

ADRA Denmark
ADRA Sudan

If the CAP Fits...

A Review of SAHEWA and CBWASAP Projects

May 2016





Acknowledgement

The Review Team thank most sincerely the staff members of ADRA Sudan and ADRA Denmark who were so warm in their welcome, so supportive of our assignment, and so open in the many discussions we held with them.

In the same way, we would also like to thank the many people we met in the field who gave so freely of their time, information and ideas.



A group of girls
on their donkeys
in West Darfur

The Projects

Sustainable Access to Health Education and Water for All – Phase 3 West Darfur

SAHEWA-3 is the continuation of SAHEWA projects that were started in June 2011, building on a number of one-year community health education projects funded by Danida and sustainable water access projects funded by ECHO – projects implemented in different localities of Sirba, Krenik and El Geneina. Over the years, it has evolved into a resilience project. The objectives and outputs of the current phase are:

Overall objective: Reduced disease risk and improved livelihoods among selected conflict-affected communities in West Darfur.

Immediate objective 1: To improve livelihoods of both pastoralists and agriculturalists through improved access to water resources and other activities.

- Output 1.1: Continued *haffir* rehabilitation and rural construction;
- Output 1.2: Strengthened *haffir* management;
- Output 1.3: Community action plans developed;
- Output 1.4: Livelihood strengthening of agriculturalist, agro-pastoralist and pastoralist – *through village savings and loans associations (VSLAs) and farmers' field schools (FFSs), herder schools (HSs) and other income generating activities (IGAs).*

Immediate objective 2: To improve access to basic services to water and sanitation for conflict affected communities in West Darfur;

- Output 2.1: Water access through sustainable improved dug wells;
- Output 2.2: Sanitation, health and hygiene improvement;
- Output 2.3: Technology development pilot on SSB and different options other than brick making using wood.

Immediate objective 3: To maximise impact through up-scaling of best practices and better coordination and cooperation with other stakeholders in areas relating to first and second objective in two years.

- Output 3.1: Strengthening of the project technical steering committee (PTSC);
- Output 3.2: Documentation and dissemination of lessons learnt;
- Output 3.3: Networking, coordination and cooperation with relevant stakeholders.

Community-Based Water and Sanitation Project

Blue Nile

CBWASAP, a two-year project, is the fourth phase of WASAP in Blue Nile, but under a new name and with a new approach. Essentially a resilience project, it focuses on improving access to water and sanitation services, and to improve the livelihoods of conflict populations.

Overall objective: Reduction of mortality and morbidity in Blue Nile State.

Immediate objective 1: To improve livelihoods of conflict-affected populations in Rosaries, Damazin, Geisan and Tadamon localities.

Output 1.1: Rehabilitation of *haffirs* and construction of small watering facilities, the *ruhud*, along pastoralist migratory routes;

Output 1.2: Improve saving disciplines and women's empowerment through village savings and loans associations (VSLAs)

Immediate objective 2: To improve access to basic services to water, sanitation and hygiene for conflict-affected populations in Rosaries, Damazi, Geisan and Tadamon.

Output 2.1: Training of water committees and assist with the construction of wells and rehabilitation of pumps;

Output 2.2: Undertake community action plans (CAPs) to improve access to water, sanitation and hygiene;

Output 2.3: Make a pilot implementation of community-led total sanitation (CLTS);

Output 2.4: Support construction of institutional latrines;

Output 2.5: Health and hygiene training – *of hygiene promoters*

Immediate objective 3: To maximize impact through up-scaling of best practices and better coordination and cooperation with other stakeholders in areas relating to first and second objectives.

Output 3.1: Strengthening the role of the Project Technical Steering Committee (PTSC);

Output 3.2: Documentation/dissemination of lessons learnt;

Output 3.3: Networking, coordination and cooperation with relevant stakeholders.

Contents

Abbreviations.....	ii
Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	6
Objectives of the Review	6
The Team	6
Review Methodology	7
Relevance.....	9
A Situation Analysis.....	9
Responding to Needs	11
Project Design	12
Assumptions and Risks.....	13
Efficiency.....	14
Funds and Other Inputs	14
Management.....	16
Monitoring and Reporting	17
Effectiveness.....	19
Achievements	19
Strategies	19
Resilience	25
Cross-Cutting Issues	26
Best Practices.....	26
Capacity Building.....	27
Impact.....	28
Government Policy and Community Organisation	28
Changes in Lives and Livelihoods	28
Sustainability	32
Local Ownership.....	32
Cooperation	32
Prospects for the Future	33
Communication Strategy	33
Annex A: Terms of Reference	35
Annex B: Review Programme	41
Annex C: Checklist for Interviews and Meetings with ADRA Staff.....	43
Annex D: Checklist for Interviews and Meetings with Beneficiaries	44
Annex E: SAHEWA: Achievement of Outputs	46
Annex F: CBWASAP – Achievement of Outputs.....	53

Abbreviations

ADRA	Adventist Development and Relief Agency
CAP	Community Action Plan
CBWASAP	Community-Based Water and Sanitation Project
CDRD	Community-Driven Recovery and Development
CLTS	Community-Led Total Sanitation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic cooperation and Development (OECD)
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HAC	Humanitarian Aid Commission
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
INGO	International Development Organisation
LNGO	Local Non-Governmental Organisation
LRRD	Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development
MSC	Most Significant Change
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OD	Open Defecation
ODF	Open Development Organisation
PM	Project Manager
PTSG	Project Technical Steering Committee
RT	Review Team
SAHEWA	Sustainable Access to Health Education and Water
SPC	Spare Parts Centre
SPLM-N	Sudan People's Liberation Movement - North
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund
WASAP	Water and Sanitation Project
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WES	Water, Environment and Sanitation Agency

Executive Summary

The Projects

The reviewed two-year projects, supported by ADRA Denmark and implemented by ADRA Sudan, are:

- In West Darfur, the Sustainable Access to Health Education and Water for All – Phase 3, **SAHEWA-3**, implemented in selected villages in El Geneina, Krenik and Serba localities.
- In Blue Nile, the Community-Based Water and Sanitation Project, **CBWASAP**, implemented in Rosaries, Damazin, Geisan and Tadamon localities.

The main intended results of both projects are:

- Improved livelihoods of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists;
- Better access to basic water and sanitation services;
- Up-scaling of best practices and better coordination and cooperation with other stakeholders.

Both projects were piloting approaches that were new for the targeted localities: Community Action Plans (CAPs), Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs), and Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS). In the SAHEWA project there were also Farmer Field Schools (FFS).

The Review

The fieldwork for the review was carried out by two teams, one in West Darfur and the other in Blue Nile, from 10 to 21 April. The review team (RT) was a mix of consultants from Kenya and Sudan. They were accompanied in the field by staff members of ADRA Sudan and ADRA Denmark. The RT observed activities across all three of the project components, interviewed key stakeholders and held focus group discussions with project staff and beneficiaries. As well as collecting data on the achievements of the projects' targets and identifying main issues affecting the implementation of the projects', the RT applied the 'Most Significant Change' approach, which involved recording stories told by beneficiaries about the impact the project has had on their lives and livelihoods.

Findings

Relevance

The projects are certainly addressing most relevant needs.

These are essentially resilience projects, developing the capacities of communities that have been affected by conflict: in areas where water sources, health and education facilities, are in need of rehabilitation – and anyway are insufficient – and where there are no other opportunities for accessing loans to improve livelihoods.

The project designs are well conceived but poorly articulated in their logframes.

The three main components – improving water supplies, for both humans and livestock; improving sanitation and increasing hygiene awareness; establishing savings and loans associations – are all relevant for addressing the priority needs of the target communities.

However, the logframes – important for identifying precise and realistic targets – show a weak understanding of the conventional ‘grammar’ for distinguishing between objectives, outputs, outcomes and activities. And this means that the logframes are not as useful as they should be for monitoring and managing the implementation of the projects.

The projects have shown a readiness to adapt during implementation.

The CAP approach itself entails adapting to community development priorities. Also, in West Darfur, there is the example of the project agreeing to respond to a government request to construct an important sub-surface dam.

The identified assumptions and risks were valid

All the assumptions concerning security, access and willingness of targeted beneficiaries have held.

Efficiency

The projects’ inputs (funds, equipment, etc.) were sufficient but not always available on time.

The description of activities and outputs in the budget do not always mirror those in the logframe, as was found in the SAHEWA project, presenting a challenge in monitoring expenditure per activity. The budget was sufficient to carry out planned activities; however, the projects have experienced a number of delays in disbursement, owing to unwieldy accounting procedures applied when there was a possibility of fraud having happened, delayed reporting, and staffing problems.

Project activities have been delayed and other management problems have been experienced.

Activities started about three months late because of delays in obtaining the state governments’ technical agreements – now, a change in the implementing cycle, from April to March, is being considered.

Sudan Khartoum has gone through a period when there were serious staffing shortfalls, but new appointments for the Khartoum office – especially the programme director and the two programme assistants – has considerably eased the situation.

There is a need to review and revise the monitoring and reporting procedures.

As indicated above, the logframe is not an easy tool to use for monitoring activities and outputs. Also, the monitoring manual is unusually complex and not user friendly. Yet there are many achievements of the projects that deserve imaginative recording and dissemination. But the ADRA Sudan staff feel that the current reporting format is rather restrictive.

Effectiveness

The achievement of a number of envisaged outputs has been delayed, as indicated above – especially those within the third component concerned with the dissemination of lessons learnt and the up-scaling of activities. A detailed record of achievements against plans is given in Annexes E and F. However, the most important objective of the review was to assess the approaches being piloted in both projects.

The strategies – CAP, VSLA, FFS and CLTS – are clearly appropriate for such resilience projects.

All four approaches are particularly appropriate in terms of facilitating a shift from a humanitarian to a development strategy – from a ‘bounce back’ to a ‘bounce back better’ situation – and increasing the livelihood choices of the beneficiaries. But the RT suggests that it is important that community plans – all ADRA Sudan community-based interventions could be linked more closely with state and locality provision of services.

The projects are addressing cross-cutting issues.

Both projects are enhancing the chances for community members to participate in the needs assessments that lead to project interventions and to be involved in project governance structures.

Both are focusing on hygiene and income-generating issues of particular importance to women and including them in the project-related groups and committees.

However, there is less evidence that the projects are specifically focusing on environmental issues.

A number of significant best practices can be identified.

The community-based committee promoting CLTS can be an important mechanism for sustaining the improved sanitation practices. The CAP approach could be applied in other projects in other places implemented by ADRA Sudan – a key strategy for moving along the LRRD spectrum and enhancing the resilience of target communities.

Capacity building is a key feature of all project components.

The CAP develops a community’s ability to assess priority needs and to be involved in project implementation. However, the staff need further training in order to ensure that they can facilitate a rigorous analysis of needs and a realistic identification of projects. The VSLAs are very popular – but more training is needed in order that regulations are understood and applied.

Impact

A number of likely and positive impacts can be identified.

The participating community groups have grown in confidence and skills. There is evidence that government attitudes towards the seemingly ‘soft’ CAP approach has shifted from negative to positive when ‘hard’ and needed results are seen to follow.

There are changes occurring in people’s lives and livelihoods.

Communities where CLTS has been implemented have been able to declare themselves open defecation free. Farmers are achieving increased and varied crop yields. Families have been able increase incomes through membership of the VSLAs.

Sustainability

The RT finds that the sense of local ownership is high, and especially the project-related groups and committees have been empowered. But the links with government at state and locality levels are weak – and the capacity of official government structures engaged in service delivery is crucial for the long-term sustainability of development initiatives. The documentation of the achievements, challenges and lessons of ADRA projects such as

SAHEWA and CBWASAP could be made much more imaginative and could be disseminated more widely for the benefit of agencies engaged in similar programmes in other places.

Recommendations

1. In line with the Sudan Government's policies related to the empowerment and engagement of Sudanese organisations in humanitarian and development work in the country, ADRA Sudan should formulate a strategy for collaborating with and, when relevant, building the capacity of local non-governmental organisations (LNGOs).
2. In the short term, the management staff should engage in a workshop to reflect on the conventional and consistent use of logframe terminology.
3. In the longer term – particularly in designing new phases for SAHEWA and CBWASAP – the theory of change model should be used, in order to undertake a more rigorous analysis of needs, a more clearly articulated rationale for the interventions, and a more precise and usable presentation of yearly output and outcome targets in a results matrix.
4. In that some of the budget lines for the projects do not match the kinds of activities and outputs in the logframe, causing difficulty in tracking expenditures against planned activities, the RT suggests that in subsequent planning exercises the two documents should be aligned, in order to help both the project staff, as well as the financial staff, in reporting with greater ease on project costs.
5. Recognising the 'goodwill value' of responding to requests for assistance from government agencies, the RT suggests that the benefits of responding need to be balanced against the cost of not carrying out planned activities.
6. The monitoring manuals used for the both projects should be revised in order to make them easier to use by project staff. Additionally, ADRA Denmark should consider revising the reporting template to ensure that the staff have more leeway in reporting some of the successes and lessons being gleaned during implementation. This will also be useful for creating shared learning with other INGOs on some of the approaches, such as CLTS and the CAP, which ADRA has successfully adapted to the Sudan context.
7. Recognising the success of the pilot projects incorporating approaches more suited to development objectives, ADRA Sudan should consider making the CAP methodology central to any future programming of its development interventions.
8. In relation to implementing a CAP approach, the RT suggests that the ADRA projects should strengthen the links with government development planning at both state and locality levels, in the interests of enhancing collaboration, helping to build capacities of government structures, and ensuring sustainability beyond project timescales.

