primary education enrolment;
6. Capacity of the target communities (men & women) and key local government employees/institutions built in managing project results.

Phase 3 (2014-2017), which amounted to €1,207,001 over four years, focused on a reduced number of kebeles (8) and also limited the scope to i) improving access to food and water; and ii) empowering women through improved control and decision-making power over productive resources. The rationale for the more narrow scope, which was based on internal evaluations and consultations, was to consolidate resources in fewer sectors to have greater effect. The activity areas have included:

1. *Water development* – building of birkas, hand-dug wells, sanitation awareness, and forming of water committees;
2. *Crop development* – introduction of improved seeds, new vegetables (like onion, peppers, beans), bullocks for the most vulnerable women, donation of mechanical threshers; provision of farm tools, and support to district farmers’ training centres;
3. *Livestock production* – training of Community Animal Health Workers (CAHW), introduction of poultry rearing, drug and equipment support to district veterinary services, and training in forage development;
4. *Income generating activities* – establishment of women’s groups that receive access to a revolving fund, and training in income generation;
5. *Environment protection* – training in natural resources & environmental protection, and tree seedling production.

LWF is planning for Phase 4 which will encompass with similar goals and activities as the current phase, but will focus on six new kebeles further away from Jijiga, in Kebri Beyah.

**Table 1: Woredas targeted ICA’s support by project phase**

S/N	Name of Kebele /Center	Woreda	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3
1	Chamabohade /Akara	Northern Jijiga	x	x	
2	Andodersha /Abdikebejan	Northern Jijiga	x	x	
3	Debelewyne /Abdikebejan	Northern Jijiga	x	x	
4	Kerideley /Elbahay	Northern Jijiga	x	x	
5	Koreteley /Elbahay	Northern Jijiga	x	x	
6	Hare Meregajo	Southern Jijiga	x	x	
7	Hadenta /Beledka	Southern Jijiga	x	x	
8	Dundumase /Hadow	Southern Jijiga	x	x	
9	Wajigebo /Tuluguled	Tuluguled	x	x	
10	Gedanode /Jidile	Tuluguled	x	x	
11	Fedade	Tuluguled		x	
12	Mulale /Haroreys	Northern Jijiga		x	
13	Araska	Southern Jijiga		x	x
14	Godene	Tuluguled		x	x

15	Dualeamude /Akara	Northern Jigjiga			x
16	Gumburka /Sehateley	Northern Jigjiga			x
17	Hassan dobe /Abdikebejan	Northern Jigjiga			x
18	Jidle	Tuluguled			x
19	Biyadilabah	Tuluguled			x
20	Tulurefensa /Jefebadi	Tuluguled			x
	<b>Total</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>

### 3. Outcomes and impact

LWF's regular monitoring reports recount the outputs achieved according to the objectives set. Discussions with stakeholders generally confirm the achievements of these outputs. In line with the ToR, this evaluation has focused on assessing the extent there have been transformational results in the communities where the project has been implemented. The first part of this chapter provides examples of such changes. This is followed by a discussion on the factors that contributed to these results, as well as the factors that affect the project negatively.

At a general level, discussions with the different stakeholders indicate overall better living standards and quality of life within the kebeles that have been targeted. This includes clean water, greater food security, improved diets, better sanitation, higher income (and thus better beds, clothing, and kitchen utensils) and more children attending school with their school supplies. All focus groups explained that their economic situation has improved:

*Before we were sitting. Then we could stand. Now we are starting to walk.*

Successes have not always been immediate – some communities have shunned poultry rearing (refusing to eat birds or eggs) and sometimes poor rains or other circumstances led to crop failure. The concept of separating the kitchen area from the living/sleeping quarters has not been easily accepted. Nevertheless, in the six communities visited, at least some of the inputs and activities have led to significant changes. These are discussed below.

#### 3.1 WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT AND GENDER RELATIONS

The LWF support has, according to the communities, significantly changed the situation for women. They explain that before women mostly stayed inside or around their homestead alone with their children and had to ask their husbands for money. The children often did not go to school for lack of funds.

First, *training* of women in new farming approaches, poultry rearing, shoa<sup>2</sup> fattening; followed by the *provision* of chickens, better farming tools (e.g. hoes, ploughs and a mechanical thresher) and drought resistant seeds for newcrops (such as onion and peppers, tomato, haricot beans), allowed for improved food security, better diets and additional income (from selling of surplus output). Second, women's *credit groups* and training in income generation was considered extremely important. By learning how to sell agricultural produce and engaging in

---

<sup>2</sup>Collective term for sheep and goat.

petty trading activities, women were able to bring important additional income to the families. The supported women typically reinvested some of the profits to make more income. For example, one woman cultivated onions with seeds she bought with credit. With the profits from selling part of her onion harvest, she bought 20 sheep. With credit, another woman bought supplies that she resold in the community. The profits allowed her to buy clothes for her children, additional food and 10 goats. With the profits from fattening the goats she bought two cows. Others explained that they had bought land in Jijiga and even opened mobile shops in the kebeles.

The most successful example of a woman using credit to pull her family out of poverty includes a formerly poor mother of 11, who received a loan of about USD 180 in 2011. With her agricultural profits she initially bought goats and then a camel. It produced a calf that she sold. In six years, she has been able to increase her camel herd to 10 animals (worth USD 1000 each), establish a goat flock of 40, set up a clothing shop along a main road, invest in property in Jijiga while continuing to grow cash crops on her land. She is putting two children through tertiary education, but she herself is still illiterate and can only write her name.

Women explaining the changes to their lives, stated the following:

*“Before we were in darkness. Now we are in the light.”*

*“We have come out of the darkness into the light.”*

*“We were ignorant and blind. Now we can open our eyes.”*

*“We are feeding our children better.”*

*“We can send our children to school now. Before they were at home.”*

*“Before we slept on hides, now we can afford blankets, mattresses and household utensils. It has changed my life.”*

*“Before were poor. We could only afford used clothes. Now my children have new clothes.”*

*“Before we had never visited town. We did not know how to get to Jijiga. We can now afford the transport to go to Jijiga. We can shop there and sell our produce.”*

The women and men explained that the women have developed greater self-confidence and are playing a more active role in their communities. They are also being more exposed to the world outside the kebele. A couple of women felt that the success they have achieved through support from the project, makes them see themselves as role models for other women in the community. They would like other women to realise their potential the way they have.

Women’s status in the community has improved as a result of the income they bring in and the more active roles they are playing. Women are getting respect from their husbands and the community. One stakeholder told of how she could never get credit in shops before. Because of her income generating activities, this is no longer the case and she now feels recognised as a full member of the community.

