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1.0 Executive Summary
In 2009 Send a Cow Uganda in partnership with Heifer Netherlands signed a contract agreement to support and strengthen its pro-poor interventions for 78 households in Bunyole sub region located in Butaleja district. The Bunyole Agricultural Sustainable Project was therefore designed with an objective of improving food security and incomes of households, through the provision of improved quality seeds, improvements in farming techniques and integrating live stock in the crop farming systems to improve soils with manure. Additionally, the project emphasised the need for environmental protection through improved land use and sustainable productivity.

The project supported mainly two women groups namely, Hadubi Hedala found in Buwesa parish, Budumba Sub County and Mudodo womens groups located in Kachonga parish, Mazimasa Sub county in Butaleja district. Both groups were formulated and registered by SACU in 2004 with Hadubi group having 43 women while Mudodo were 35 women.

It was anticipated that this initiative would transform households into becoming economically self-sustaining and raise their living standard. Furthermore, that the successes registered by the project would resonate and trigger similar developments in the area.

An end of project evaluation was conducted and the main objective was to assess the project results in line with its objectives and also identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve the design and implementation of future SACU projects. The specific objectives were:

(i) To investigate the impact of the project against set objectives
(ii) To examine whether the capacities of target beneficiaries have been built
(iii) To Inform whether the original objectives have met the priorities of the target beneficiaries
(iv) To understand how cost effective and sustainable the project has been and,
(v) To Capture lessons learnt and recommendations in order to inform future plans and projects

The evaluation assessed the BSAP relevance i.e., the extent to which the objectives were consistent with the SACU strategy, beneficiaries’ needs and the priorities at the country and international level. Literature reviewed and key informant interviews revealed that the BSAP was well aligned with the local, national and the international development needs.

The design of the project was equally found to be relevant to the following

Uganda’s National Poverty Eradication Action Plan (NPEAP), and the SACU strategy of working with farmer partners to improve farm productivity for food security and household income. Given that by 2009, 40% of the Butaleja population was living below the poverty line, thus poverty reduction remains SACU’s and the country’s overarching goal for development strategy.

Under human resource development, one of the major BSAP activities focused on training of project beneficiaries. This is consistent with SACU’s main strategic objectives, which includes learning, policy development and advocacy so that the impact of its work is maximized. Additionally, the project was relevant to the NPEAP, which includes training, adult literacy and primary education as actions, which directly improve the quality of the life of the poor.

The project’s concern for environmental sustainability was directly related to the National Environmental Policy (1994), the Butaleja District Environmental Policy (2009) and the SACU strategic plan, which ensures that economic growth and poverty reduction efforts address efficient use of natural resources and prevent environmental degradation. The NPEAP also recognise that environmental management is both a cause and a consequence of poverty. Therefore, the environmental management plan incorporated in the design of BSAP was relevant to the NPEAP. For example, the BSAP exposed farmers to sound ecological principles (e.g. soil fertility management, organic farming, and planting of fruit trees).
Globally, HPI was anchored to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals especially goal number 1) of eradication of poverty and hunger; 3) of promoting gender equality and women empowerment; 7) of ensuring environmental sustainability.

Although the BSAP emphasis was on empowering women, gender analysis was marginal at initiation. Gender analysis is critical in poverty directed projects for (i) work activities differentiated on the basis of gender, (ii) ownership of livestock in areas where the legal rights of women to own livestock are constrained through customs laws (iii) organisation of groups to design and implement projects in areas where the roles of men and women are rigidly defined.

The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project were rated as satisfactory on the basis of its alignment to government and SACU strategies as well as the needs of the rural poor, the level of achievements of its objectives within the time span and budget, and high profitability of the groups/households it supported.

The rural poverty impact was also rated as satisfactory given the benefits that have accrued to the target groups in terms of income and assets, food security and agricultural productivity, human and social capital and empowerment, as well as institutions, policies and markets.

Sustainability was rated as satisfactory. The level of ownership by the local population and the financial sustainability of the project’s subprojects were high, but there were still challenges with regard to sustainability of the pass-on system. On the basis of the overall positive impact of the project on women, gender equality and women’s empowerment is assessed as satisfactory.