-
9. The CAP manual should be reviewed in the light of the pilot experiences in West Darfur and Blue Nile, keeping it as simple as possible, and with a pull-out summary of the process in a table format for ease of use.
 10. Further training on CAP should be provided for relevant ADRA Sudan staff, so they can facilitate the process in greater depth for consequences of priority actions to be anticipated – and with a wider planning horizon, to take account of government development planning.
 11. With regard to VSLAs, again further training is recommended, so that group members will be better informed about the regulations governing the associations.
 12. For members of farmer field schools, the RT suggests that more inputs on product marketing and post-harvest storage should be provided.
 13. For CLTS, the RT recommends that the approach being used in West Darfur and Blue Nile should be well documented and disseminated, so that agencies implementing similar programmes in other countries can assess the benefits of, particularly, the ‘committee-led’ process of community triggering, in that it could well ensure better behaviour change sustainability.
 14. Given the desirability of institutionalising relationships, ADRA Sudan should advocate with relevant government agencies concerning the possibility of establishing coordinating forums at state and locality levels for development initiatives, involving both government and non-government organisations.
 15. ADRA Sudan should develop a communication strategy that captures its achievements, lessons learnt and best practices, in an imaginative, attractive and arresting manner.



A woman shows her
pots in Garadaya
Village

Introduction

Objectives of the Review

The assignment was to carry out an evaluation of two ADRA projects in Sudan, implemented by ADRA Sudan in partnership with ADRA Denmark:

- Sustainable Access to Health Education and Water, Phase Three (SAHEWA-3) in West Darfur;
- Community-Based Water and Sanitation Project (CBWASAP) in Blue Nile.

They are both particularly interesting projects in that they are building on previous interventions by ADRA, but also experimenting with new approaches in the target areas – and they are both challenging in that they are being implemented for conflict-affected communities.

As stated in the terms of reference (ToR), the overall objective of the review is to examine the effects of SAHEWA and CBWASAP in improving the living conditions of the project beneficiaries – appraising the changes that are being made in the lives and livelihoods of people, whether agriculturalists or pastoralists, IDPs or returnees, and assessing the likelihood of the benefits being sustained.

The ToR also identified a number of specific issues to be explored:

- Significance of needs being addressed;
- Intervention logic;
- Efficiency of implementation;
- Appropriateness of the methods being deployed;
- Achievement of intended outputs and outcomes;
- Degree of coordination with other relevant agencies;
- Relevance of the funding modalities.

The full ToR are given in Annex A.

The Team

The review team (RT) was made up of two consultants from iDC of Kenya, two independent consultants from Sudan, and staff members of ADRA Sudan. It was not possible to obtain permission for either of the Kenyan consultants to visit Blue Nile, and the fieldwork in Sudan took place a week later than indicated in the ToR – from 10 to 21 April.

For the fieldwork, the RT split:

The West Darfur Team:

- John Fox, managing director of iDC and team leader;
- Christine Kamau, director of iDC;
- Abdel Wahab, Sudanese consultant;
- Enas Osman, ADRA programme assistant.

The Blue Nile Team

- Nasr Adam, Sudanese consultant
- Hanadi Waad, ADRA programme assistant
- Mohamed Harun, ADRA (SAHEWA staff, CAP & VSLA)

Christian Sorensen, ADRA Denmark Programme Adviser, accompanied the team working in West Darfur; Helene Elleman-Jensen, ADRA Denmark Programme Director, joined the RT for the final phase of the assignment in Khartoum.

The review programme is given in Annex B.

Review Methodology

Analytical Framework

For the collection of data, an analytical framework was used that is drawn from the 'big five' DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability – the same evaluation themes identified in the ToR. Within this framework all the specific issues from the ToR, and noted above, have been taken up – issues related to the needs being addressed by the projects; the logic underpinning the interventions; the implementation strategies; appropriateness of the methodologies; achievement of outputs and outcomes; coordination with other humanitarian and development agencies; the adequacy and use of funding. This framework guided all the consultations, whether in interviews or in focus group discussions (FGDs), and it has provided the main structure for this review report:

- **Relevance:** The appropriateness of objectives to the problems and potentials that the SAHEWA and CNWASAP projects are designed to address – and to the physical and policy environments within which they operate.
- **Efficiency:** The cost, speed of response, and ability of project management, in relation to the way inputs are being utilized.
- **Effectiveness:** An assessment of the degree to which outputs are being realised and the appropriateness of the approaches being used in the various project components.
- **Impact/degree of change:** The likely longer-term effect of the projects on their target groups and wider communities.
- **Sustainability:** The likely continuation of the stream of benefits produced by the projects.

Data Collection Methods

The consultants utilised a range of methodologies to ensure triangulation of the information gathered:

- **Documentary evidence:** The variety of documents identified in the ToR – the project documents, logframes and budgets; the 2015 Danida review; the 2014 SAHEWA review; 2014 CBWASAP review; quarterly and annual reports.
- **In-depth interviews:** One-on-one discussions and group meetings in Khartoum and in the two project sites with ADRA programme managers, other relevant development

agencies, members of the Project Technical Steering Group (PTSG) of SAHEWA, representatives of local authorities, ADRA's national NGO partners, and community members. The interviews were guided by semi-structured checklists, capturing responses related to the themes and issues indicated above.

- **Focus group discussions:** With project field staff and with beneficiary groups. The two checklists for interviews and FGDs are given in Annexes C and D.
- **Observations:** Carried out during field visits of completed and ongoing project activities.

Most Significant Change

To collect additional qualitative data, the RT used the 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) approach – the qualitative methodology of collecting, analysing and selecting stories about the progress and impact of a project. The focus was on the participants' perceptions of the impact of the projects on their aspirations and practices. A number of these stories will be found in the Impact section of this report.



Children on their
donkeys in West
Darfur

Relevance

Assessing the appropriateness of activities to the problems that the projects are designed to address – and to the physical and policy environments within which they operate

A Situation Analysis

West Darfur

The Greater Darfur, an area of 549 square kilometres, is the most western region of Sudan. It has five states: West, East, North, Central and South Darfur. At the time of the review, a referendum was being held to determine whether the five should form one united state. The decision was to keep to the five.

Darfur has a low and variable rainfall, ranging from less than 50 mm in the northern desert to approximately 200 mm around El Fasher; 300-500mm in Geneina and Nyala; up to 800 mm or more in the south and in Jebel Mara. In recent times the extent of drought forced many Darfurian tribes to change their nomadic lifestyle and seek settlement in lands considered by other tribes as their homeland. Also, there was a migration of other nomads into Darfur in search of water and grass.

Climate change also has affected the traditional migratory routes of livestock, as well as the movement of people. And this has thrown up the issue of land rights. Also the pace of urbanization has put pressure on the natural resources.

And so there was the conflict that erupted in 2003-4. The situation was critical for those who had moved into IDP camps near the urban centres, for those who had moved from one area to another in the rural areas, and also for those who had remained in the villages. Darfur has changed much over the years of conflict

West Darfur State borders Chad, the DRC, and South Sudan. It has a population of 1.6 million, 90% of whom live in the rural areas. It has less rebel presence compared to the other Darfur states. Nevertheless, it is also affected by sporadic tribal conflict. And the poor rainfall results in sudden market fluctuations, livelihood changes, and the displacement of people. But the nature of the conflict has changed over time and, now, some kind of normality is returning in the major parts of West Darfur State.

West Darfur's governance structure is in line with the federal system in the country, with a governor and ministers at the state level. At the lower level, the state is divided into eight localities: Kulbus, Jebel Moon, Serba, El Geneina, Kereinik, Beida, Habila and Foro Baranga. Each locality is then divided into administrative units – the smallest government units.

In the period following the conflict, the humanitarian actors focused on life saving, social protection, and the provision of basic services in health, education and the provision of water. The armed conflict had destroyed basic infrastructure, leaving communities without access to essential services.

However, the current situation allows for a return to livelihood restoration for returning villagers involved in agriculture, for pastoralists continuing their migratory livestock keeping, and for agro pastoralists who have settled and engage in trade and some cultivation.

The people of West Darfur practise three types of livelihood. There are pastoralists and agro-pastoralists whose livelihood depends on their animals; there are the crop farmers who depend on their fields. The prolonged drought of the 1980s had adversely affected water availability for both the people and their animals. And, therefore, access to water and pasture resources had been a serious source of conflict.

Although the government of Sudan provided *haffirs* (water reservoirs) and dug wells meant to provide year-round water, these facilities, particularly the *haffirs*, failed to meet the needs during the peak of the dry season – and there was also a problem of maintenance. The only source of water was in the few remaining dug wells. Since livestock is essential for their survival, pastoralists were ready to prioritize the welfare of their animals and with little regard for the needs of other people. This generated direct conflict with the local people.

Moreover, the hygiene and health situation in the rural areas has been appalling, with high rates of morbidity and mortality. Assessments made by humanitarian agencies revealed that the health systems – their infrastructures and other resources – were very weak. There are very limited health services; hospitals are insufficient, and there are few nurses or trained and qualified traditional birth attendants. The mortality rate for small children is especially high, due to diseases that can be easily treated, such as acute respiratory illness, diarrhoea, malnutrition and malaria.

These are the issues and problems that ADRA's SAHEWA project is designed to address. Also, the state government is now exerting more effort to deliver basic services, but it has inadequate material resources and human capacity. And the regional Darfur government, through the Qatari and Arab League Funds, have established pilot villages for returnees in the greater Darfur, including some in West Darfur. But the impacts of these efforts are not yet known.

Blue Nile

Blue Nile State, an area of 38,500 square kilometres, is situated in the eastern part of Sudan, neighbouring Sennar and White Nile States to the west, and sharing international borders with Ethiopia and South Sudan. Its population is about 831,500 individuals and 138,600 households. It is divided into seven localities: Ad-Damazin, Al Kurmok, ArRoseires, Tadamon, Bau or Baw, Geisan and Wad Almahi.

Blue Nile hosts forty different ethnic groups. A region of heavy rainfall and high temperatures, the main economic activities are based on agriculture and livestock – and there is increasing mineral exploitation. Moreover, the rural population practises fishing, wood and bamboo cutting, petty trading and gold mining in the hilly areas of Geisan, Kurmuk, Bau and Rosaries. The state also has the Rosaries Dam, which is the main source of Sudan's hydroelectric power.

Largely due to its strategic and economic importance, Blue Nile has, since 1997, been the focus of a struggle for political control between the Government of Sudan and the former Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM). Before the South Sudan cessation of 2011, this was a transitional and war zone between the north and the south. It then became an avenue for a continued dispute between the SPLM-N forces and Sudan Armed Forces. This has negatively impacted the livelihoods of its peoples, their social wellbeing, and their access to basic services – all this despite its rich natural resources. There are many victims of displacement, torture and rights violations.

So the armed conflict continues to be the major cause of the deteriorating humanitarian situation in some parts of the state, with thousands of people internally displaced since the start of the conflict in 2011. Fighting, although sporadic, is still going on in areas of Geisan, Bau and Kurmuk localities. The northern parts of Kurmuk and Geisan, as well as south eastern Bau, are accessible to NGOs, but the rest of the area is largely inaccessible.

Approximately 50% of the state's population has limited access to water, and 75% has no access to clean drinking water. In the rural areas people continue to drink from unsafe water sources such as traditional hand dug wells, streams, *haffirs*. During the dry season, women have to walk very long distances, ranging between three to five kilometres, to fetch water – usually carrying only 20 litres, which is never enough for a family's domestic use.

Access to sanitation facilities in Blue Nile is a big challenge, and open defecation is a common practice. In addition, basic hygiene and health awareness amongst the people is still very limited. The WASH sector members are making efforts to improve access to safe water and sanitation. The government has plans to provide safe water to those communities in Tadamon locality that are dependant only on *haffirs* for drinking water.

These are the main water, sanitation and health education issues that provide the rationale for CBWASAP. Currently, there are four other international organizations operating in Blue Nile, of which three have access to rural communities through their local partners. Islamic Relief, as well as ADRA Sudan, works through Mubadiroon, a Sudanese NGO, in providing life-saving services, WASH and education interventions in Rosaries, Damazin, Tadamon and Geisan localities. Save the Children and World Vision are operating through CORD and Labina in food security, education and WASH. Practical Action has reduced its activities to the minimum and retained only a skeletal staff to run the office.