The relationship between men and women has also changed. Some of the men and women explained that since the wives had started earning income, the decision-making power in the family regarding expenditure had changed and both parties were able to shoulder the responsibility of making ends meet. Men and women told of how women used to ask their husbands for money. These days, women have their own money, can purchase food and other household needs herself. Indeed, several focus groups (male and female) mentioned that it was now more common for men to ask their wives for money.

*“Before I had to buy all the clothes for the children, now the children can ask their mother.”*

*“Before I used to beg him for money, now it is the other way around. Sometimes I buy him clothes.”*

*“I like this change. I like that we can ask our wives for money.”*

*“The love between women and men is better (in our community). My relationship has improved by 90 percent. Before my husband told me what to do. Not anymore. Now I can tell him what to do. Happily, he accepts this.”*

All women and men (spoken to separately) that the team talked to confirmed that women had sole control over the profits made. Many carry keys on their wrists for their safety boxes.

According to an elderly man in one kebele, when asked what LWF activities (agriculture, water development, livestock development, etc.) had had the most effect in his community, he stated that the economic empowerment of women brought the single most important change in the community. He said it had changed family dynamics in a positive way, enhanced living standards, was helping them out of poverty, and made a positive contribution to the future of the community’s children.

### 3.2 COMMUNITY ORGANISATION

The three types of groups/committees that the project helped initiate can be seen as emergent grass root community organisations. The agricultural, water, and women’s groups have been given training in basic organisation (formation of democratically elected executive committees, introduction of by-laws, meeting processes, etc.). Each are run by an executive committee of four to six persons of which usually around two are women. They have taken on tasks such as management of the water source (including gully management), management of the community thresher, and administration of the women’s credit initiatives. The water committees seemed to be particularly active and focus groups explained in detail the tasks they undertake and the range of fines that have been introduced to ensure that community members abide by the rules that have been set (e.g. fines exist for e.g. letting animals drink directly from a birka, collecting water on a day in which you are not entitled to do so, jumping over the birka fence, failure to contribute manual labour to maintenance work, etc.)



In these groups, women and men are learning about benefits of organisational or group approaches to resolving challenges. The committees appear to be popular, well-functioning, and active – even in kebeles of the former phases. Staff mentioned that in a few kebeles, the committees have even been more successful than the official kebele council structures, requiring LWF to intervene to promote the councils. Focus group participants saw the committees as permanent and “owned” by the communities.

### 3.3 NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Water management has been the most important change in the communities in relation to natural resource management. As discussed above, the supported kebeles have communally adopted water management practices that appear to be strictly enforced. Some stakeholders have seen the benefit of the surface water filled birkas, learnt from the project how best to construct these, and have since built their own private birkas.

Other environmentally related activities that have been adopted include energy saving cook stoves and household pit latrines. The discussions in the focus groups suggested that these have been espoused by some villagers, but not all. Some interviewees mentioned that their cook stoves needed repair and they had not yet found the funds/made the effort to address this.

Tree planting has gained some traction in some communities, but the results are relatively modest.

### 3.4 AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK

The project has resulted in communities adopting new and improved agricultural practices. These include the following:

- The communities are farming with **better tools** (metal hoes, ploughs, bullocks) and using **new techniques** (such as row planting) that have produced better harvests. Post-harvest practices have been improved with the introduction of a communal mechanical maize thresher.
- The trained Community Animal Health Workers (one for each kebele) have, according to stakeholders interviewed, ensured better detection and treatment as well as much **healthier animal stocks**.
- Communities are **planting new crops** (onions, tomatoes, peppers etc.) that were previously unknown to them. They have procured seeds themselves for subsequent planting seasons after receiving a first batch from LWF. The crops seem to be very popular – both for their value as food and cash crops.

- Some communities have started **raising poultry**. Neither eggs nor chicken have been part of the traditional diet, so some communities have not adopted poultry. However, amongst those that have, the egg production has been highly appreciated as a source of food – particularly for children – and as a very regular source of income. As one villager stated, “hens are our new camels”.

### 3.5 TIME SAVING

The project has resulted in saving time for many members of the community.

First, having a **clean water** source close to the living areas has made a huge difference for many families. Where hand-dug wells have been possible, time has been saved throughout the year. For communities that are now served with an improved birka, clean water is accessible nearby for up to 6 months. The remainder of the year, families typically need to walk 6 to 12 hours to fetch water with beasts of burden. It seemed to vary who typically saved time in the community by having to spend less time on water fetching, depending on the circumstances – it was sometimes children (freeing up time for school), but more often men or women (freeing up time for farming, income generation and other activities).

Second, **improved agriculture inputs** saved time. Having access to bullocks made reduced ploughing from a day to an hour’s work. Likewise, threshing maize mechanically reduced post harvesting processes to a fraction of the time used before and produced better results.

### 3.6 BEHAVIOURAL AND ATTITUDINAL CHANGES

The project has also changed attitudes, mostly through training and awareness-raising in relation to the following:

- **Food consumption:** Women have learnt to include eggs and new vegetables in their household diets and ways of preparing them for their families. Communities themselves are particularly impressed by their acceptance of eggs as a food source, which from their perspective represents a significant change.
- **Sanitation practices:** According to stakeholders interviewed, homes are kept cleaner (not least due to better water availability). Women maintain they are preparing food with greater sanitary consciousness. As discussed above, water use practices involved significant regard for keeping the water clean.
- **Gender roles:** As discussed in section 3.1, women have changed their role in their families and in the community. As a result of this, men have also to some extent changed their roles (no longer the sole breadwinner) and have changed their attitudes regarding women’s roles in the family and community.

Stakeholders nevertheless mention that changes in behaviour and attitudes have not always been possible with everyone in the community. Elders and religious leaders were mentioned as community members who were not always prepared to change. Practices such as separating the kitchen from the living areas was something that was very difficult to convince people to adopt. Early marriage seemed another area that endures despite awareness-raising. Communities expressed that FGM was much less accepted these days, although how much that is a result of LWF awareness-raising is unclear since government campaigns and effective law enforcement are also likely to have played an important part. In relation to domestic violence – a subject for which the project raised awareness - one community mentioned that domestic violence had been addressed by community leaders, but this could not be verified.

### 3.7 CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

A number of aspects that have been integral to **LWF's approach** have contributed to the transformational results achieved. These are discussed below:

- LWF has provided **multi-dimensional livelihood support within a scope that corresponds to its areas of proficiency that responds to critical needs** of the community. While clean water has been the foundation of the support, animal health, sanitation, new crops, agricultural technology, awareness-raising, community organisation and revolving fund schemes also form part of the support. These different components have been mutually strengthening, allowing for change to take place. At the same time, LWF has not over-stretched its support. While the second round of support included building a school and a health centre, LWF narrowed its scope in the subsequent project period to areas it felt it had a solid capacity and comparative advantage in.
- The support from ICA has been **long-term**. The first support started in 2008. ICA has undertaken regular monitoring missions, typically on an annual basis. The communication between ICA and LWF seems to have been good and the relations have been smooth.
- In addition to the long-term funding, there has also been relative **continuity** in staff, both in LWF and within the government. A majority of the government officials encountered by the team had been involved in the project since the beginning. Likewise, many of the LWF staff have been working on the project more than five years.