SACU realised visibility largely hinged on its historical reputation and the fact that it’s one of the few NGOs that have promoted agricultural development through livestock distribution. Through the use of SACU extension workers with in communities, involvement of local leaders and local government workers has greatly enhanced SACU’s visibility. Compared to other NGOs in the region and government aided projects, SACU lacked project identification signposts. However SACU has fully utilised the available means like vehicles, T-shirts, calendars with logos and images.
2.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

2.1 District Context

Butaleja Background
Butaleja district was established in July 2005 out of Tororo district when Bunyole County was cut away to create the new district. It is located in Eastern Uganda and borders Mbale district in the East, Namutumba and Bugiri districts in the West, Budaka and Palisa in the North and Tororo in the South.1

The population of Butaleja district is estimated at 190,400 and was projected to reach 211,200 by 2012. The population growth rate in Butaleja stands at 3.3 percent per annum (UBOS, 2007). About 57.4 per cent of the district population are children below 18 years, 6 per cent of the population is aged 65 and above, and 36.7 per cent of the population is the active working group, 18-65 years. The main source of livelihood is subsistence farming taking a percentage of 84.7 per cent. Rice growing is the main economic activity mainly in Mazimasa, Kachonga and Butaleja sub-counties (UBOS, 2002).

2.2 A project Context

In 2009 Send a Cow Uganda in partnership with Heifer Netherlands signed a contract agreement to support and strengthen its pro-poor interventions for 78 households in Bunyole sub region located in Butaleja district. The Bunyole Agricultural Sustainable Project was therefore designed with an objective of improving food security and incomes of households, through the provision of improved quality seeds, improvements in farming techniques and integrating livestock in the crop farming systems to improve soils with manure. Additionally, the project emphasised the need for environmental protection through improved land use and sustainable productivity.

The project supported mainly two women groups namely, Hadubi Hedala found in Buwesa parish, Budumba Sub County and Mudodo womens groups located in Kachonga parish, Mazimasa Sub county in Butaleja district. Both groups were formulated and registered by SACU in 2004 with Hadubi group having 43 women while Mudodo were 35 women.

It was anticipated that this initiative would transform households into becoming economically self-sustaining and raise their living standard. Furthermore, that the successes registered by the project would resonate and trigger similar developments in the area.

---

1 Butaleja District Development Plan
Table 1: Project Information

| Country: Republic of Uganda (UG2081) |
| Title: Bunyole Sustainable Agriculture Programme |
| Approval date: 2009 |
| Effective date: January 2009 |
| Closing date: December 2013 |
| Total cost: UGX 371,513,996 million |
| Heifer Netherlands International Grant: UGX 203,046,414 million |
| Contribution of SACU Uganda: UGX 168,467,582 million |
| Programme Owner: Send A Cow Uganda |

2.3 The Evaluation

2.3.1 Objectives of the Evaluation

The main objective of the EPE was to assess the project results in line with its objectives and also identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve the design and implementation of future SACU projects. The specific objectives were:

(vi) To investigate the impact of the project against set objectives
(vii) To examine whether the capacities of target beneficiaries have been built
(viii) To inform whether the original objectives have met the priorities of the target beneficiaries
(ix) To understand how cost effective and sustainable the project has been and,
(x) To capture lessons learnt and recommendations in order to inform future plans and projects

2.4 Methodology

The methodology used to conduct the evaluation included the following:

Review of documentation: Review of documents relating to the HPIN Project and supplementary information was done and these included: The original project proposal, financial records, the gender strategy and Plan, Periodic Bi annual and annual project reports, among other literature reviewed.

Household Evaluation: A household evaluation questionnaire was administered to all project beneficiaries during the field data collection exercise. This was important in accessing the key results of the project in line with the objectives and outcomes. Key aspects included: The social demographic characteristics of beneficiaries, capacity of women organization’s to plan and manage developed projects, women empowerment livestock, production, Nutrition, household incomes, leadership, family cohesion and other aspects to evaluate the project effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and impact.

Focus Group Discussions: Focus group discussions were held with members of the HPIN community groups, their leadership, spouses and associate members (men), partners, SACU staff and community leaders and some of the local government officials.