Responding to Needs

Is the project addressing the most relevant needs of the target communities?

In assessing the degree to which the project has been able to adhere to Sudan's policies and priorities, the RT finds that the implementation approach is able to accomplish this well. The management has been keen to ensure that the conduct of its staff is in keeping with the directives of the Sudan government, and that government policies are observed. A case in point is the Sudanisation policy that requires all international NGOs to partner with local NGOs in order to build the capacity of these organisations. However, observing this policy has not been without its challenges, especially in West Darfur where the capacity of local

NGOs is particularly low. Further, ADRA is a self-implementing NGO and, therefore, adopting an approach that was interpreted to be almost akin to sub-contracting a local organisation to implement on its behalf was alien to the organisation's ethos.

An additional challenge in observing this policy is that the selection of the partners has not been solely ADRA's decision, in as much as the Humanitarian Aid Commission (HAC) has to screen and approve any such partnerships. But ADRA has been flexible in surmounting some of these challenges. This is evident in the different approaches taken in working with the current three partners. In Blue Nile, the local partner – Mubadiroon – is a large NGO with very good capacity; whereas the situation is different in West Darfur, where the two local partner NGOs – Future and IDEAS – have very low capacity. However, the RT finds that ADRA-Sudan has not yet developed a coherent and articulated partnership strategy. But this issue will be dealt with in more detail later on in the report. Nevertheless, it should be said that ADRA is attempting to respond to government policy in a positive manner.

In general, the emphasis of aid in both West Darfur and Blue Nile is still primarily a humanitarian one, despite the fact that the majority of the community has since moved from an emergency situation into a recovery mode. To its credit, the ADRA projects have been able to evolve in response to the changing circumstances and needs described above. In speaking to members of the communities, it became clear that the adoption of a more development-oriented approach has been welcomed and taken up with zeal. ADRA has been working with the target communities for some time, and it had recognised – as observed by the RT as well – that the communities have grown in confidence and have shown an ability to organise themselves in such a manner that particularly the Community Action Plan (CAP) approach could be applied successfully.

In fact, in assessing all the four methods employed by the projects – CLTS, FFS and VSLAs, as well as the CAP – the RT finds that the decision to introduce them was timely. It is an indication that the project management is in tune with the interests and aspirations of the communities, such that they have been able to let the projects grow at pace with the evolving needs of the communities they are working with.

Project Design

Is the design well conceived in order to address the identified needs?

However, there is one negative aspect of project design that should be highlighted here. The logframes are difficult tools to use, especially for project monitoring. For both projects, but particularly for CBWASAP, the overall objectives – and their indicators – are stated in terms more suited to projects concerned with health rather than more eclectic resilience interventions. In both, there is confusion in how the various terms are used: outputs vs. activities; activities vs. indicators. So, although the benefits of the interventions can be observed on the ground, the intervention logic is not clearly stated. And a more consistent use of terms and a more precise formulation of outputs and indicators would make the monitoring of outputs and the evaluation of outcomes much easier.

Assumptions and Risks

How valid were the assumptions and risks identified at the outset of the project?

The assumptions (and the risks, which can be seen as the ‘flip-side’ of the assumptions) made when designing the project have all held. But these are all external assumptions and risks, as is usually the case when using conventional logframes. What would have assisted ADRA even more would have been to also articulate the internal assumptions – the rationale for the design of the projects – that can also affect implementation if mitigation measures are not put in place early enough. Such an exercise, for example, would have captured assumptions related to organisational capacity, which eventually affected implementation progress severely during SAHEWA 2b and part of SAHEWA 3, due to the lack of sufficient qualified staff to manage the project, both at Khartoum level and on the ground.

We propose that using a theory of change approach for any future projects could assist ADRA in having a more robust consideration of the various methods being used; in articulating the support needed from the organisation’s management, the government and from partner agencies, with the aim of strengthening the support function to the field offices for improved results.

Recommendations

- **In line with the Sudan Government’s policies related to the empowerment and engagement of Sudanese organisations in humanitarian and development work in the country, ADRA Sudan should formulate a strategy for collaborating with and, when relevant, building the capacity of local non-governmental organisations (LNGOs).**
- **In the short term, the management staff should engage in a workshop to reflect on the conventional and consistent use of logframe terminology.**
- **In the longer term – particularly in designing new phases for SAHEWA and CBWASAP – the theory of change model should be used, in order to undertake a more rigorous analysis of needs, a more clearly articulated rationale for the interventions, and a more precise and usable presentation of yearly output and outcome targets in a results matrix.**

Efficiency

An appraisal of management issues, assessing the cost, speed of response, and general management issues in relation to the way inputs have been utilised

Funds and Other Inputs

Are inputs (funds, equipment, etc.) sufficient and available when needed?

In keeping with the discussion above regarding the quality of the logframe, we propose that the description of activities and outputs in the budget should mirror more closely the activities in the logframe, or vice versa; for example, in the SAHEWA budget, Output 1.1 refers to 'Water for animals' and related activities. But in the logframe, Output 1.1 relates to continued *haffir* rehabilitation with no related activities articulated for this, although it could be argued that *haffirs* are primarily used to water animals. Outputs 1.4 in the logframe relates to livelihood strengthening, while there is no related Outputs 1.4 in the budget, and livelihood activities fall under Outputs 2.2.... and so on. This is in contrast to the documents of CBWASAP, where there is a close association between the budget and the logframe.

The table below presents, briefly, the above mentioned differences observed in SAHEWA's documents.

Output	Description in logframe	Description in the budget
1.1	Continued Haffir Rehabilitation	Water for animals
1.2	Strengthened Haffir management	Strengthening of Haffir management
1.3	Community action plans developed	Community action plans pilot (12 villages)
1.4	Livelihood strengthening of agriculturalists, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists	Missing
2.1	Water access through sustainable improved dug wells	Community action plans up-scaled (15 villages)
2.2	Sanitation, health and hygiene improvement	Livelihood strengthening activities

In terms of project management, therefore, this presents a challenge as to how well the staff members are able to match and monitor implementation of the budget against planned activities. At the close of 2015, for example, there was an overspending in the budget in West Darfur due to a misunderstanding about the actual amount available for activities.

This aside, during implementation, ADRA Denmark has allowed flexibility between the various budget lines as long as the total budget cost of 4M DKK remained intact. This has enabled the project to be responsive to emerging needs on the ground, which has been crucial in securing 'buy-in' from the community and good will from the West Darfur State Government and other government agencies. One example of this flexibility was the construction of the sub-surface dam at Mejmere at the request of the West Darfur State Water Agency. This was not included in the plan, but the result was the building of

invaluable good will with the State Water Agency, an important counterpart for the project in its WASH-related activities.

Although this is a positive development, the project staff will need to remain aware that ADRA's mandate is not to fund government projects, and such future request should be weighed carefully against planned requirements and the need to remain in the Government's 'good books'.

The project has experienced a number of delays since their inception due to various reasons:

- At the beginning of each year, the projects have to wait for the approval of the technical agreement from the State Government and, although the application is often made early enough – around December or January of the following year – the approval is routinely delayed for up to three months. It is not possible to carry out any activities in the intervening time without this approval. Further, the guidelines on the application process often change, making it difficult to anticipate the delay and make an earlier application. This delay also means that, instead of 12 months, the projects only have about eight or nine months in which to deliver on activities.¹ This means that the project has to cover overheads for three months, during which time no project activities are taking place. In monetary terms, this translates into high administration costs and a reduced value for money.

To mitigate these delays, ADRA is exploring the possibility of changing the implementation timing to begin in April through to March, allowing for a full 12 months cycle in an implementation year. This will ease the pressure on the project staff and enable them to have more time to engage with communities, to monitor and review activities. However, to a large extent, the delays caused by this precondition are beyond ADRA's control.

- Disbursement of funds to the project office in West Darfur has frequently been delayed, and so has transfer of funds from Denmark to Khartoum. During 2015, the key reason for this was that a misunderstanding in accounting for some expenditure from West Darfur resulted in an auditor pointing out the possibility of fraud. This was taken quite seriously in Khartoum, where strict disbursement guidelines were instituted. Although it was eventually established that it was not fraud but a case of wrongful reporting, the safeguard measures instituted as a consequence of this were extreme. Any expenditure had to be counter-signed by the finance manager in Khartoum, meaning that related documentation and payments had to be sent to Khartoum for approval and signature.

This system was found to be highly inefficient, as it caused unconscionable delays in implementation. Occasionally, this resulted in an inability to pay for running costs and salaries, and for the programme manager to resort to personally paying for some of

¹ And this period can be shortened further by rains that usually constrain mobility and access to some communities.

these costs while waiting for funds. Fortunately, it was reported that this did not result in delays to project implementation, although staff morale was said to have suffered.

- Financial reporting is done monthly, and reports are expected to be submitted to Denmark by the 10th of the following month. And the disbursement of funds is done on a quarterly basis. However, there are occasional delays from West Darfur in submitting reports to Khartoum, but the major delays, especially in 2015, were due to Khartoum delaying the reporting to Denmark. The finance manager at the time was going through personal problems that eventually affected his work.

Since the beginning of 2016, it was said that reporting has improved, and this is to a large extent is due to the project employing a new finance manager who has managed to streamline reporting procedures.

In assessing the ratio of administrative costs to direct project costs, the calculation is about 37% for administrations versus 63%. This is on the high side, but it is due to the fact that, at the time of the review, the West Darfur office and staff were being maintained fully by the SAHEWA project. This is a costly way of managing a project. The ideal scenario would be for the West Darfur office and some staffing costs to be shared between at least one or two other projects, thereby minimising the burden on any one project. West Darfur has recently been awarded one such contract, and this is bound to ease the situation to a certain extent.

It is, however, important to note that funding to Darfur has generally been dropping over the last few years, and in this situation it is unclear whether ADRA Sudan will be able to secure additional projects to shore up the office and to reduce the burden on SAHEWA.

Management

Are project activities on time, at planned cost, and well managed on a day-to-day basis?

As discussed above, project activities started late because of the delay in obtaining the government's technical agreement – and it is hoped that a change to an April-March implementing cycle will ease this problem.

Also, between 2014 and 2015, both SAHEWA and CBWASAP suffered from some management challenges both at the Khartoum office and on the ground. In Khartoum, the projects were without project officers concerned with their specific issues; neither did ADRA Sudan have a programme manager to oversee matters. Instead, the monitoring manager was assigned the roles of both monitoring and programme management and, as a consequence, both functions suffered.

We have already mentioned the challenge with the financial manager that further complicated matters.

In August 2015, the SAHEWA programme manager fell ill, and has been incapacitated since, meaning that he has been absent from the field for the last six to seven months. Needless to say, the effect on project implementation has been telling. In speaking with ADRA Denmark's programme adviser, the quality of implementation was assessed to have fallen in

these seven months, although the project staff tried to make up for the absence as best they could. The Denmark-based programme adviser himself made over five visits to West Darfur during this time to support the staff. One of the staff took on the role of acting programme manager, but it was found that he could not replace the programme manager in ensuring the quality of outputs.

By February 2015, the major staffing challenges had been addressed at the Khartoum level, with the recruitment of two project assistants – one for each project – and a dedicated programme manager to provide management oversight. For SAHEWA, the assigned project assistant had been deployed to manage the project in West Darfur, while the recruitment of a new programme manager was ongoing.

As a consequence of delays in getting government approval, and also the staffing issues discussed above, a number of activities have fallen behind schedule. In a number of the boxes of the Achievements Tables² for both SAHEWA and CBWASAP presented in Annexes E and F there is either ‘Not done’ or ‘Re-planned for 2016’.

However, there are two delayed activities that should be particularly noted here. First, the RT was not able to get clarification why the PTSG has not yet been formed in Blue Nile. This has seriously constrained the project in Blue Nile in achieving the envisaged outputs under the objective of maximising impact ‘through up-scaling of best practices and better coordination and cooperation with other stakeholders’.

Second, in both West Darfur and Blue Nile, the envisaged documentation and sharing of lessons learnt – again, under the third objective of the two projects – has not taken place. It seems to the RT that this is mainly because ADRA Sudan does not have a clearly articulated communication strategy. But this is an issue to be taken up later in the report.

Monitoring and Reporting

How inclusive and flexible are the M&E and reporting systems being used?

As already mentioned, the project logframes present a challenge in the way they have been written and, as a result, they are not easy to use to support monitoring. For both projects, a monitoring manual was developed through a joint process between management and staff. However, the RT is of the opinion that these manuals are very complicated to use. This was later confirmed by the staff.

With regard to project reporting, the projects are required to use a pre-designed template. This is necessitated by the rigour of reporting required by Danida in the reporting that ADRA Denmark makes to them. As a result, although the template allows the staff to record important information related to indicators and implementation progress, the format is rather restrictive and does not allow for the capture of many of the interesting

² These tables are derived directly from the logframe. The RT used these to track progress made on each project activity.

achievements that the RT was able to observe when visiting the various interventions on the ground.