- LWF has developed **strong relations with the communities it serves**. The long-term support with visits at least twice a month, has allowed for a trusting relationship with good communication. When asked, the communities mentioned that initially, they were a little suspicious of LWF. They even wondered if they had come to steal their livestock. This has changed to the extent that some of the villages refer to LWF as “our NGO”. The formation of community groups and having a democratically elected Community Development Facilitator in each kebele to interact with LWF seem to have worked well, even in kebeles where LWF are no longer undertaking activities. Furthermore, LWF has placed posters in Somali at each site that outlines the project, planned activities and budget.
- As discussed in section 5.2, the communities feel a **strong sense of ownership and responsibility and accountability**. The sense of responsibility has been developed through the “revolving donation” approach that LWF uses: basically, any individual who are singled out for direct support (usually based on poverty/vulnerability) in the form of e.g. a bullock, credit, seeds, chickens, etc., must promise to donate a tangible result from the original donation within a specified deadline to another community member that he or she has identified. This could be, for instance, seeds, new born chickens or goats bought with income generated from farm produce – that in turn can generate more income. The second level recipient must in turn identify another community member and repeat the procedure. LWF calls this revolving approach “the gift that keeps giving”. The approach places responsibility on recipients of support to produce value and are held to account by the next recipient.
- LWF has established a **fruitful relationship with government counterparts** that is based on good communication and collaboration. The government officials spoke very highly of LWF and considered them one of the best performing CSOs in the Somali Regional State, because of the results achieved for poor people and how well they cooperated with the authorities. Government officials from Livestock, Agriculture and Water offices in Jijiga greatly appreciated that LWF has been diligent in informing about their activities (they claim LWF is the only CSO that provides quarterly reports on time), consulted with the authorities, linking activities with government initiatives or programmes<sup>3</sup>, and supporting the government run Farmer Training Centres (FTCs). They felt they had learnt from LWF’s holistic approach. Government representatives furthermore expressed gratitude

---

<sup>3</sup>For instance, unlike some CSOs, LWF linked the trained CAHWs with the Animal Health Offices and ensured certification. This meant that the CAHWs were registered and had access to drugs and were permitted to travel with them.

that when LWF visited communities, they often give rides in their vehicles to government staff so that they also could visit communities in the districts. They mentioned that LWF was also the first to collect and analyse data on the effects of the last drought on communities.

- While the team did not meet with any external trainers used in the projects, who in many cases came from local government institutions. However, based on the feedback from the communities, the **trainers appear to have been of good quality**. Communities repeated that they had learnt a lot from the different training and awareness raising activities that LWF had organised.
- LWF has been assisted by relatively **easy logistical access**. The project sites are around an hour's drive from Jijiga (although in different directions). The close location has permitted LWF to make frequent visits. This has made follow-up easy and communication with communities more straightforward. Any potential misunderstandings can more easily be cleared up.

### 3.8 CONSTRAINING FACTORS

External factors and risks that affect the project negatively include the following:

- The Somali region is **prone to regular drought**. Indeed, efforts to increase and diversify crop cultivation have sometimes failed due to insufficient water. Likewise, some birkas have not filled up as expected due to lack of rainfall. Even the birkas that have filled up do not supply enough water to last more than four to six months. This requires the communities to collect water from sources many hours' walk away, typically a dam outside Jijiga.
- The Charities and Societies Law's **'70/30' directive** requires that CSOs devote 30 percent of their budget for "administration". What counts as administration is broadly and arbitrarily defined, including monitoring and evaluation activities, communications, and equipment such as office generators. A number of programme costs are categorised under administrative costs. Until recently, vehicles and travel to projects were to be accounted for as administrative costs. The regulation is prescriptive about project costs and their allocation, leaving little room to manoeuvre and restricting LWF's options significantly.
- **Security in the region has been a challenge**, not least with the worsened conflict between Oromo and ethnic Somalis.

## 4. Efficiency

LWF is an established international CSO with a long history in Ethiopia. LWF has a well-developed and **professional RBM approach**, with a sound theory of change (which, along with its vision, overall impact, ultimate outcomes, internal outcomes, and immediate outcomes have been printed on a large board at the entrance of its offices in Jijiga), and undertakes consistent monitoring against targets and data derived from its baselines studies.<sup>4</sup>

LWF has provided the support in a **timely** manner, successfully **meeting its targets**. LWF monitoring reports show that every year almost all planned activities are implemented. From 2014 it introduced “the project scorecard” in its annual performance reports that reveal that between 92 and 100 percent of activities were implemented.

LWF is **cost-conscious**. An external analysis of 31 positions of seven international civil society organisations in Ethiopia showed that in all but two positions, LWF’s salaries were below the market average. For certain positions, LWF paid almost a quarter of what the top paying CSO paid. For 23 of the positions, LWF offered the lowest salary level of all seven organisations. The 30/70 directive acts as an incentive for cost-consciousness. The team recognised LWF’s modest approach during the visit (e.g. office facilities, transport arrangements, per diems, equipment). LWF’s management overhead for the support is at around 12 percent, which seems reasonable for the tasks at hand.

**Communication** between ICA and LWF has been straight-forward and congenial. Relations and information flows are good.

LWF has **learnt lessons** during the phases of implementation. This is clear from discussions with LWF staff. The lessons are to some extent also presented in the project proposals for each new phase. However, these could be elaborated in the future to convey what approaches have worked particularly well; what adjustments have been made along the way; and what initiatives have been less successful. These could be included in an annex to the project proposal. More could also be done to **communicate the successes** externally. LWF explained to the team, however, that because of the 70/30 directive, LWF cannot afford to spend time to document and communicate successes.

---

<sup>4</sup> The evaluation team discussed with LWF the risk of adhering too strictly to results frameworks to live up to promises given to funding partners, even when realities (both new opportunities and new challenges) require a change of approach, activities, or expectations.

LWF **staff show strong commitment, technical knowledge and skills**; and understanding of the livelihood issues facing the communities, as well as of the regional particularities. While LWF has a knowledgeable gender specialist in Jijiga, it does **not have any women** working with the project communities because of difficulties in hiring women. Potential female candidates from outside the region have shown limited interest in working in Jijiga and in the Somali region there are few women who are qualified.