Key informant Interviews: Key informant interviews were held with identified individuals to evaluate specific aspects of the HPIN project in more details, assessing their view of impact on participants and the wider community, challenges, solutions and potential for work going forward.

Farm visits: These were carried out to validate data collected from household evaluations and to capture the view of participating households. Farmers visited were randomly selected and case studies of successful and less successful households collated.
**Data Collection:** This was conducted together with a team of SACU technical staff from the head office and the eastern region. Data entrants supervised by SACU extension workers equally participated in the evaluation data collection. The consultant pre-tested the instruments, and trained SACU team on use of the instruments, quality assurance, and ethics of data collection. Further, the consultant also conducted three FGDs in Haddubi Hedala and Mudodo Group to gain a general view of the project implementation and governance.

**Data Entry and Analysis:** Data entry was conducted internally by a team of data entrants supervised by the consultant. SPSS software was used for data entry and analysis for mainly the quantitative questions while the qualitative analysis was analysed using the SPSS multiple response method. Direct transcription of qualitative responses was conducted in Microsoft word especially for key informant interviews.
3.0 FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

This section narrates the findings of this evaluation. In particular, the design, formulation, and implementation of the Bunyole Sustainable Agricultural Project are analysed. This section also analyses the attainment of results according to the set targets, and discusses the findings concerning the sustainability of the project beyond its lifecycle. The analysis provided here are based on evidence gathered using the methodology that has been elaborated in section 2.4.

Relevance

The evaluation assessed the BSAP relevance i.e., the extent to which the objectives were consistent with the SACU strategy, beneficiaries’ needs and the priorities at the country and international level. Literature reviewed and key informant interviews revealed that the BSAP was well aligned with the local, national and the international development needs. The baseline report indicated that the BSAP targeted the right needs of beneficiaries. For instance, of the targeted 82 households interviewed at baseline, 73% were depending on subsistence farming and sale of farm produce for a living, while only 1% depended on animal husbandry. 70% of the households earned a monthly income ranging between UGX 5000 and UGX 30,000.

During the evaluation, households were asked to comments on whether the project design was appropriate to meet the household expectations, of which 89.5% said yes it did, more still, of the households interviewed 98.7% felt ownership of the project interventions.

Figure 1: Beneficiaries responses to the relevant areas the project addressed.

At the design stage of the project, 12 major activities were planned as seen in annex B. 100% activity execution was realised on schedule, however because of the inclusive concept of the beneficiaries in the development stage, additional components were introduced to meet the needs of the beneficiaries and these included home sanitation and hygiene, biogas production, animal husbandry management, tree planting, planting of grass, gender, conflict and resolution, local savings schemes.

The design of the project was equally found to be relevant to the following

Uganda’s National Poverty Eradication Action Plan (NPEAP), and the SACU strategy of working with farmer partners to improve farm productivity for food security and household income. Given that by 2009, 40% of the Butaleja population was living below the poverty line, thus poverty reduction remains SACU’s and the country’s overarching goal for development strategy.

As regards human resource development, one of the major BSAP activities focused on training of project beneficiaries. This is consistent with SACU’s main strategic objectives, which includes learning, policy development and advocacy so that the impact of its work is maximized. Additionally, the project was relevant to the NPEAP, which includes training, adult literacy and primary education as actions, which directly improve the quality of the life of the poor.

The project’s concern for environmental sustainability was directly related to the National Environmental Policy (1994), the Butaleja District Environmental Policy (2009) and the SACU strategic plan, which ensures that economic growth and poverty reduction efforts address efficient use of natural resources and prevent environmental degradation. The NPEAP also recognise that environmental management is both a cause and a consequence of poverty. Therefore, the environmental management plan incorporated in the design of BSAP was relevant to the NPEAP. For
example, the BSAP exposed farmers to sound ecological principles (e.g. soil fertility management, organic farming, and planting of fruit trees).

Globally, HPI was anchored to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals especially goal number 1) of eradication of poverty and hunger; 3) of promoting gender equality and women empowerment; 7) of ensuring environmental sustainability.