Related to this, there are numerous stories of changes and lessons that could be used for learning purposes, both within ADRA Sudan and ADRA Denmark, but also for some of the INGOs implementing similar interventions in Sudan. For example, as will be seen further on in the discussion on CLTS, the manner in which the project staff have adapted the approach to fit the communities that they work with could be documented as a lesson on how to enhance the sustainability of this method in Sudan and elsewhere.

Recommendations

- **In that some of the budget lines for the projects do not match the kinds of activities and outputs and activities in the logframe, causing difficulty on tracking expenditures against planned activities, the RT suggests that in subsequent planning exercises the two documents should be aligned, in order to help both the project staff, as well as the financial staff, in reporting with greater ease on project costs.**
- **Recognising the ‘goodwill value’ of responding to requests for assistance from government agencies – as in the construction of the sub-surface dam – the RT suggests that the benefits of responding need to be balanced against the cost of not carrying out planned activities.**
- **The monitoring manuals used for the both projects should be revised in order to make them easier to use by project staff. Additionally, ADRA Denmark should consider revising the reporting template to ensure that the staff have some leeway in reporting some of the successes and lessons being gleaned during implementation. This will also be useful for creating shared learning with other INGOs on some of the approaches, such as CLTS and the CAP, which ADRA has successfully adapted to the Sudan context.**



Effectiveness

An assessment of the degree to which outputs are being realised and the appropriateness of the approaches being used in the various project components.

Achievements

Are the envisaged outputs, as identified in the logframe, being achieved?

The answers to this question, for both SAHEWA and CBWASAP, are given in detail in Annexes E and F – where the project staff were asked to record performance against the outputs and activities identified in the logframes. And this record of achievements corresponds with what is presented in the annual reports of 2015 for both projects.

There are a number of concerns here, as noted in the previous chapter in the discussion about delayed activities. However, the main objective of the RT, as is the emphasis of the ToR, was more to do with strategy: to assess the effectiveness of the approaches being taken as the projects moved from humanitarian objectives (to enable the communities to ‘bounce back’ after experiencing shocks) to development objectives (to assist the communities to ‘bounce back better’ through building their capacities and increasing their choices with regard to livelihoods).

Strategies

Are the strategies of the project appropriate, particularly the CAP, VSLA, FFS and CLTS?

Community Action Plans (CAPs)

The CAP approach, piloted in West Darfur and in Blue Nile, borrows from the community-driven recovery and development (CDRD) model that has been implemented by the Danish Refugee Council for many years in countries such as Somalia and parts of Kenya. However, in applying it in Sudan, the staff members have modified the approach in one key feature: instead of giving a stipulated amount of cash to the communities, the project supports them by providing materials to fill a gap in a specific community initiative.

For example, when a community builds a school, ADRA contributes by providing roofing and benches for the students – in kind instead of cash – and the amount used per community differs depending on the kind of initiative. In the CDRD approach, communities are given a cash grant – a similar amount for all communities supported – and a selected community-based committee is then trained on how to manage the funds, and go through a full planning, procurement and monitoring process of an intervention. CDRD, therefore, is more time consuming and more resource intensive (in terms of staff) considering that it takes time to train committees on each of the tasks that they are meant to perform.

But one element that the RT considers to be still crucial in promoting the CAP approach, and that is missing from the way that the CAP has been piloted by ADRA, is building the link between communities and the local authorities. For the sake of sustainability, and even to enable a scaling up of the approach, it is important to link such community activities with

the local authorities' plans.³ ADRA, especially in West Darfur, has made concerted efforts to ensure that line ministries in the sectors that they work in are involved in project planning and monitoring, through the PTSG. Considering the low capacity of local authorities in Sudan in general, this is an understandable and sensible approach, as it does ensure a link with relevant government agencies. However, the RT maintains that it is still desirable to further strengthen links with government development planning at both state and locality levels in the interests of enhancing collaboration, helping to build capacities of government structures, and ensuring sustainability beyond project timescales.

Another issue that ADRA should consider is the importance of documenting and learning from what has happened in the pilot stage of the CAP. For example, in visiting the communities, it became evident that they needed more support in the manner in which the facilitation process is provided with regard to identifying their development priorities. Most of the communities sampled during the review in West Darfur had built schools as their number one priority. But, afterwards, they realised that water is an important factor when running a school. The main complaint was that, because of lack of water in some of these communities, children would only attend for a few hours and then leave to go and look for water. And for the women in all the villages visited, water was their key problem. As one villager said, *'We now think that perhaps we should have prioritised water first because the school needs water to run it well, and the homes need water in order to let their children come to school'*. It was also said that the communities are prone to replicating what they see happening in other villages, and so there is a risk that, without proper facilitation, there will be a sudden proliferation of schools in the SAHEWA project areas.

So the lesson from the pilot of CAP is that the rigour of the prioritisation process needs to be improved. In the roll-out to other communities, the project staff should pay particular attention to ensuring that their facilitation of the process goes deeper, to explore the implications of priorities made by the communities, and to assist them in ensuring that the activities that are finally selected are in keeping with the specific context of each village, or set of villages, being supported.

One final comment on the CAP is that, when the project started off the pilot, the staff were not adequately trained in what the process entails. And although there was an exchange visit arranged for the West Darfur staff to learn about how the INGO, Plan, is implementing it elsewhere, commitment to the approach, and also the confidence to apply it, have only come to the staff as a result of them observing its take-up by communities. There is a risk that, if the principles of the approach are not fully grasped from the outset, and the facilitation skills are not developed, the identified plans might not be thought through fully enough.

However, In the RT's visits to the communities, it became apparent that the CAP approach is working effectively in as much as it seems to suit the mindsets of the communities in both West Darfur and Blue Nile. There was little evidence of a dependency mindset: the

³ Although the local authorities were assessed to be particularly weak in both States, it is still important that this aspect is built-into the adapted approach, considering that they are still a component of the government structure, and that they are the part of the structure that is closest to the communities.

communities are keen to demonstrate their self reliance. They appreciate the assistance that ADRA is providing, but they are also proud of their ability to do things for themselves.

Some of the lessons that ADRA can take from the CAP pilot include:

- The fact that ADRA has been working with the communities in West Darfur for a significant period makes a good basis for implementing the CAP approach. The communities have learnt to trust ADRA, and they have grown in confidence with regard to their own capacities. So the introduction of the CAP did not entail such a great 'leap of faith'.
- As for the government agencies, there was an initial resistance to the CAP approach; they saw it as 'soft' and perhaps not bringing the hardware that they were used to seeing from INGOs. However, when they eventually saw the results on the ground, there was a shift in their attitude. So the CAP approach is now supported, especially by the HAC.
- The communities have taken initiatives on their own, such as constructing water yards, health centres and schools, using their own resources and without any support from ADRA. From an LRRD perspective, therefore, through its long association with the communities in West Darfur, ADRA has been able to elicit a 'contiguuum' effect (doing things together rather than in sequence) that is most desirable if the recovery and resilience of a community is to be assured.
- There is a good case for documenting the lessons that are emerging from the piloting of the CAP in West Darfur and Blue Nile. ADRA developed a basic manual on CAP for the staff, but it should now be reviewed in the light of the pilot experience. But it will be important to keep it as simple as possible, and to have a pull-out summary of the CAP approach in a table format, considering that it might be a challenge for the staff to refer frequently to the manual.
- Training the staff, refreshing the training, and sharing experiences between staff implementing the CAP approach in the different states – this will be crucial.
- From a conflict-sensitivity perspective, allowing the communities to decide on the in-kind support they need is a safeguard against them becoming dissatisfied about different kinds of support received – a safeguard against rivalries developing when some communities see others as being more favoured. So ADRA, the staff and the organisation, is not seen as having a bias towards certain communities. In this way, the CAP approach is in keeping with the principle of 'Do no harm'; a particular strength of the CDRD approach.

Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs)

The RT visited four VSLAs: two in West Darfur and two in West Nile. They are clearly popular, and a comment on their impact will be taken up in the following chapter.

The VSLA approach is widespread across the developing world; ADRA has applied it in a other countries where it is working – but it is a relatively new approach in ADRA’s target communities in Sudan. From the enthusiasm of the VSLA members, and from what the RT was told by ADRA staff, it seems there is a great demand for expansion.

It is a very simple idea, and that is part of its attraction. It is essentially a group of people who save together and take small loans from those savings. The activities of the group run in cycles of one year, after which the accumulated savings are distributed back to members. It is particularly appreciated in places such as the rural target communities reached by SAHEWA and CBWASAP, where there are few, or no other, means of accessing loans. So the VSLA is a more transparent, structured and democratic version of the informal savings groups found in villages and slums in many parts of the developing world. However, the rules should be simple enough for even the least literate, least influential members of the groups, to understand and trust.

Each group should be composed of 15 to 25 members. And members save through the purchase of shares. The price of a share is decided by the group, and is set at the beginning of the cycle. But members do not have to save the same amount as each other; and they do not have to save the same amount at each meeting. Also, by saving more frequently in very small amounts, the poor can build their savings more easily – and this can be an effective way of improving the security of the members’ households. The accounting system is not complex. At the end of each meeting, the closing balance of the loan fund is counted, announced and recorded in a notebook. In order to track the individual savings and loan liabilities of its members, VSLAs use a simple passbook.

A few lessons can be drawn from the contact the RT had with the groups:

- It seems that many of the members are much more focused on the loans rather than the savings. So there is a risk here that if savings are not sustained a group can falter and disintegrate.
- Even though the rules and regulations are simple, group members were not always well informed about them. In one group, many of the members did not know the value of their shares. And when the RT sat in on a meeting of the ADRA West Darfur staff VSLA, members were not at all clear about the rules to be applied when a member was leaving the area and the group. So there is a case for more and careful training. And there is a need to reiterate the need for all members to understand the rules and regulations of their groups, or at least to have access to copies of the by-laws of their group.
- In one group, it was observed that the secretary had been one of the first to take a loan – and then had taken another. There is a danger here that, in such circumstances, the members’ trust in their officers could be lost. Trust is a key element of a functional group, and without it, a group could easily disintegrate.

Farmer Field Schools (FFSs)

The farmer field school is a school without walls, says the FAO. In fact, it was the FAO and partners that developed the approach about 25 years ago in South-East Asia. It was seen to be an alternative to the prevailing 'top-down' agricultural extension method of the Green Revolution.

As described by the FAO, in a typical FFS a group of 20-25 farmers meets once a week in a local field setting and under the guidance of a trained facilitator. In groups of five they observe and compare two plots over the course of an entire cropping season. One plot follows local conventional methods, while the other is used to experiment with what could be considered 'best practices'. They experiment with and observe key elements of the agro-ecosystem by measuring plant development, taking samples of insects, weeds and diseased plants, and constructing simple cage experiments or comparing characteristics of different soils. At the end of the weekly meeting they present their findings in a plenary session, followed by discussion and planning for the coming weeks.

The RT was able to visit only one FFS group – in Bej Bej village in West Darfur. It was not an actual school in operation, but it is clear that the proceedings of their FFS are not as systematic as the above FAO description. Nevertheless, the appreciation of the participants – over 30 men and women – was clearly demonstrated. They talked about the FFS meetings with great enthusiasm; they displayed a range of drought-resistant crops they were growing; they provided a most nutritious lunch to be shared with the RT!

A few lessons emerged:

- One benefit of such an FFS can be the introduction of fast-growing crops in the pastoralist migration routes that can be harvested before the pastoralists pass through and cause damage.
- As well as crops for household consumption, the villagers were growing crops for sale in El Geneina, which is not too far away. There is a need, then, for inputs on informal marketing information systems and relevant marketing strategies.
- In the village, the RT noticed some bags of grain left on the ground and under an open shelter, which had clearly been eaten by rodents. Perhaps this is an isolated example but, if not, there is a need for inputs on effective post-harvest storage techniques in as much as post-harvest food loss is one of the causes of food insecurity, impacting a family's health, nutrition and financial stability.

Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS)

As defined by the CLTS Knowledge Hub of the Institute of Development Studies at Sussex University, CLTS is an innovative methodology for mobilising communities to completely eliminate open defecation (OD). Communities are facilitated to conduct their own appraisal and analysis of open defecation (OD) and take their own action to become ODF (open defecation free).

At the heart of CLTS lies the recognition that merely providing toilets does not guarantee their use, nor result in improved sanitation and hygiene.⁴ Earlier approaches to sanitation prescribed high initial standards and offered subsidies as an incentive. But this often led to uneven adoption, problems with long-term sustainability and only partial use. It also created a culture of dependence on subsidies. Open defecation and the cycle of fecal–oral contamination continued to spread disease.

In contrast, CLTS focuses on the behavioural change needed to ensure real and sustainable improvements – investing in community mobilisation instead of hardware, and shifting the focus from toilet construction for individual households to the creation of open defecation-free villages. By raising awareness that as long as even a minority continues to defecate in the open everyone is at risk of disease, CLTS triggers the community's desire for collective change, propels people into action and encourages innovation, mutual support and appropriate local solutions, thus leading to greater sense of ownership and sustainability.