The government of the Somali region is placing **strict hiring demands** on LWF that it hires a head of office that is ethnically Somali. For LWF, in principle, this is acceptable, however; because it has not been able to identify a suitable candidate, the position remains vacant.

While LWF's cost-consciousness is advantageous in terms of cost savings, it makes it challenging for LWF to compete with other international CSOs in **attracting qualified candidates**. Given that LWF are in great need of both women and Somali applicants, having modest salary levels can be a disadvantage.

As mentioned above, the position as head of the Jijiga office is vacant, which is placing extra burdens on other staff. In addition, **staff are over-stretched** as a result of the government's 70/30 directive – which is forcing LWF to broaden the job descriptions of staff, so that one staff member covers many functions.

## 5. Sustainability

This section examines the sustainability of the project. It focuses on three aspects of sustainability:

1. The extent that the assets introduced are being maintained;
2. The extent there is ownership of the project from the communities that have been targeted; and
3. The extent that support has been linked with government efforts.

The final section examines exit strategies and sustainability challenges.

### 5.1 MAINTENANCE

In terms of tools, machines and infrastructure, the evaluation team assessed the extent that the farming tools (hoes, shovels, etc.), mechanical threshers, hand-dug wells, and birkas are /have been /or can be expected to be maintained.

Villagers interviewed stated that the farming tools have held up well, are of good quality and are being used. The mechanical threshers were functioning in the communities visited and spare parts would be available in Jijiga if needed at a price that the communities would be able to afford. Likewise, LWF reports that the wells are in good functioning order. The team visited one that had been installed during the second phase. The team visited five birkas. Four of the birkas were also mostly in good working order. One birka built in the current phase contained too low water levels to use – which according to LWF was due to poor rains. Another, also built in the third phase, had cracks and was awaiting repair.

Discussions with communities revealed that collective responsibility for protecting and maintaining the communal infrastructure (threshers, water sources) was high. By engaging in income generating activities and collecting fine/user fees, committees appeared to have resources for repairs and maintenance. For instance, one community collected 30.000 Birr to repair the cracked birka mentioned above.

In the current phase, LWF has also supplied piped water to a Farmers Training Centre in Tuluguled, as part of the effort to support the local government institutions that can help support the farmers in the targeted kebeles. The team found that the district has not paid the utility costs for the water, rendering the irrigation system at the centre useless.<sup>5</sup> However, the team

---

<sup>5</sup>The team heard that funds had been diverted to address the heightened insecurity of the district.



chanced upon a female farmer living near the centre who had greatly benefited from the instruction at the Centre, supported by the project.

## 5.2 LOCAL OWNERSHIP

Discussions with groups in different kebeles revealed that solid ownership for the project has been established among the target communities. It appears that LWF has achieved this through good communication with communities, participation of community members throughout the process, and establishment of democratically elected committees.

**Community participation and clear and regular communication and interaction** with the target groups has been central. From early on, it seems that communities felt that they were part of the process. Discussions with target groups conveyed that the whole community was involved and in agreement with how the project was introduced and implemented. Initially, there were several meetings, in which the communities considered that their needs and concerns were addressed:

*We told them our needs and priorities and they (LWF) listened to us.*

Along the way, the communities received information about the project and planned activities, including posters in the local language which have been placed in each site with activities and budget. They also participated in the implementation process by, for instance, organising themselves and providing the manual labour for the birkas and wells and planted the seedlings received.

Likewise, having **democratically elected community members** to provide leadership and responsibility for project components has been critical in fostering ownership. As discussed above, community committees were established for water, agriculture, and income generation activities. These, which typically consist of 4-6 members and have at least one female representative, manage communal assets and take decisions on behalf of the community. Their authority and leadership is accepted and, according to the focus group discussions, villagers typically attend when they call meetings. The communities also elect a Community Development Facilitator (CDF) who serves as the interlocutor with the project staff. The CDF together with the committees have played a key role in rallying and mobilising the community members during the planning and implementation process.

## 5.3 RELATIONS WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

As with the communities, LWF has been diligent in communicating with the different government stakeholders within the district. The team met with local government representatives (in the fields of water, livestock and agriculture) in Jijiga and in Tuluguled and found that all were very familiar with the LWF project. They stated that they monitor the work of LWF. Indeed, they could effortlessly recount the different activities that the project has undertaken. By informing the government counterparts, getting their advice and agreement, LWF's efforts have been well integrated in local government plans and systems, according to the representa-

tives interviewed. Government staff have also been drawn on for some of the training initiatives that LWF has held in the kebeles. On the other hand, as evidenced by the non-functional piped water at the Farmer's Training Centre in Tuluguled (see section 5.1), the government has not always shown financial commitment.

#### 5.4 EXIT STRATEGY AND SUSTAINABILITY CHALLENGES

LWF exits communities when it is assessed that the households meet criteria for an improved level of livelihood. It is expected that the organisational structures left behind by the project (the community development facilitators, the water committee, agricultural groups, women's credit groups, etc.) will provide leadership for a continued momentum for change and ensure resources for upkeep. By regularly informing, working with, and signing an agreement with the local authorities, LWF also expects that these will assume greater responsibility once LWF has moved on.

Meetings with kebeles that LWF worked in in the earlier phases revealed that communities continue to organise themselves, maintain assets, and engage in livelihood activities introduced by LWF. It thus seems likely that the community organisational structures will continue to play an important role in the kebeles, even in the more recent project sites. Extreme external pressures – such as drought and conflict – could, however, affect the social fabric in a way that would cause the community structures to crumble.

Meanwhile, the capacity of the local government is limited. The engagement of government offices in the kebeles will probably be at a much reduced level compared to LWF.

## 6. Relevance of the project

This section examines the relevance of the support in relation to the needs of the target population, the priorities outlined in Iceland’s CSO Guidelines, and Ethiopia’s development policies.

### 6.1 NEEDS OF THE TARGET POPULATION

LWF’s support has been based on participatory needs assessments and baseline studies that have involved discussions with the communities. The support addresses key livelihood issues of communities. Discussion with target groups revealed that they were in agreement with how the project was introduced and implemented and the issues being addressed. When asked if they would have wanted any changes, the answer was usually “no, we want more of the same activities”.

### 6.2 RELEVANCE TO ICELANDIC DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

The principal objective of development support through Icelandic civil society organisations is to contribute to an independent, **strong and diverse civil society** in low income countries that **fight against poverty** in its various forms. The support furthermore aims to support civil society in safeguarding democracy and the human rights of impoverished and marginalised populations. The Icelandic CSO guidelines highlight income generation, provision of basic services, capacity building and advocacy as means to reduce poverty and realise human rights. In addition, the guidelines confirm the importance of promoting **gender equality** and **environmental sustainability** – key priorities areas in the Icelandic development cooperation strategy; draws attention to the **human rights principles** – non-discrimination, participation, accountability and transparency; and raise the importance of **local ownership**.