Project Effectiveness
Project Effectiveness addressed a number of aspects on household beneficiaries exclusively in the two groups “Hadubi Hedala and Mudodo with emphasis on: What impact the project had against set aims and objectives?, To examine whether the capacities of target beneficiaries have been met; To Inform whether the original objectives have met the priorities of the target beneficiaries

In terms of outreach, the BSAP registered 2 groups in Bunyole at the start of the project in 2009 and ended with 2 groups. Of these Hadubi Hedala, had 43 household beneficiaries while Mudodo had 35 beneficiaries. Both groups were due for graduation by the end of the project.

The analysis below is pegged on the outcomes as laid out in the baseline report October 2009 and the grants proposal. It’s important to note that targets were not reflected. Below are the results

Capacity of women’s organization’s to plan and manage development projects
Figure 2 below shows that positive results realized from the project inform of women’s capacity to plan and manage. For instance at baseline, only 1% of the farmer groups depending on animal husbandry had knowledge on livestock rearing however by the end of the Project, 93.3% acknowledged that their capacity and skills had improved. 24% at baseline depending on subsistence farming did not have knowledge on Organic farming however by the end of the project; over 90.7% noted an improvement in their skills. Other aspects included leadership and gender as seen in figure 2 below.
Leadership was a key aspect in empowering women in decision making and their influence in the project, an evaluation on leadership was made to determine the involvement of women in leadership positions and to ascertain whether free and transparent elections were conducted. Figure 3 below shows that 79.7% of the women beneficiaries were members, while 4.1% served as secretaries. 5.4% were treasurers and 2.7% were chair parsons. 8.1% occupied other leadership positions which included serving as assistants to their leaders.

Figure 4 below indicates that there was an improvement in the level of decision making by members of the group with 68% of the beneficiaries noting to have participated in election of leaders, and 29.3% participating in meetings convened by their leaders.

Figure 3: Women participation in leadership
An assessment was done to check if the targeted results of the project were achieved in order of priority. 86.7% of the farmers noted an increment in incomes, followed by 85.3% of the farmers who noted an improvement in nutrition. 74.7% of the farmers attested to an improvement in knowledge and skills in key essential areas. Other areas that yielded positive results included; Improved food security at 66.7%, improvement in family relations at 69.3%, self-reliance 64.0%, opening land using OX plough 28.0%.

**Figure 5: What Benefits have you and your household derived from being a member of the project group**
Ability to Access funds from outside the project

Farmers were assessed on their capacity to acquire supplementary resources from outside the project. Of the responses, 70.3% said ‘Yes’ and these were mainly seeds distributed by NAADs, at 64.8%. 53.7% acquired advice from other farmers while 31.5% got financial assistance particularly from NUSAF and the local government. Major sources of resources came from NGOs at 47.2% followed by government at 37.7% while MFI’s were at 1.9%.

Figure 6: What kind of resources did you access from outside the project program?

Figure 7: Sources of Resources to Beneficiaries
Crop production:
At initiation the average crop yield by type was 3.5 bags per acre, which translates into 350Kgs, however by the end of the project, 6.5 bags, were now being produced per acre giving 100% fold increase in crop productivity. The figure below shows that Maize, Cassava, potatoes were the highest yields at 96.1%, 78.9% were other food crops which included rice and millet. 63.2% of the food crops were G-nuts. The least productive were tomatoes at 11.8% and simsim at 6.6%.

Figure 8: Percentage increase in crop production

For crop diversities, 44.1% actively ventured into growing of vegetables and planting of fruit trees in addition to their core crops highlighted above. 23.7% diversified and ventured into all; vegetables, fruit trees and tomatoes. This is as shown in figure 9 below.

Figure 9: Crop diversities
Change in production of livestock

Figure 10 below explains the percentage change in livestock productivity; results revealed that for households that owned livestock, 49% of the households produced 1 to 5 litres of milk a day which indicated a percentage change of 23.3%, while 41.0% change was seen for farmers producing 6 to 10 litres of milk a day. 27.0% change was seen for farmers that produced over 10 litres of milk a day. Thus the project realized positive results in regards to the upward change in livestock productivity.