This is the sanitation approach that is being piloted in both SAHEWA and CBWASAP.

However, at first, the RT reacted quite negatively, in that what the team was seeing was not 'pure' CLTS – it seemed to be committee-led rather than community-led. But then, the more the RT members saw and heard, the more convinced they were that there are some important and positive lessons that can be derived from the approach ADRA is taking in Sudan:

- In what has become conventional CLTS, the first, and most significant, move is to carry out a 'triggering' of, as much as possible, a whole community – a triggering carried out by an outside facilitation team. And then the facilitators remove themselves, offering only advice. It is hoped that natural leaders will emerge to push on with the latrine building by the community members who have been 'shamed' into action. But what the ADRA staff do is establish a CLTS committee selected by the community. They train the committee in the CLTS approach – and it is then the committee that carries out the triggering exercise and then encourages households to construct their latrines. It could well be that this approach is a way of improving the chances of sustaining the community's determination to be ODF. And this is important, because it is now widely recognized that the 'short, sharp shock' of CLTS triggering does not always last long.
- An additional advantage of this committee is that it was able to act as a general WASH advisory team, considering that the training provided to them by ADRA also revolved around issues of hygiene and sanitation. And in the villages visited, the committee was

⁴ This was evident to ADRA when the project was previously using the Community Approaches to Sanitation (CATS) method. Communities built latrines but they continued with open defecation while the latrines remained largely unused.

acting as a useful resource for the community with regard to all matters hygiene. So, in addition to CLTS, the project was able to achieve wider sanitation benefits.

- As a consequence of this, it could be of great significance to the world-wide CLTS 'community' that the ADRA Sudan experience is well documented.

Resilience

To what extent are the projects enhancing the resilience of the target individuals and communities?

Perhaps it would be appropriate to explain the RT's understanding of the term 'resilience'. It seems that the term was first used to describe the ability of timber materials to bounce back into original shape after being subjected to a force. Over the recent years the term has taken centre stage in development discourse. Donors and development partners increasingly refer to the term as they work towards efforts to identify lasting solutions to reducing human suffering and poverty.

A number of definitions have been coined as to the meaning of resilience. The UKAID/USAID (2012) Discussion paper, for example, refers to resilience as: 'The ability of countries, communities and households to manage change, by maintaining or transforming living standards in the face of shocks or stresses – such as earth quakes, drought or violent conflict – without compromising their long-term prospects'.

For the RT, as indicated above, it is useful to distinguish between a 'bounce back' and a 'bounce back better' concept of resilience. The former can be related to the objectives of a humanitarian intervention – to enable a community to recover from whatever shock it has suffered. The latter – the 'bounce back better' concept – can be used to highlight the capacity building objectives of a development initiative. And this capacity building is towards increasing the diversity of livelihoods and enhancing the choices open to the beneficiaries.

In as much as capacity building is an essential feature of both SAHEWA and CBWASAP – whether with regard to the development planning involved in the CAP, the ability to save through a VSLA, the improvement of crops through a FFS, or reaching ODF through CLTS – these projects are certainly enhancing the resilience of the target communities.

And this is something that the HAC Commissioner for El Geneina noted when interviewed by the RT. He talked about how impressed he was when he visited the Bej Bej village – particularly by the way in which the villagers were involved in identifying their development needs and then were active in the implementation of their projects.

Cross-Cutting Issues

To what extent are cross-cutting issues – related to governance, gender and environment – being taken into account?

Governance

In all the components of SAHEWA and CBWASAP the beneficiaries are involved by means of project-related groups and committees. That community members are able to organise themselves in project planning is the central feature of the CAP. That they take responsibility for improving sanitation in their locality is the critical aspect of CLTS. So, in these ways, the projects are focused on engaging beneficiaries in the governance of their projects.

From another perspective, ADRA Sudan has demonstrated a concern for improving its own project management system by establishing the PTSG, which means, for SAHEWA, that it is able to get advice from senior members of relevant government agencies. In Blue Nile, the project team has been in discussions with relevant line ministries and government agencies to explore ways in which they could institute a similar PTSG, although they have so far experienced some resistance, hence the delay.

Gender

All the components of the two projects are of direct benefit to women: whether in improving food security; reducing illnesses, especially diarrhea in children, through better sanitation; improving household incomes. And this will be highlighted in two of the change stories to be found in the next chapter.

Also, the RT noted that many women are involved in the project-related committees and groups that have been established – often in leadership positions.

Environment

With regard to the projects taking account of environmental issues, the RT did not see evidence of this – though the WASH, agriculture, sanitation and small-scale construction projects are not likely to involve significant environmental damage.

However, it should be noted that in the CBWASAP project the intention is to pilot the installation of solar pump-driven water yards in communities that have achieved ODF through implementing the CLTS approach.

Best Practices

What best practices can be identified that can be adopted or adapted elsewhere?

As argued above, the RT considers that it has already been demonstrated that ‘the CAP fits’. So this approach – especially relevant for communities that have been exposed to development projects and have shown a confidence in their own capacities – could be taken up in other ADRA projects in Sudan.

On a wider scale, the RT argues that the genuinely community-based, trained local committee, approach to CLTS could be written up for possible application in CLTS

programmes in other countries, because it opens up possibilities for sustaining the effects of the triggering process.

Capacity Building

How effective have been any capacity building initiatives being undertaken?

One example of effective capacity building has just been noted above – the training of the CLTS committees. And capacity building is an essential feature of both projects: in WASH components, training pump attendants and hygiene promoters; in VSLAs, training the groups' officers. As for ADRA staff, the RT argues that more training is needed in areas such as project design and project monitoring. More crucially, perhaps – and to repeat what has been said above – more training is needed in the facilitation of the CAP process. This is so that the analysis of needs can be more thorough in anticipating the consequences of actions (for example, that a health centre will need staff and medical supplies) and more in tune with government plans (for example, the health centre might not be seen as a Ministry of Health priority when the population density of the catchment area is considered).

Recommendations

- **Recognising the success of the pilot projects incorporating approaches more suited to development objectives, ADRA Sudan should consider making the CAP methodology central to any future programming of its development interventions.**
- **In relation to implementing a CAP approach, the RT suggests that the ADRA projects should strengthen the links with government development planning at both state and locality levels, in the interests of enhancing collaboration, helping to build capacities of government structures, and ensuring sustainability beyond project timescales.**
- **The CAP manual should be reviewed in the light of the pilot experiences in West Darfur and Blue Nile, keeping it as simple as possible, and with a pull-out summary of the process in a table format for ease of use.**
- **Further training on CAP should be provided for relevant ADRA Sudan staff, so they can facilitate the process in greater depth for consequences of priority actions to be anticipated – and with a wider planning horizon, to take account of government development planning.**
- **With regard to VSLAs, again further training is recommended, so that group members will be better informed about the regulations governing the associations.**
- **For members of farmer field schools, the RT suggests that more inputs on product marketing and post-harvest storage should be provided.**
- **For CLTS, the RT recommends that the approach being used in West Darfur and Blue Nile should be well documented and disseminated, so that agencies implementing similar programmes in other countries can assess the benefits of, particularly, the 'committee-led' process of community triggering, in that it could well ensure better behaviour change sustainability.**

Impact

The likely longer-term effects of the projects on their target communities

Government Policy and Community Organisation

What longer-term impacts can be identified (for example, changes in policies affecting the communities; ability of the communities to organise themselves)

SAHEWA and CBWASAP do not have an advocacy component, and so there is no overt attempt to influence government policy in relation to WASH, agriculture or savings groups. However, in as much as the projects are establishing the PTSGs, it could well be that influence can go two ways – not only will the projects receive good technical advice, but also the participating representatives of government agencies might well take note of good practices they observe. And if the RT's advice is taken, then ADRA Sudan could take a significant role in advocating for the setting up of a development planning and coordination mechanism at state and locality levels.

The RT has already given one example of how government can be influenced: the change of mind of the HAC Commissioner in El Geneina and his recognition that the CAP approach can lead to the construction of needed facilities – and the stimulation of a strong sense of community ownership. Also, in West Darfur the Ministry of Social Welfare has made the promotion of VSLAs its official policy.

As for the degree of community organisation in both projects, much has been said already in this report. The CAP has been seen to fit; if it is worn, it can only further strengthen the communities' capacity to take more charge of their development initiatives.

Changes in Lives and Livelihoods

What changes in people's lives and livelihoods are being made – changes to which the project can be said to be contributing?

Given the objectives and scope of the review, it was not possible fully to measure the impact of the different interventions being implemented by SAHEWA and CBWASAP. This would have entailed a household survey to establish changes occurring to such aspects as increased yields, increased income, and reduction in morbidity. Moreover, impact could only be assessed at a later stage after completion of the implementation. This has been essentially a qualitative review and, as indicated above, the main purpose was to assess the effectiveness of the intervention strategies.

However, from the team's discussions and observations it is possible to make some assessment of likely impact. And, for each of the three main approaches – FFS, VSLA and CLTS – we are presenting a personal story collected by the RT in West Darfur. These three people were all participating in focus group discussions held in three villages the team visited.

The first story is from a woman member of the FFS in Bej Bej:

“

Arjon

I am a married woman. But my husband has travelled. He has not come back here for seven years. I have six children – though one of them has married and moved away. So the children have been helping me to work on the farm here. But all but one have moved out now, so I have only one left doing the work with me. And when that child goes out, I will be working alone.



Our lives have depended on this farm. It is five acres. And it has been a tough life. It used to be very tough.

I felt that in joining the farmers' group there would be a number of benefits. The first thing is just about coming together – about joining a social activity. The second thing is that I would get knowledge of how to do farming. I have been farming for some time, but the production was not so good.

But now the production has increased. I have learned some new ways to do farming. When the rains come I am growing sorghum, millet, ground nuts, and sesame. In the winter season I am growing tomatoes, cucumber, and other vegetables. We are able to use some of the produce for food – and some of it we can sell. With the extra money we can buy a few things. We can pay the school fees too – but my husband does make some contribution to the fees.

For my children I am hoping a good future. If any one of them wants to become a farmer here in Geneina, that would be good. As for me, I look forward to some rest. If my children come to be, say, officials in offices, I hope they can look after me.

Arjon's story is in keeping with other statement by FGD members also involved in the field schools. The claim is that yields have increased, and the farmers are able to raise family incomes by selling produce. The farmers along pastoralist migration routes have learnt how to better sequence the planting of their crops in order in order to avoid conflict.

Farmers said that they have adopted better spacing of seeds and this has led to a significant increase in production – despite the late and short rainy season in 2015. Farmers have also benefited from training related to processing cheese and yoghurt – and there was a display of such products when the RT visited the group involved in the FFS.

The second story is from the secretary of a VSLA in Adaar Village in El Geneina:

“

Aziazi

I am a widow. My husband was killed in 2012. He was in the house. People came from outside and killed him.

I have children at different levels – from basic school, through high school, to university. There are nine of them.



I am a farmer. I used to be a volunteer teaching in the school here at Adaar. But after my husband was killed, the money I was getting from the work at the school was not enough. So I decided to become a farmer.

I have five *feydan* (4,200 sq metres), and the soil is clay. I have divided the land into two parts. On half I grow millet; on the other half I grow vegetables, cucumbers, tomatoes. There is a well and a pump and so I do some irrigation. The pump I have to hire. The children help with the farming.

I joined the VSLA group because of the opportunity to get a loan – even if you are able to buy only one share. I had in mind using a loan either for buying an animal and selling it, or buying agricultural products. And I am now the secretary of the group.

The first loan I took 1,000 pounds and bought four sheep – after four months I was able to sell them for 2,000 pounds. The second loan was for 500 pounds to buy seeds of cucumber and tomato. When I sold the produce I got 20,000 pounds. With that money I bought a plot in El Geneina town. I want to build a house there for the children, when they go on with their education or get jobs there.

The group is good for me too, because it's where people can come together and know each other. If there are problems we can share them.

Many members of the four VSLAs visited, in both West Darfur and Blue Nile, told similar stories of how the small loans had helped them improve their farming or start up small businesses. As a community leader in Aljamam village of Blue Nile said, 'The main change that has happened in my life is to be able manage my money in the savings group – and, of course, to be able to take out a loan.'

The third story is from a primary school teacher in Ardimi Village in El Geneina. He is also the chairperson of the CLTS committee:

“

Abdallah Dgosh

I am involved in this CLTS work because I think I must like to explain things to people. I think it is because I am a teacher, a teacher in the primary school here.

The main aim of the committee is to make sure that the area is clean. The situation here before was quite bad.

Wherever you walked you had to take great care to look down, because you might easily tread on shit. But now you can walk with your eyes closed.