The extent to which the project is relevant to the Icelandic CSO guidelines is discussed below:

**Poverty reduction:** The support is strongly guided by reducing poverty among the most poor. LWF works in kebeles that have poor access to water (often six to eight hours walk) and food shortages (according to baseline surveys, 73-93 percent have been unable to feed themselves with their farming and livestock activities), have little access to services and face human and animal health problems. Eighty percent are illiterate. They are very poor communities within

short distances of Jijiga town.<sup>6</sup>

**Strengthening civil society:** The LWF livelihood project in Jijiga does not explicitly promote civil society development or strengthening. It is not a stated objective. Nevertheless, the formation of committees – agricultural, water and women’s committees - are a central tenant of the support and a key contribution to the results of the projects. The committees appear to be popular, well-functioning and active, even in kebeles of the former phases. Additionally, staff mentioned that in a few kebeles, the committees have even been more successful than the official kebele council structures, requiring LWF to intervene to promote the councils. Focus group participants saw the committees as permanent and “owned” by the communities. One male community member spontaneously told the team that the committees have changed how their community functions and they now “practice real democracy”. While not formal civil society organisations, the committees can be regarded as foundational structures for civic engagement.

**Gender equality:** LWF has placed emphasis on supporting women, who in Somali culture are significantly disadvantaged and almost always illiterate. In addition, bullocks have been donated to widows and the more disadvantaged women in the communities (selected by the communities themselves). While the project has worked to improve the situation of women since the start, in the current phase, empowering women is one of the two objectives.

**Environmental sustainability:** The support is relevant to environmental sustainability in several ways. Clean water (wells, birkas and water source protection) and sanitation are key component of the support. The support has also involved sustainable farming practices. To a lesser extent the project has also introduced energy saving cook stoves and environment protection activities such as tree planting.

**Local ownership:** As discussed in section 5.2, the project strongly promotes local ownership.

**Human rights:** The project does not advocate for human rights since this is outside the mandate of international organisations in Ethiopia. The project is, nevertheless, indirectly addressing civil and political rights (raising the issue of traditional harmful practices and domestic violence and introducing democratic process in the community organisations), as well as social and economic rights such as basic needs and health. Human rights principles are also taken into consideration:

---

<sup>6</sup> One can assume that there are even poorer kebeles in more remote locations, but LWF has prioritised communities that are logistically more unproblematic. Nevertheless, phase 4 will include kebeles that are further away from Jijiga, but still in proximity to a main road.

- **Participation:** Participation is a central component of LWF’s approach, as discussed in section 5.2. From the beginning, people feel that they are part of the process and they have close relationship with the LWF staff in the area.
- **Non-discrimination:** The project is guided by addressing the poorest members of the community. People with disabilities are not specifically targeted by the current support, although this has been included in the upcoming Phase 4 project proposal.
- **Accountability:** In each kebele, one person is appointed as the Community Development Facilitator. He or she has the activity plan for each year, informs the community and forwards suggestions and complaints to LWF – for instance, if activities are delayed. LWF management also encourages villagers to call them on their mobiles should anything be amiss. Likewise, the government says it monitors LWF’s work and requires LWF to submit quarterly plans – which it does in a timely and satisfactory way.
- **Transparency:** As mentioned in section 3.7 and 5.2, activities and budgets for each kebele are posted at project sites and shared with the intended beneficiaries and sub-county officials. The process of identifying people in the kebele for e.g. a grant is, according to the stakeholders interviewed, fair, participatory and open.

### 6.3 GOVERNMENT POLICIES

The Ethiopian government has designated four of the country’s regions – one of which is the Somali Regional State – as Developing Regional States (DRS). LWF’s project is in a direct support of this development policy.

Ethiopia’s development policy emphasises the importance of investing in pastoralists to improve their food security situation. It also acknowledges the usefulness of the traditional pastoral knowledge to manage pastoral resources. LWF’s interventions align with this core policy towards pastoralists in Somalia Regional State. Furthermore, the food security policy focuses on addressing vulnerability, which exists in different parts of the country, including in Somali Regional State. The project thus also coheres with the food security policy.

Moreover, there are three priorities that are emphasised by the Somali Regional administration for the state’s development: education, environmental empowerment, and gender equality.<sup>7</sup> The support is strongly relevant to the latter two priorities.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://allafrica.com/stories/201706090966.html>

## 7. Relevance and added value of support through ICA

Iceland's Guidelines for CSO support emphasises the importance of utilising “the expert knowledge of the (Icelandic CSOs), their willingness, ability and social networks to successfully reach Iceland's developmental objectives.” It highlights the links that can be made between the grassroots in Iceland with the grassroots in developing countries, through this type of support. To be eligible for support, the Icelandic CSOs must “be able to show that their participation will increase the value of the development cooperation”, not least by contributing towards an Icelandic public that is well-informed through dissemination of information and educational activities about developing countries and development cooperation. The CSOs should also support Iceland's development cooperation through engagement in the country's aid programmes by providing expertise and insights in the country's development discourse.

In relation to ICA's support to Uganda and Ethiopia, ICA adding value to Iceland's civil society support in the following ways:

**Additional funding:** Effectively, the MFA funds and ICA's own funds are able to leverage each other to have greater effect. In recent years, the Icelandic contributions to the projects have been 80 percent from the MFA and 20 percent of ICA's own funds.<sup>8</sup> In recent years, MFA has allowed ICA to spend three percent of the project funds for information dissemination activities, as well as travel costs for monitoring visits; otherwise all of ICA's additional headquarter costs associated with its development cooperation efforts come from its own funds that are external to the joint MFA-ICA contribution to the projects.

**Monitoring and administration of the support:** ICA monitors the projects and reports back to the MFA regularly. The CSO desk at the MFA is a small unit which does not have the capacity to enforce monitoring and administration of the support in a way that the ICA does.

**Reduced financial risk:** With the addition of ICA's funds and the monitoring support it supplies, MFA reduces the financial risk involved in supporting civil society organisations in developing countries. If MFA were to support CSOs directly in developing countries, it is likely it would have to support more established organisations with strong capacity, especially in countries where it does not have an embassy.

---

<sup>8</sup> In 2007-2011, ICA's contribution was as much as 40%, by 2012-2015 it was 30% and from 2016 it has been 20%.

**Information dissemination and awareness-raising in Iceland:** ICA is well known in Iceland and has been considered one of the major pillars of Icelandic development cooperation and humanitarian aid for the last decades. A Gallup survey from April 2017 indicates that 89,5 percent of the public knows of ICA. Of five organisations working in development, only the Icelandic Red Cross is better known with 96,9 percent.