CLTS is a very interesting approach to sanitation awareness. It leads to a sense of shame in a community that practises open defecation. But we don't point a finger at an individual. The key is in the way the questions are put – questions that lead to he himself saying, 'Oh, it is better to have a latrine'. Better than saying, 'Why do you shit in the open? Why don't you have a latrine?' You ask him, 'If you want to relieve yourself, where do you go? Do you have a place to go?' And he will say, 'No we don't have'. And you say, 'After you have seen what can happen when we eat or drink shit; after knowing about how it can cause diarrhea, what is better – doing it in the open or in a latrine?' So, little by little, you lead him to saying, 'Oh it is better to have a latrine'.

How to sustain CLTS? What will be important will be to convince the children in our schools. If they get it in their minds they will keep it in their lives.



The immediate results of the CLTS initiatives in both states are quite remarkable. According to the Sudan Household Survey carried out in Blue Nile in 2010, 40% of the people were practising open defecation. Now, it seems that the four communities targeted by the sanitation component of CBWASAP in the later stages of 2015 have constructed 272 latrines by their own efforts, and the villages are well on the way to declaring themselves as ODF. In West Darfur, 516 latrines have been constructed by the targeted communities and five villages had declared themselves ODF.

When the RT visited Garadaya Village in El Geneina, they visited households at random – and all had latrines that were in use.

The question raised by Abdallah at the end of this interview is an important one: how to sustain the improvements that are stimulated by the community triggering of CLTS? The issue of sustainability is taken up in the following chapter.

Sustainability

The likely continuation of the stream of benefits produced by the projects

Local Ownership

What is the quality of local ownership and what are the prospects of institutional sustainability at the local level?

And

Have the communities' capacities been sufficiently built so that they can carry on with activities that need to be carried on?

The RT was impressed by the attitude of the project beneficiaries that they met. Many of them expressed gratitude for the assistance they had received from ADRA Sudan, but they also went on to talk about their own capacity to do things for themselves. This was not at all like the kind of dependency that is seen in communities that have been on the receiving end of aid for some time. These are proud people. So the sense of ownership is high.

Cooperation

What is the level of cooperation and coordination with other relevant agencies working in the area and with the same or similar agencies?

With regard to the relationship with the partner local NGOs, the collaboration with the national NGO, Mobadiroon, in Blue Nile is very close. Some beneficiaries said that in the field they could not distinguish between the staff of the two organisations. However, as discussed above, the relationship with the two NGOs in West Darfur – Future and IDEAS – has not yet been thought through.

The establishment of the PTSG in West Darfur has enabled creative contact with relevant government agencies concerned with the sectors covered in the SAHEWA project. The members of the group are engaged in monitoring project activities, and they are in a good position to offer advice to the project managers. But the RT suggests that it might be more appropriate to call it an Advisory rather than a Steering Group – they have influence rather than power!

However, it would be desirable to have some kind of coordination mechanism at state and locality levels for humanitarian and development work that brings together government authorities and NGOs – a mechanism that goes beyond information sharing and is genuinely involved with programme planning. ADRA Sudan could play a role in advocating for this.

Prospects for the Future

What is the likelihood of positive changes continuing in future?

The RT suggests that there are four main factors to be taken into account when trying to assess sustainability:

- Government support;
- Capacity building;
- Ownership;
- Funding.

Despite the Government's declared policy that INGOs will be phased out in Sudan, it is clear that ADRA is held in high regard because of its non-confrontational stance and its focus on basic livelihood needs of the communities where it is working. In fact, the HAC Commissioner in El Geneina, when interviewed by the RT, concluded his remarks by saying, 'If the INGOs leave Sudan then I hope ADRA will be the last to go!'

At the community level, this report has already emphasized the way in which groups and committees established through the projects show a confidence that bodes well for their future.

With regard to engaging with partner LNGOs, this is where ADRA Sudan will need to formulate a positive and coherent policy that includes a capacity assessment and a capacity building component. As it is, the LNGOs seconding one staff member to ADRA Sudan, as is happening in West Darfur, might well be of benefit to the individuals but perhaps not to their organisations.

Communication Strategy

Are lessons learnt being documented and communicated, lessons that can inform any future programming or exit strategies?

And

In particular, what lessons can be learned for strengthening the LRRD strategies of ADRA in Sudan and elsewhere?

The RT finds that what ADRA Sudan is doing in West Darfur and Blue Nile is being undersold – not so much in relation to embellishing ADRA Sudan's image but more with regard to making known significant experiences that should be of interest to humanitarian and development agencies doing similar work.

There is a lot of good work going on – particularly in relation to the CAP and CLTS – that deserves to be better known, because there are lessons that could be applied elsewhere. ADRA Sudan's reports could be fuller, more imaginative and more graphic. The RT found that there are many good stories to tell.

Finally, with regard to LRRD, what the RT recognises is that what especially distinguishes the movement from Relief and Rehabilitation to Development is the focus on capacity building and empowering communities. Implementing the CAP approach can mean that all three of the phases can occur together. The links are not necessarily in sequence – one stage leading to another. It is a matter of contiguity rather than continuation. And making the CAP fit so that it can be worn by the communities is perhaps the most important capacity building that an agency like ADRA can engage in.

Recommendations

- **Given the desirability of institutionalising relationships, ADRA Sudan should advocate with relevant government agencies concerning the possibility of establishing coordinating forums at state and locality levels for development initiatives, involving both government and non-government organisations.**
- **ADRA Sudan should develop a communication strategy that captures its achievements, lessons learnt and best practices, in an imaginative, attractive and arresting manner.**



ODF-free
celebrations at
Dalaba-Gosa Jamat

Annex A: Terms of Reference

SAHEW AND CBWASAP REVIEW

Location: Sudan – Darfur and Blue Nile- Duration 15-20 days (April 2016)

1. Background of SAHEWA-3 and CBWASAP

ADRA Denmark is implementing two projects in partnership with ADRA Sudan- Sustainable Access to Health Education and Water, phase three (SAHEWA-3) and Community Based Water and Sanitation Project(CBWASAP) – SAHEWA-3 in West Darfur, CBWASAP in Blue Nile.

They are both the continuation of a series of short – typically twelve months – rehabilitation projects, which focused on water provision, hygiene and sanitation awareness and health education. These projects started 2006-7 in West Darfur and 2011 in Blue Nile and were funded by ECHO and Danida respectively. These past projects responded to needs of a conflict-affected population, who had been displaced, were hosting IDPs or were simply neglected by humanitarian actors or the Government. Much focus has been on the big number of displaced people living in camps in West Darfur. The ADRA projects focused on the communities affected by conflict, often subjected to temporary displacement, followed by return to their villages.

Since 2013 in West Darfur, and 2014 in Blue Nile, the projects have changed their focus on immediate emergency needs to supporting sustainable livelihood development. This focus on development was in line with the needs expressed by the communities and was also called for by the Government and some humanitarian organizations, notably UNDP and UNEP. In both states, ADRA is now working in areas of relative stability, where Government institutions are functioning, although with low capacity. This change into more development-oriented programming has been difficult, but has also opened for new promising initiatives, one of which is community action planning (CAP) This is a simple participatory planning method, which allows communities to identify their priorities and initiate plans for which they can raise resources. It has been embraced enthusiastically by the communities, and it is increasingly supported by the government moreover, it has been an eye opener to the ADRA staff, who were used to an input and service delivery approach.

Both SAHEWA-3 and CBWASAP are planned as two-year projects, 2015-2016

The socio- economic background is different in the two States, which also means that while the two projects largely use the same approach, there is also a difference. West Darfur is semi-dry and primarily dominated by the pastoralist and agriculturist mode of production, while there is also a good number of agro-pastoralists. Water access for humans and animals are equally important for lives and livelihoods in West Darfur. The conflict, which erupted in 2004-5 was political and very violent and displaced up to 2 million people. It has not yet been solved, but the actual fighting has subsided. The underlying competition over access to natural resources – primarily water and land – between the different groups is still very much an issue.

However, the relative peace and stability in the project in West Darfur has made it possible to go further than in the Blue Nile with the transition developmental approaches especially the CAP approach, which is being institutionalized. Saving groups have become very popular to improve household financial resilience, but also to make it possible for individuals to contribute to community plans as the building of schools, clinics and after infrastructure problem, specific to West Darfur, is the inclusion of pastoralists in development processes.

Until recently, SAHEWA has failed in efforts to collaborate with the pastoralist communities in realizing their priorities, such as securing access to water for their animals.

Blue Nile is dominated by smallholder farming with low productivity, but is also affected by the political conflict between the Sudanese Government and the opposition – primarily the SPLM-N. The state is presently divided into the Northern part, which is controlled by the Sudanese Government and the South-Eastern part, which is controlled by the opposition. The focus in Blue Nile has been access to water for humans. The rainfall in Blue Nile is actually much higher than in West Darfur, but lack of clean water has led to very poor health and sanitary conditions.

The development approaches are being implemented with slower speed in Blue Nile compared to West Darfur because of the conflict, which still affects people's lives a lot. Displacements continue to occur, sometimes temporary, sometimes for a longer period. CBWASAP's focus is on access to water and sanitation. The methods in WASH are changing to be more community driven than previously. In addition, some of the successful approaches from West Darfur have been introduced with success in Blue Nile – especially saving groups and CAP. In relation to water for animals, things have been easier in Blue Nile. The management of *haffirs* (reservoirs for watering animals) in Blue Nile is under Joint community and Government control, something that has not worked in West Darfur, where the pastoralists are much more dominant in number and in terms of local power.

SAHEWA was evaluated in December 2013 and WASAP in 2014. In addition, a Danida Review of ADRA Denmark's operations and activities took place in 2015, where ADRA Sudan was chosen as a humanitarian ADRA Denmark partner to be viewed. This included a trip to West Darfur, where SAHEWA acted as a sample for practical implementation. The Danida review in 2015 recommended strongly that a detailed review of ADRA Denmark's partnership with ADRA Sudan, with focus on the two projects SAHEWA and CBWASAP, should be undertaken in 2016.

2. Purpose of the review

2.1 Objective

The overall objective of the review is to examine the effects of SAHEWA and CBWASAP on improving the living conditions of the intended project beneficiaries in West Darfur and Blue Nile. In other words the review will assess the changes in the lives of people in local communities, agriculturalists and pastoralists, IDPs and returnees, to which SAHEWA and CBWASAP support contributed, as well as the likely sustainability of such changes.

2.2 Results

The review takes place in the second part of the two-year phase of the projects, and it will thus also recommend on the focus, priorities and practices that should be included in the design of a new phase of programming, which may be the last. Recommendations to a phasing-out strategy of the projects are thus part of the expected outputs of the review. The main clients for the review report are ADRA Sudan and ADRA Denmark as well as the project donor (Danida).

2.2. Specific

The review has following specific questions – (percentages in brackets indicate the priority of the various sets of questions):

1. *On Needs:* To what extent can the needs for the livelihoods restoration and development as conceptualized by the projects be verified? Have the needs been specified in relation to vulnerability and gender? How well are the needs of pastoralists addressed in the projects? How relevant are the chosen designs and methodologies of the projects for fulfilling the needs? How well are the needs described in project documents? What are the most pressing needs to be addressed in a next phase? (15%)
2. *On the Logic:* Is the project logic plausible? Are there any unforeseen/unintended consequences of the project? Analysis here will include the assessment if indicators, risks and the assumptions. Which changes are recommended for the next phase? (10%)
3. *On Implementation:* Are all the components critical to the success of the project being implemented? To what degree does the target population participate in and feel ownership of the activities? Is there the right staff mix/quality to implement the projects? Which changes in implementation should be made for the next phase/ phasing out? (25%)
4. *On Methodologies:* Are the methodologies used in the project appropriate, including the use of CAP, VSLA, FFS and CLTS? Can the transition from rehabilitation to development – in the LRRD continuum – be verified? How does the adaptation of the methodologies differ in the two projects and how can the projects learn from each others' best practices? How well is this transition and the underlying strategy documented? How can ADRA upscale best practices of this approach in Sudan? Which changes are recommended for the next phase/ phase out?
5. *On Effectiveness and Efficiency:* Has the project achieved its intended outcomes? Can the project outcomes/ impact be achieved at lower cost? (20%)
6. *On Coordination:* Have the networks of people/ organization required to achieve the program objectives been identified? How well are the Technical Project Steering Committees functioning? How well are the Government and Humanitarian clusters informed about the projects? Has an appropriate

communication/ influence strategy been developed and implemented? Which changes are recommended for second phase? (15%)

7. *On Funding*: Is the current funding strategy the most appropriate for the program? Are there other funding opportunities that may meet the peculiar needs of the program? How well do the projects belong to humanitarian or development agendas? (5%)

3. Scope of Review

While the review will cover all aspects of project effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and relevance, specific primary data gathering will be done to assess the impact of intervention on household resilience and livelihoods, food security and/or peace and stability. The review will cover the SAHEWA and CBWASAP projects to date and all the areas of intervention and target groups supported by the projects. The review of the projects shall be conducted in ADRA Sudan operational areas in West Darfur and Blue Nile. The selection criteria for the specific areas to be covered but the review will be based on various considerations such as accessibility, diversity of intervention implemented and number of beneficiaries reached.