In its awareness-raising and public education, ICA promotes the collective responsibility for peaceful and prosperous co-existence. It has suggested ways of welcoming newcomers of all faiths to Icelandic society through communal work of parishes all over the country. The bishop of Iceland has conveyed these suggestions to all pastors of the National Church of Iceland. It furthermore provides information on the vision and strategy of Iceland's development cooperation, disseminating the message to schoolchildren, confirmation classes, NGOs, the elderly and to pastors in parishes all over Iceland. Some of its activities include the following:

- Twice a year ICA publishes a twelve-page supplement on its work and support in developing countries in one of the country's biggest newspapers (86,000 copies). It is distributed to more than 70,000 households and public places.
- A news magazine (16 pages) is distributed to 6000 households twice a year.
- ICA staff give presentations on their projects and ICA staff are also active in writing media articles on development issues.
- ICA staff engage in active discussions with confirmation classes which run throughout the year. For the past 19 years, the confirmation classes have also been involved in fundraising for the ICA development projects and every second year the class receive a visit from someone from the project area, usually a young individual, to educate them and share their experiences with the class.
- From its online shop, the public can learn about its development activities and can buy the *Gjöf sem gefur*, (the gift that gives) – a donation of the same value as a goat or chicken. This has proven to be popular Icelandic Christmas presents.

**Active in the development cooperation community in Iceland:** ICA has participated in different development fora:

- It is a member of the Association of Icelandic NGOs that work in development cooperation and humanitarian assistance – SÍMAH.
- It participates in MFA's Development Cooperation Committee.
- It used to participate in the annual week-long public awareness campaign on development issues – *Próunarsamvinna ber ávöxt* – with former ICEIDA and other Icelandic CSOs, which ended with the merger with the MFA in 2016.

**Engaged in international solidarity and international networks:** ICA is a member of two transnational church organisations – the Lutheran World Federation and ACT Alliance. It furthermore engages with the other Nordic Lutheran organisations, which hold annual directors' meetings, collaborate on common strategies, and on occasion make joint statements.

## 8. Conclusions and Recommendations

### 8.1 CONCLUSIONS

The ICA-MFA funded LWF project in Jijiga has, during its three phases, made substantial transformational change within the kebeles that were targeted. Clean and closer water, greater food security, improved diets, better sanitation, higher income (and thus better beds, clothing, and kitchen utensils), saved time, and more children attending school have effectively changed the lives of many people in the 20 kebeles that received support over the years. Furthermore, the communities are farming with better tools and using new techniques and crops that have produced better harvests. They have healthier animal stocks and are raising poultry for the first time.

In addition to making important socioeconomic differences to the communities served, the support has also led to psycho-social changes. Many of the women have become self-confident, are active in their communities, have been exposed to the world outside the kebele, and are enjoying an improved status in the communities through the respect they have gained. Moreover, community dynamics have changed in a positive way as a result of the support – including gender roles and community organisations.

In terms of sustainability, there is evidence from the kebeles that LWF worked in during the earlier phases that communities continue to organise themselves, maintain assets, and engage in livelihood activities introduced by LWF. Within the communities there is a strong sense of ownership, responsibility, and accountability to one another. The local authorities express significant moral support for the project, but there is little evidence of them undertaking follow up support after LWF has moved on.

The project is relevant in several ways. First, LWF has provided multi-dimensional livelihood support within a scope that corresponds to its areas of proficiency and which responds to critical needs of the community. Second, it is highly relevant to Iceland's priorities of reducing poverty, promoting gender equality, and the sustainable use of natural resources. While the support does not purport to strengthen civil society or human rights, to a lesser extent it also contributes to these priorities as well. Third, the support is well aligned with the priorities of the Ethiopian government and the Somali Regional State.

LWF is a professional and cost-conscious organisation with considerable experience and well developed tools and approaches. The support has been efficiently managed by LWF, reaching most targets successfully within the timeframes set. Good communications and trustful relationships have also contributed to efficiency. This includes between LWF and ICA; between LWF and relevant government authorities; as well as between LWF and the communities it serves. The project has furthermore benefitted from the long-term financial support that it has received from Iceland, as well as a relatively high level of continuity among staff and local government counterparts.



The many years of support has allowed LWF to reflect on results and adjust the support in the subsequent phase. The lessons learnt, however, have not always been fully documented. Furthermore, while LWF pays visits to kebeles from the earlier phases, it has not documented the post implementation situation in these communities. Doing so, and analysing the factors that contribute/constrain continued effects, could provide useful input for the proposed upcoming phase.

LWF staff show strong commitment, technical knowledge, and skills. They are, however, over-stretched, due to staffing shortages, resulting in work-life imbalance. These shortages are largely caused by external factors: the Ethiopian government's 30/70 directive that forces LWF to broaden the job descriptions of staff so that one staff member covers many functions; and the difficulty to identify qualified ethnic Somali staff in line with the regional state government's insistence. Hiring female staff has been particularly challenging. There are currently no female project staff.

## 8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation 1 (LWF):** LWF should consider revisiting the kebeles included in earlier two phases, to monitor, document and analyse the situation to serve as input to the strategies and approaches of the proposed fourth phase.

**Recommendation 2 (LWF, ICA, MFA):** There are potentials for synergies between LWF's Jijiga livelihood project and Iceland's support to Ethiopia via UNU-GEST and UNU-LRT. First, there is an opportunity for alumni from these programmes to interact with LWF's efforts. There is also an opportunity for LWF to suggest candidates for these training programmes from its own organisation, as well as from local government agencies, research institutes, universities etc. with which it interacts.

## Annex 1 –

## Evaluation Framework – ICA – Ethiopia and Uganda

Evaluation Question	Areas of inquiry/indicators	Methods	Potential sources	Comments
<b>Relevance</b>				
<p>1. To what extent is the support relevant to dialogue on and awareness-raising/public education of Iceland development assistance efforts? To what extent does ICA's awareness-raising in Iceland add value to Iceland's development cooperation effort?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What types of information and public education initiatives that ICA has undertaken to inform public?</li> <li>• What are the types of constituencies that ICA has tried to reach with information?</li> <li>• Has ICA undertaken or been involved in any specific campaigns to raise awareness about development?</li> <li>• What have been the costs of these activities?</li> <li>• To what extent has ICA participated in different development for a (e.g. CSO networks, meetings with MFA, special development seminars or initiatives in Iceland, fairs, etc.)</li> <li>• What evidence is there that the public is well informed about ICA and Icelandic development cooperation?</li> </ul>	<p>Desk based research</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Sample a few confirmation students and/or school students, ICA focal points in congregations</p>	<p>ICA Information material</p> <p>Media clippings</p> <p>Internet</p> <p>ICA Records of meetings, seminars, etc. with public, constituencies, networks, schools</p> <p>ICA</p> <p>External informants</p> <p>MFA</p> <p>completed CSO survey</p>	<p>ICA will need to play a key role in compiling data on the work it has undertaken in this area.</p> <p>The team will not be able to measure the effect of the information efforts on Icelanders but could potentially undertake some very random sampling of members of the public.</p> <p>Beyond scope to look at how the support has built capacity of the CSOs in Iceland</p>
<p>2. To what extent do the CSOs add value as a modality for the Icelandic Development Cooperation?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are likely consequences on the programme if the MFA would transfer the funds directly to LWF/RACOBQA? Incl. but not limited to cost effectiveness, quality of monitoring, quality of the project.</li> <li>2. What are the specific contributions of ICA to the project?</li> </ol>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Document review</p>	<p>ICA,</p> <p>LWF, RACOBQA</p> <p>ICEIDA representative in Uganda</p> <p>Financial reports</p>	