In addition, the projects will be assessed in terms of their performance on crosscutting issues such as gender equality and social inclusion, and impact on the environment. Based on the above analysis the review will draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary further action by ADRA Sudan and ADRA DK, including any need for the follow-up action in the next phase/phase out of the project and in other projects.

Review Methodology and Organization

3.1 Methodology

The review will adopt a participatory approach and use triangulation as a key method for validation of information and evidence. It will follow a consultative, iterative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholder throughout the whole process. The logical framework for the projects will be used as an analytical basis for the review. The assessment shall consider both primary and secondary sources of data, primarily beneficiaries who have been supported by ADRA in West Darfur and Blue Nile. Primary data gathering will be undertaken using a combination of key informant, focus groups and households interviews. Household level interviews will principally look at the issue of project impact.

Primary data will also be gathered from other stakeholders (i.e. line ministries, UN, private sector input providers, other NGOs/ CBOs and implementing partners. Secondary sources of data include, amongst others, project documents, progress and final reports, need assessment reports budget to actual expenditure reports, beneficiary assessments and project outputs (bulletins, training material, minutes, etc.) and other data produced throughout the project lifespan in those areas.

3.2 Review Team

The review will be conducted by a team led by John Fox, who is an international expert with good knowledge of Sudan. He is specialized in rural livelihoods, WASH, agriculture, pastoralism, research, participatory approaches and the project cycle. He will be assisted by a Sudanese consultant with strong local knowledge and technical expertise on project relevant areas such as WASH, livelihoods, pastoralism, and agriculture. The maximum number of team members is five, including resource persons (e.g. ADRA Sudan/ Denmark and stakeholder organizations), who are not paid fees for their participation. The number of working days may be different for the different members of the team.

The team leader is responsible for conducting the review, applying the methodology as appropriate and producing the review report. The team will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions and field visits, and will contribute to the review with written inputs for the draft and final report. By the end of the data and information gathering phase, the team will present his/their preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the key stakeholder, to discuss and obtain feedback from them to be incorporated in the review report.

The ADRA Denmark Programme Adviser is responsible for initiating the review process, clearance of the Terms of Reference, recruiting the team members and supporting his/ their work during the mission. He has quality assurance role on the final report, in terms of presentation, compliance with ToR, timely delivery, quality of the evidence and analysis done. The office of ADRA Sudan is responsible for agreeing the time of review and its geographical coverage in consultation with the team, provision of in-country support including, where relevant, participation in meetings with the review team, making information and documentation available as necessary, and to comment on the final draft report.

The ADRA Denmark Program Director will participate in the review as a resource person.

5.4 The Review Report

An initial brief *inception report* describing in more detail the methodology to be applied is required before the end of March 2016. A *debriefing* with main conclusions and findings to ADRA in Sudan will take place, while the team leader is still in Sudan. A *draft report* should be submitted within 2 weeks after completion of the assignment in Sudan. The *final review* report should be submitted immediately after feedback has been received from ADRA. It will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the review issues and the review criteria listed in the ToR. The report will be clear and concise and will be a self-standing document. It should not exceed 30 pages excluding annexes. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report and for future reference. The report will be prepared in English. Translation into other languages, if required, will be the responsibility of ADRA.

5.5 Review timetable and organization of the review mission

The duration of the review is **18 days** during April 2016

Activity	Days
Preparation for the review – desk review and development of data collection tools	2 Days
Briefing and team building in Khartoum	1 day
Interview with Khartoumbased stakeholders	1 day
Field mission in West Darfur and Blue Nile including interviews at locally and community level	10 days(including 2 days of travel)
Debriefing at Khartoum level	1 day
Report writing	3 days

Annex B: Review Programme

Khartoum Phase 1

Sun 10 April	Arrival in Khartoum and initial meeting with ADRA Sudan staff and national team members
Mon 11 April	Briefing sessions with Paul Howe, ADRA Sudan Country Director; Tom Benton. Programme Director; Christian Sorensen, Programme Coordinator, ADRA Denmark; Orientation of field teams in relation to field schedule and research tools
Tue 12 April	Travel to the field: team 1 to Darfur and Team 2 to Blue Nile

Fieldwork in West Darfur, Team A

Tue 12 April	Arrival in El Geneina; Interviews at HAC - HAC Commissioner, Mohamed Manzool Aphandi, HAC NGO Director, Abdel Rahman Mohamed Baraka (Dreig); Interview with Chairman of the Technical Steering Group, Hamad Abdalla, Director General, State Water Corporation; Briefing of the two fieldwork teams.
Wed 13 April	Visit to BejBej Village in El Geneina; Meetings with members of the Farmers' Field School (FFS) and WASH Committee; Extended interview with a member of the FFS; Visit to BejBej Health Centre; Interview with Shareif Hammad Hussin, Director, Geneina Research Station of the Agricultural Research Corporation (ARC).
	Visit to Kirkir Village in Krenik; Meetings with villagers in Kirkir; Interview with CAP committee; Site visits to school constructed through CAP; Extended interview with a member of the CAP committee.
Thu 14 April	Visit to Mouko Village in Krenik; Meeting with CAP committee; Meeting with Mouko village members; Site visit to school constructed through CAP; Meeting with partner NGO - Futures Director and staff.
	Visit to Ardimi Village in El Geneina; Meeting with two CLTS Committees; Extended interview with chairman; Meeting with IDEAS partner NGO; Meeting with Tendalti Community-Based Organisation
Fri 15 April	Visit to Adaar Village in El Geneina; Meeting with VSLA Group; Extended interview with Aziaza, Secretary of the group; Visit to sub-surface dam at Mejmere.
	Visit to Garadaya Village in El Geneina; Meeting with CLTS Committee; Meeting with village members; Site visits to randomly selected households in the village.
Sat 16 April	Meeting with ADRA West Darfur staff on issues emerging
Sun 17 April	Follow-up meeting with ADRA West Darfur staff

Fieldwork in Blue Nile

Wed 13 April	In Rosaries Locality, visiting: Almaseed Klnana for VSLA (2 nd cycle); N C (w2), fencing with bricks; Altartara for CLTS, CAPs, NC, CC and hygiene training, school latrine; Sawlail for CLTS, CAPs NC, CC and hygiene training; Daiwa for segregated latrines, community response to building a bathroom
Thu 14 April	In Tadamon Locality visiting: Om Odam for haffir; Ahmer Roro for CLTS, seg. latrines, CAPs, hygiene + CC; Aljamam for VSLA, haffir, CLTS, hygiene + CC
Fri 15 April	In Damaza Locality visiting Jabal Fouta for VSLAs, CAPs, SPC, washing place; Alamara Shazali for CAPs, latrines, NC based on CAPs, SPCw
Sat 16 April	Rest
Sun 17 April	In Damazin FGD with staff
Mon 18 April	Drive to Khartoum

Khartoum Phase 2

Tue 19 April	Review Team meeting: briefing from Blue Nile team, sharing of experiences and preparation of joint briefing presentation
Wed 20 April	Review Team meeting: final preparation and presentation and discussions with ADRA Sudan management and ADRA Denmark staff
Thu 21 April	CLTS Workshop for ADRA staff and other stakeholders

Annex C: Checklist for Interviews and Meetings with ADRA Staff

Relevance

- Is the project addressing the most relevant needs of the target communities?
- Is the design well conceived in order to address the identified needs?
- How well have the activities adapted during implementation to new emerging needs?
- How valid were the assumptions and risks identified at the outset of the projects?

Efficiency

- Are inputs (funds, equipment, etc.) sufficient and available when needed?
- Are project activities on time, at planned cost, and well managed on a day-to-day basis?
- How inclusive and flexible are the M&E and reporting systems being used?

Effectiveness

- Are the envisaged outputs, as identified in the logframe, being achieved?
- Are the strategies of the project appropriate, particularly the CAP, VSLA, FFS and CLTS?
- To what extent is the project enhancing the resilience of the target individuals and communities?
- To what extent are cross-cutting issues – related to governance, gender and environment – being taken into account?
- What best practices can be identified that can be adopted or adapted elsewhere?
- How effective are any capacity building initiatives being undertaken?

Impact/degree of change

- What longer-term impacts can be identified (for example, changes in policies affecting the communities; ability of the community to organize themselves)?
- What changes in people's lives and livelihoods are being made – changes to which the project can be said to be contributing?
- If there are wider unplanned effects, are they positive or negative?

Sustainability

- What is the quality of local ownership and what are the prospects of institutional sustainability at the local level?
- What is the level of cooperation and coordination with other relevant agencies working in the area and with the same or similar beneficiaries?
- Have the communities' capacities been sufficiently built so that they can carry on with activities that need to be carried on?
- What is the likelihood of the positive changes continuing in future?
- Are lessons learnt being documented and communicated, lessons that can inform any future programming or exit strategies?
- In particular, what lessons can be learned for strengthening the LRRD strategies of ADRA in Sudan and elsewhere?

Annex D: Checklist for Interviews and Meetings with Beneficiaries

Relevance

- What problems, in relation to yourself or your community, would you say this project was addressing?
(Ask the respondents to describe the situation at the onset of the project)

Efficiency

- From your perspective, how well was the project being implemented?
(Prompt them, by asking whether activities were on time, in the right kind of place, well managed on a day-to-day basis, etc)
- Were you involved at all in any monitoring activities?

Effectiveness

- What outputs have you seen being put in place?
*(1. Try to get a distinction between outputs from previous phases of the project
(2. Explore how the project has built on outputs put in place in previous phases)*
- Have you any views about the appropriateness of the methods/strategies the project is using?
(Ask them, for example, about the establishment of VSLAs, FFSs, CAPs, or about the approach of CLTS)
- To what extent are you in a better position to cope with the problems that were affecting you at the beginning of the project?
(For example, enhancement of skills, or increase in income, etc)
- Would you say that the different needs and interests of women and girls, men and boys are being addressed by the project?
(Explore how the needs of each of these are being addressed)
- Do you know whether the local authorities are involved in the project?
(One issue here, for example, is the relationship between the CAP and the government policies and plans)
- What, if any, effect is the project having on the environment?
(Explore whether these effects are positive or negative? Intended or unintended)
- If ADRA was to carry out a similar project elsewhere, what changes would you recommend?
- What do you think about the capacity building methods being used?

Impact/degree of change

- What longer-term impacts do you think this project is achieving?
(Prompt, for example, about changes in policies affecting the communities; ability of the community to organize themselves better)
- In relation to yourself, what changes in your own life and livelihood have happened because of the project?
- In general, have there been any unplanned effects, and are they positive or negative?
(Note that this is a broader question than the one above about the environment)

Sustainability

- To what extent would you say your community feels that it owns the facilities being put in place?

(Ask this question in the light of your own observations about the level of ownership of the facilities installed)

- Are you aware of the extent to which ADRA is coordinating their activities with other development agencies?

(Here we are exploring efforts to achieve economies of scale or achieve integration of development efforts)

- Do you think that the community's capacities been sufficiently built so that it can carry on with relevant activities after the project is finished?