<p><b>3. To what extent is the support relevant to the objectives and priorities outlined in Iceland's strategic guidelines for CSO support?</b></p> <p><b>Objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Strong, diverse, independent civil society in LDCs</li> <li>b. Capacity of CSOs in LDCs to promote democracy &amp; human rights of poor &amp; marginalised</li> <li>c. Strengthen the proficiency and ability of Icelandic CSOs</li> </ul> <p><b>Focus areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Promote environmental sustainability</li> <li>e. Promote gender equality</li> <li>f. Promote human rights principles of transparency, non-discrimination, accountability and participation</li> <li>g. Promote local own-</li> </ul>	<p>The extent to which the support is contributing to an <b>independent, strong and diverse civil society</b> in low income countries that fights against poverty.</p> <p>The extent to which the support is contributing to civil society's capacity to <b>safeguard democracy and human rights</b> of marginalised people.</p> <p>The extent to which the support is taking into account the specific needs of <b>girls, boys, men and women and marginalised groups</b>.</p> <p>The extent to which the support is promoting <b>environmental sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable farming practices in Ethiopia</li> <li>• Energy saving cook stoves</li> <li>• Learn about environment</li> <li>• Sanitation practices</li> <li>• Environment protection activities</li> </ul> <p>The extent the support promotes <b>local ownership</b> – see question 6</p> <p>The extent the support promotes human rights principles –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transparency</li> <li>• Participation</li> <li>• Accountability</li> <li>• Non-discrimination</li> </ul> <p><b>Awareness raising</b> and public education – see question 1</p> <p>The extent the support empowers the Icelandic CSOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides CSOs with opportunities to build capacity in areas such as development coopera-</li> </ul>	<p>Documentation analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Annual reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target groups</li> <li>• Community organisations</li> <li>• ICA</li> <li>• LWF</li> <li>• RACOB AO</li> </ul>	<p>The range of issues that are addressed in the policy are broad. There could be a good case to prioritise the policy principles that the evaluation should focus on.</p> <p>There are some unclear aspects in the strategic guidelines. This could be a translation issue. For instance, there are two sets of objectives in different parts of the document. One seems of focus on country level CSOs and the other on objectives for Icelandic CSO support. Moreover, the target group is defined as “civil society in low income countries, especially those who are poor or marginalised.” Those that are poor and marginalised</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>ership</p> <p>h. Undertake awareness raising and public education</p> <p>i. Icelandic CSOs are empowered</p> <p>j. Activities of services, income generation, advocacy and capacity building</p>	<p>tion <b>approaches</b>, practices, policies; public education and outreach; networking in Iceland and abroad; understanding of country contexts</p> <p>The extent the support addresses the <b>prioritised activities</b> of: Basic services, creation of income, building local capacities, advocacy</p>			<p>are not civil society, unless they are organised in groups.</p>
<p><b>4. To what extent is the support relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups?</b></p>	<p>The extent that target groups have been consulted and been given opportunities to express their needs and priorities</p> <p>The extent the support has taken into consideration the specific needs and priorities of girls, boys men and women, orphans, widows</p> <p>The method for selecting target households</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> <p>SWOT survey and discussion</p> <p>Focus groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final report</li> <li>• Annual reports</li> <li>• LWF staff</li> <li>• RACOB AO</li> <li>• Village councils, village committees, religious leaders</li> <li>• Women's groups, target populations/ households</li> <li>• District authorities responsible for water and sanitation, health, social services</li> <li>• Site visits</li> </ul>	
<b>Outcome /impacts</b>				
<p><b>5. What intended, unintended, positive and negative</b></p>	<p>Water access and availability Jijiga improved</p> <p>Situation changed for women</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Final report</p> <p>Annual reports</p>	

<p><b>effects has the support had on people, communities and partners?</b></p>	<p>Health of animals improved  Food security improved  Women´s groups  Women more voice, more respect, more influence?  Women and girls more aware of their rights? Are they demanding more? Attitude change towards women and girls?  Health improvement of communities?  Changes for orphans, single guardians –  Attitude change vis à vis HIV families  Better opportunity for education, livelihood, voice, participation in community,  Have they managed to keep and maintain the assets received?  Health, nutrition, sanitation practices  Income?  Gained time efficiency  Relations with local authorities  Orphan awareness of rights  Changed behaviour in relation to HIV risks – nutrition, sexual behaviour</p>	<p>Direct observation  SWOT survey and discussion  Focus groups</p>	<p>LWF staff  RACOBABO  Village leaders, village committees  Women’s groups, target populations/ households  District authorities responsible for water and sanitation and health  Site visits</p>	
<b>Effectiveness</b>				
<p><b>6. To what extent were objectives achieved / will objectives likely be achieved? What factors are contrib-</b></p>	<p>The extent that the planned activities and outputs were undertaken according to plan.  The extent that the projected numbers and percentages in work plans have been achieved</p>	<p>Document review  Interviews  Direct observation</p>	<p>Final report  Annual reports  Village leaders, village commit-</p>	