(Here, the issues are about management and maintenance)

(Explore with stakeholders the potential for the sustainability of the interventions, in relation to political/policy support, resources of relevant government institutions, capacity building of the communities, and likely funding)

Annex E: SAHEWA: Achievement of Outputs

Objectives & Outputs	Indicators	Achievements	Comments
Immediate objective 1: To improve livelihoods of both pastoralists and agriculturalists through improved access to water resources and other activities	No. of haffirs, dams, ruhud, in the project are maintained by management committees through community action plans	One sub-surface dam constructed; One <i>ruhud</i> rehabilitated	The Technical Steering Group recommended not to construct the <i>haffir</i> but to construct the sub-surface dam
Output 1.1: Continued haffir rehabilitation, and 'ruhud construction'	No. of haffirs and ruhud in project area holding water into last third of the dry season	Three	The rest of the <i>ruhud</i> dried out earlier
Output 1.2: Strengthened haffir management	No. of meetings with SWC and other stakeholders are conducted to discuss water management issues	Eight meetings conducted	Six with SWC; two with Nomad Commission on Water Issues
Activity 1: Rehabilitation of 1 ruhud	No. of ruhud rehabilitated and maintained through community participation	This was not done in 2015	The activity has been re-planned for 2016
Activity 2: Number of haffirs that have functional management structures in place	No. of haffir management committees that are functional in the project area; No. of water management committees that have regular (monthly) meetings	Six committees; No regular monthly meetings are being conducted	The target number
Activity 3: Capacity building of 6 haffir/dam committees	No. of trained water management committees in the area		
Output 1.3: Community action plans developed	No. of activities per village started as result of planning process within six	Six activities started in different villages;	This is the number planned;

	months based fully or partly on own resources; No. of general meetings to discuss problems and plans	Six general meetings were conducted	The target number
Activity 1: Staff and partner orientations	No. of staff and partners who attended orientation meetings on development approaches	Not done	Orientation sessions were held in 2014
Activity 2: Study tour to DRC (Central Darfur)	No. of exchange visits conducted	Not done	Re-planned for 2016
Activity 3: Info meetings with community leaders	No. of info meetings with community leaders per village	Six information meetings conducted per village	The target number
Activity 4: General community information meetings	No. of general meetings conducted per selected communities with Gov. & partners during the quarter	Six general meetings have been conducted	The target
Activity 5: Facilitation sessions on resources base, problems and solutions	No. of facilitation sessions for problems solving are conducted with partners in the targeted villages during the quarter	Six facilitation sessions held	Following the general meetings
Activity 6: Action planning (shared with Govt. and ADRA/others)	No. of community plans shared with Govt. and other partners for implementation	Three CAPs shared with government and partners	After the facilitation sessions
Activity 7: Implementation of plans	No. of community plans prepared for implementation	Three	Three communities able to implement their plans
Activity 8: Research on community planning methods	No. of publications on community planning methods introduced	No publications	But existing manuals are being used

Activity 9: Review and update of manual	An updated manual on CAP is produced and shared with partners	Not done yet	Re-planned for 2016
Output 1.4: Livelihood strengthening of agriculturist, agro-pastoralist and pastoralist	No. of VSLAs increasing savings during the first and second cycle; Adoption of new knowledge in FFSs	13 VSLAs formed in 2015; Eight FFSs shown to be adopting new knowledge in 2015	The rest of the FFSs re-planned for 2016
Main activity	Village savings and loan associations (VSLAs)		
Activity 1: Study tour and training of staff	No. of staff attended, study tour and training during the quarter	None	Will happen in 2016
Activity2: Initial information meetings (20) villages	No of VSLA initial information meetings conducted per targeted villages during the quarter	13 information meetings	Rest will be carried out in 2016
Activity 3: Training of VSLAs	No. of trainings conducted for the newly formed VSLA groups during the quarter	Seven groups trained	According to budget
Main activity	Farmer Field Schools (FFS) including agro-pastoralist schools		
Activity 1: Training and linking of staff to MoA, FAO and Agritech Talk	No. of linkages conducted for project staff/MoA/FAO and Agritech Talk	Not done	Not covered in the monitoring for 2016
Activity 2: Formation of FFSs (10)	No. of new FFS groups formed and functioned	Five FFS groups formed and functioning; Also one CBO	According to budget

Activity 3: Implementation of FFSs	No. of FFS trainings are conducted for the new FFS group; No. of exchange visits for new FFS; No. of plots for farming and learning process (agricultural package)	Five training for each group; One construction training (requested by community); One exchange visit; 11 plots acquired for farming and learning	Availability of land is a determining factor for promoting the agricultural packages
Activity 4: Evaluation of FFS experience in 10 villages	No. of publications on documented lessons learned distributed	Not done yet	Re-planned for 2016
Main activity	Herder Schools (HSs)		
Activity 1: Community Action Plan sessions on the existing experience with herder schools	No of CAPs conducted with HSs during the Quarter	Not done yet	Re-planned for 2016
Activity 2: Initiation of piloting of 1 herder school	No. of the initiated HS group and meetings; No. of action plan activities in their camps	Not done yet	Planned for 2016
Activity 3: Experience shared with the govt. and other partners during the meetings	No. of meetings conducted shared by the govt. and other partners	Two meetings held	More will be held in 2016
Main activity	Other livelihood strengthening activities		
Activity: Identification of income generation activities (IGAs)	No. of new IGA groups are identified per group and are active; No. of identifies IGA supported	Seven IGA groups are functioning	According to budget
Immediate objective 2: To improve access to basic services to water and sanitation for conflict-affected communities in West Darfur	60% of targeted communities have access to safe drinking water through maintained dug wells and water management system; Health and hygiene committees formed		

Output 2.1: Water access through sustainable improved dug wells	No. of wells maintained and functional throughout the year; No. of communities with functional water management systems (WMS) in place	15 dug wells maintained and functioning; 15 committees functioning	According to plan for 2015
Activity 1: Rehabilitation of dug wells (15)	No. of dug wells maintained by the water management committee after being rehabilitated	Three dug wells are maintained by water committees	
Activity 2: Water management training	No. of water management trainings conducted in the targeted area	Three trainings conducted for 15 committees	As planned for 2015
Output 2.2: Sanitation, health and hygiene improvement	No. of hygiene and sanitation promoters trained during the quarter; No. of latrines constructed by their own using CATS approach	Two trainings conducted on hygiene , for 10 committees; Four trainings for CLTS; 516 latrines constructed by communities	The approach was CLTS not CATS
Activity 1: Train community hygiene promoters in safe drinking water in 3 villages	No. of community hygiene promoters trained on safe drinking water	15 community hygiene promoters trained	According to plan
Activity 2: Provision of 15,000 chlorine tablets	No. of improved dug wells provided with chlorine tablets in the targeted areas	Eight dug wells	Seven dug wells planned for 2016
Output 2.3: Technology development pilot on SSB, and different options other than bricks making using wood	No. of trainings on SSB production & other options	Not done	

Activity 1: Conduct search and training with the bricks makers on negative impacts on environment using wood	No. of search and trainings conducted on negative impacts	Not done	
Activity 2: Conduct ACP sessions to identify new technology for brick making rather than SSBs	No. of ACP sessions conducted; No. of technologies identified	Not done	
Activity 3: Brick production using identified technology	No. of bricks produced using identified technologies	Not done	
Activity 4: Construct class rooms, animal treatment centres, institutional latrines, etc.	No. new constructed classrooms, animal treatment centres, institutional latrines, etc	Two institutional latrines constructed	Because of delayed start, activities re-planned for 2016
Activity 5: Testing of water pumps with experience from Practical Action	No. of water pump tested and used with experience from Practical Action	Practical Action visit was made, but testing not done because of budget constraints	
Immediate objective 3: To maximize impact through up-scaling of best practices and better coordination and cooperation with other stakeholder in areas relating to first and second objective in two years	No. of other ADRA projects adopting good practices based on SAHEWA-3 lessons	Main one is CBWASAP	
Output 3.1: Strengthening of the project technical steering committee (PTSG)	No. of training events conducted with PTSG; No. of PTSG meetings conducted	15 PTSG meetings held	Three more than planned
Activity 1: Documentation/ dissemination of lessons learnt	No. of publications on documented lessons learnt distributed	Not done	Re-planned for 2016

Activity 2: Advisory group meetings/workshops	No. of discussion forums are conducted for improvement of implementation	Several discussions and forums conducted on e.g. water yards, VSLAs, FFSs	
Activity 3: Publication of reports	No. reports published and disseminated	Not done	No staff qualified in documentation
Activity 4: Dissemination workshops	No. trainings/ workshops conducted and documented	Not done	
Output 3.2: Networking, coordination and cooperation with relevant stakeholders	No. of dynamic partnerships established		
Activity 1: MoUs with Govt, Future and IDEAS	No. of signed MoUs with Govt and national NGOs with ADRA	One MoU with Ministry of Planning	
Activity 2: Stakeholder orientation Workshops	No. of orientation and training events conducted with Govt. and partners	Not done	
Activity 3: Participation in networks and working groups	No. of coordination and networking meetings attended; No. of workshops attended with stakeholders	Four such meeting, with different stakeholders	

Annex F: CBWASAP – Achievement of Outputs

Objectives & Outputs	Indicators	Achievements	Comments
Immediate objective 1: To improve livelihoods of conflict affected population in Rosaries, Damazin, Geisan and Tadamon localities in Blue Nile	No. of haffirs/ruhud in project area maintained by management committees through CAPs	Rehabilitation of 1 Haffir/ Construction of 1 Rihaied in Tadamon Locality	According to the proposal
Output 1.1: Rehabilitation of haffers and construction of small watering facilities, ruhuds, along pastoralist migratory routes	Number of haffirs and ruhud in project area holding water into last third of dry season	34 Haffir out of 39 Haffir in the project area were holding water in the last third of the dry season	Based on the data from rural water corporation and staff monitoring visit to the locations
Activity 1	Rehabilitation of 1 haffer	Activity 2	Construct 2 ruhud
Output 1.2: Improve saving disciplines and women's empowerment through VSLAs	No. and % of VSLAs increasing savings in first and second cycle	5 VSLA groups	The groups are still in the first cycle although on the monthly group update they are increasing from month to another
Activity 1	Training of staff and experience sharing tour	Activity 2	Initial information meetings
Activity 3	Training of VSLAs	Activity 4	Provide inputs for VSLAs startup
Immediate Objective 2: To improve access to basic services to water, sanitation and hygiene, for conflict affected population in Rosaries, Damazin , Geisan and Tadamon	CLTS Training	5 CLTS training out 5	Based on the proposal
	CAP	8 out of 5 areas were covered by CAP approach	The project found that CAP fits for all implement activities.
	Hygiene promoters training	53 out of 40 hygiene promoters were attended hygiene training	Increasing of the Hyg. Awareness of the communities.
	Cleaning campaign	4 out of 5 cleaning	One community not accessible du rainy season.
	Water management training	Campaign was conducted in the project area (4 training out of 5).	The last one conducted in this time, the delay due to the transfer the money.

	Construction of new hand pumps	3 out of 5 hand pumps were constructed	Due to the budget – the operation cost in WES High the targeted cost/budget
Output 2.1: Training of water committees and assist with the construction of wells and rehabilitation of pumps	No. of wells provided that are functioning throughout the year; No. of communities with functional water management systems in place	(4 training out of 5).	The last one conducted in this time.

Activity 1	Training of WASH committees in resource management and sustainability	Activity 2	Construction of 5 wells through CAPs
Activity 3	Rehabilitation of 35 hand pumps	Activity 4	Training of 40 hand pump technicians
Activity 5	Making pilot implementation of solar pump driven yard with a community	Activity 6	Supporting community action to improve household sanitation
Activity 7	Supporting construction of institutional latrines		
Output 2.2: Undertake community action plans (CAPs) to improve access to water, sanitation and hygiene	No. of WASH activities per village started as result of community action planning process within six months based fully or partly on own resources; No. of general meetings to discuss problems and plans	12 villages (CLT, CAPs, seg. Rh Hafier, New const of Ruhud, wells)	Due to the communities' needs and priorities.

Activity 1	Number of general meetings to discuss problems and plans	Activity 2	Information meetings with community leaders
Activity 3	General community meetings	Activity 4	Facilitating sessions on resources, problems and solutions
Activity 5	Sharing plans with stakeholders and government (WES, localities)	Activity 6	Monitoring implementation of plans to improve sanitation
Output 2.3: Make a pilot implementation of CLTS	Number and %-age of latrines constructed by people in pilot communities solely by their own resources	-Ahmer Roro: 42 HHL -Eljmam: 39 HHL -Eltartra: 77 HHL Sawli: 114HHL	27% before interventions. %-age increase 65% after interventions. Total No. 272 HHL in project sites.
Activity 1	Information meetings with communities	Activity 2	Conducting sessions on CLTS
Activity 3	Tools provision to facilitate construction of latrines	Activity 4	Design model latrines recommended by communities
Activity 5	Monitor community actions		
Output 2.4: Support construction of institutional latrines	No. institutional latrines constructed as a result of community plans	3 out of 3 were constructed	According to the proposal.
Activity 1	Community planning meetings	Activity 2	Supporting construction of latrines
Output 2.5: Health and hygiene training	No. of Hyg promoters were trained	53 out of 40 hygiene promoters were attended hygiene training	Increasing of the Hyg. Awareness of the communities.
Activity 1	Training of 40 hygiene promoters	Activity 2	Training and monitoring of 15 traditional healers
Immediate objective 3: To maximize impact through up-scaling of best practices and better coordination and cooperation with other stakeholder in areas relating to first and second objective	No. of other ADRA projects adopting good practices based on WASAP/CBWASAP lessons	4 practices	-Hyg campaign approach ,night exhibition - H kites - training approach - fencing of hand pump.

Output 3.1: Strengthening of the role of the Project Technical Steering Committee (PTSC)	Strengthening of the PTSC	-	Not yet in B.N
Activity 1	PTSC meetings	Activity 2	Steering committee workshops
Output 3.2: Documentation/dissemination of lessons learnt	No. of publications on documented lessons learnt distributed		Small distribution of VSLAs as seen in WASH, Prospective published in WASH sector newsletter September 2015
Activity 1	Publication of reports	Activity 2	Dissemination workshops
Output 3.3: Networking, coordination and cooperation with relevant stakeholders	No. of dynamic partnerships established	Two partnership: -WES -Mobadiroon	WES: Government Mobadiroon: NNGOs
Activity 1	MoUs with Government and Mubadiroon	Activity 2	Stakeholder orientation workshops
Activity 3	Participation in networks and working groups		