<p><b>uting/hampering the achievements of results?</b></p>	<p>The extent that expected outputs (e.g. access to water, vaccination of livestock, etc.) has led to the expected better health</p> <p>The extent internal factors (organisational issues, human resources, etc.) and external factors (social, political, environmental, economic/market etc.) are contributing or hampering the achievement of results</p>	<p>SWOT survey and discussion</p> <p>Focus groups</p>	<p>tees</p> <p>Women's groups, target populations/households</p>	
<b>Sustainability</b>				
<p><b>7. To what extent and how has local ownership been promoted?</b> <i>(note overlap with relevance question related to CSO strategy)</i></p>	<p>The extent communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• have been consulted</li> <li>• have influenced the project</li> <li>• are engaged in work within the project</li> </ul>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>SWOT survey and discussion</p>	<p>LWF staff</p> <p>RACOB AO</p> <p>Village leaders, village committees</p> <p>Women's groups, Target populations /households</p>	
<p><b>8. To what extent and in what ways has the support been supported by local government authorities?</b></p>	<p>The extent the local authorities have been involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning</li> <li>• Implementation</li> <li>• Assessment/follow up</li> </ul> <p>The extent local authorities have been supportive in granting permission</p> <p>The extent local authorities are an engaged stakeholder in the exit strategy / post-project follow-through</p> <p>The extent the project is well integrated in local government plans and systems</p>	<p>Interviews</p>	<p>Periodic reports</p> <p>LWF staff</p> <p>Local government officials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Water &amp; sanitation</li> <li>- Health</li> <li>- Social services/women, children</li> </ul> <p>RACOB AO</p>	
<p><b>9. To what extent has the support been well inte-</b></p>	<p>The frequency and quality of dialogue with different community groups and religious/community leaders.</p>	<p>Interviews</p>	<p>Women's groups, target populations/households</p>	

<p><b>grated with the local social/cultural context?</b></p>	<p>(women's groups, water committees, village councils, schools, etc.)</p> <p>The frequency and quality of interaction with target groups.</p> <p>Extent of participation of target groups</p> <p>Extent communities have influenced the planning and implementation</p> <p>Extent community groups are contributing vs hindering the achievement of desired outcomes (e.g. neighbours, leaders, etc.)</p>	<p>Direct observation</p> <p>SWOT survey and discussion</p>	<p>Village councils, village committees, religious leaders</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>RACOB AO</p> <p>Site visits</p>	
<p><b>10. To what extent are the infrastructure /assets provided by the support still functioning and being maintained?</b></p>	<p>The extent assets continue to function: e.g. water facilities, sanitation facilities, housing, kitchen assets, farming tools, livestock, nurseries, beehives, improved forage, protected natural resources, seeds</p> <p>The extent to which the assets are being maintained.</p> <p>Availability and affordability of spare parts</p>	<p>Documentation review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Direct observation</p>	<p>Periodic reports</p> <p>Site visits</p> <p>Village councils, village committees</p> <p>Women's groups, target populations /households</p> <p>RACOB AO</p>	
<p><b>Efficiency</b></p>				
<p><b>11. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the dialogue, communications processes and overall relations between the CSO and MFA, and the CSO and country level</b></p>	<p>Frequency, type and quality of exchanges among the partners</p> <p>Responsiveness and feedback to communication</p> <p>Level of openness, trust and respect among partners</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>SWOT survey &amp; discussion</p>	<p>Periodic reports</p> <p>Correspondence between partners</p> <p>MFA</p> <p>ICA</p> <p>LWF</p>	

partners?			RACOB AO	
<b>12. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the results based management processes, including monitoring &amp; reporting?</b>	<p>The extent the project results framework is used and revised</p> <p>The quality of the project planning process</p> <p>The frequency, content and usefulness of monitoring and reporting activities</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>SWOT survey &amp; discussion</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Periodic reports</p> <p>Work plans, Monitoring plans</p> <p>Interviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MFA</li> <li>• ICA</li> <li>• LWF</li> <li>• RACOB AO</li> </ul>	
<b>13. What factors in the project management/administration have promoted / promotes or hinders efficiency?</b>	<p>ICA/LWF policies and practices that promote/hinder efficiency</p> <p>The extent ICA and partners apply cost conscious approaches/ procurement</p> <p>Effect of geography/logistics on efficiency</p> <p>The extent to which cultural and societal practices have promoted/hindered efficient project implementation</p> <p>Govt rules and regulations that promote/hinder efficiency</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>SWOT survey &amp; discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MFA</li> <li>• ICA</li> <li>• LWF</li> <li>• RACOB AO</li> </ul>	



## **Annex 2 – List of persons met**

### **LWF Addis Abeba**

1. Sophia Gebreyes, Resident Representative
2. Abdelkader Ibrahim (Abdu), Food Security & Livelihoods Program Officer
3. Endeshaw Mulatu, Acting Program Coordinator

### **LWF Jijiga**

1. Negussie Kebede, Agriculture and Livestock Officer
2. Ahmednur Abib, Gender and Community Development Officer

### **Jigjiga district government officials**

1. Ashenafi Tadesse, Water Office South Jigjiga
2. Ali Abdullahi, Livestock Office South Jigjiga
3. Mohamed Ismael, Livestock Office North Jigjiga
4. Ayalle Hassen, Agriculture Office South Jigjiga
5. Isse Abdi, Agriculture Office South Jigjiga
6. Abdullahi Mohamed, Agriculture Office Head, Tuluged
7. Assed Mohamed, Livestock Office, Tuluged
8. Farmers Training Centre trainer, Tuluged

Focus group discussions (separate male and female groups, 20-35 participants) and interviews with villagers in:

1. Dually amude kebele (Harores district)
2. Gumburka kebele (Harores district)
3. Hassan dobe kebele (Harores district)
4. Araska kebele (Jijiga district)
5. Jidella kebele (Tuluguled district)
6. Biyo kebeles (Tuluguled district)

## Annex 3 – Documents reviewed

	Year	Year	Year	
LWF Annual monitoring report	2011	2012	2013	
LWF Annual performance report	2014	2015	2016	
LWF Budget for well/drilling	2015			
LWF Budget plan	2014-2017			
LWF Ethiopia Country Strategy 2016-2021	2016			
LWF Ethiopia Theory of Change, 2016-21	2016			
LWF Financial Report	2014			
LWF Financial statement and audit report	2014		2016	
LWF Jijiga Project Baseline Survey Report 2011-2013	2011			
LWF Kebri Beyah Sustainable Livelihood Project 2018-20	2017			
LWF Logical Framework	2007	2015		
LWF Project Document	2007-09	2011-13	2014-17	
LWF Second quarter performance report	2014			
LWF Six months performance report	201			
Notes to the audit report from 2014	2014			
Salary Survey of CSOs in Ethiopia	2017			
Technical report - borehole siting	2015			
<b>Documents in Icelandic</b>				
ICA Application to MFA Iceland from ICA for Jijiga	2013	2014-17	2015	
ICA letter for water research	2015			2015
ICA letter with Annual Report from LWF	2014	2015		2017
Contract between ICA and ICEIDA	2007-10			
Contract between ICA and MFA Iceland			2014	
ICA letter with application from ICA to MFA Iceland	2015	2016-17		
ICA Annual Report	2013-14			
ICA Financial statement	2013-14			
ICA Hjalparstaf Kyrkjunnar	2016-17			
ICA letter to ICEIDA about ongoing support	2010			
ICA letter with final report	2017			
ICA Performance report to MFA Iceland (one page)		2014		
ICA Publications	2014-17			