Figure 10: Change in production of livestock

Increase in income levels

From the evaluation findings, it was important to note that there were mainly 2 major income generating activities realised by project beneficiaries, 94.3% benefited from increased incomes from the sale of food produce while 2.9% benefited from the sale of milk. Other sources of income were realised from other sources like commercial trading.

Figure 11: Income generating activities practices by project households
### Change in household incomes

Figure 12 below indicates that positive results were achieved in household incomes for household beneficiaries. Households that earned between UGX 10,000 and 20,000 reduced by 9%, while households that earned between UGX 21,000 and 30,000 reduced by 23%. More households were seen to have achieved a drift in earning by 44% after the project compared to 11% at the beginning of the project thus resulting into 33% positive change.

As indicated in figure 13 below, households were engaged on their major spending lines and, 89.5% noted that they were able to spend on their basic HH needs, followed by 75% that now spend on education. Health care was at 67.1% while 48.7%, 23.7% invested in clothing and other projects respectively. See figure 13 below.

#### Figure 12: Percentage change in Household incomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,000-30,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,000-40,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000+</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 13: Major items that HHs spend on money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH Basic needs</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinvest the income to other projects</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment in other income generating activities by type

From figure 14 below, 48% of households were now capable of saving their income in SACCOs as a result of increased incomes realised. 40% invested in household assets such as radio, chairs, cups, plates etc. 19% reinvested their income towards expansion of livestock while the other 33% invested in other IGA opportunities. This implies that the project achieved its intended results in empowering HHs in developing a strong saving culture.
Figure 14: Investment in other income generating activities by type

Access to credit
Major sources of credit for SACU beneficiaries were friends at 34% mainly within groups, 12.8% were from MFIs and lastly 6.4% from banks and money sharks. This implies that cohesion among group members was good and their financial sustainability gives signs of positive success. This is as shown in figure 15 below.

Figure 15: Access to credit

Livestock effectiveness
An evaluation of the effectiveness of livestock practices was conducted and from table 2 below, it was revealed that 67.6% success rate was achieved towards SACU’s effectiveness in implementing livestock practices.

Livestock Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of women participants who received livestock gifts (by livestock type and numbers)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of livestock now owned (vs. before the project)</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women participants now able to open up land using draught power</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women participants who have passed on the gift of livestock to another farmer (by livestock type and numbers)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average effectiveness 67.5%
Nutrition practices
Results in figure 16 below show a positive increase of 36% in the number of households eating at least 3 meals a day like wise 7% ate more than 3 meals a day. This is followed by a 50% increase in households that ate meals that were rich in protein see figure 17 below. Asked whether households recorded a reduction in the number of malnutrition cases, 80% of the responses said ‘yes’.

Figure 16: Number of meals per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than three</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Number of times HH take high protein diet in a week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Two</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extent of capacity building in social development, livestock and organic farming
What extent of capacity has been built among target beneficiaries in social development, organic farming and livestock?

As indicated in table 3 below, the level of success in achieving women’s confidence and capacity in households was 65.4% which implies positive results towards efforts SACU implemented in social development of women beneficiaries. Asked about which decisions they were involved in, it is indicated in figure 18 below that 84.7% of women noted they were involvement in their household daily expenditures, 81.9% made decisions regarding farm produce, 79.2% child care, 66.7% in family planning and lastly 37.5% in asset acquisition and management.
Table 3: Women’s confidence and capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of women participants reporting increased confidence and self-esteem</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women making decisions on all fundamental concerns in the home</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women making decisions on family planning and childcare</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women participants now owning assets (by number and type)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women reporting reduced conflict</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women participants reporting a reduction or cessation of domestic abuse</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: What decisions are you involved in your household?

Family cohesion in managing household chores and child education

Family cohesion was achieved by an average of 84.2% as a result of 85.8% record on number of women reporting improved relationships in their home. More households had an average of 4 children going to school although 66.7% was realised from households with 3 children not attending school. Figures to inform the number of children who successfully completed defined school levels by age and sex were not attained. This is as shown in table 4 below.

Table 4: Family cohesion in managing household chores and child education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of women / men participants reporting improved relationships in the home e.g. better care from spouse, spending time together, working together, no harassment/intimidation,</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (boys/girls) attending secondary school by age and sex as a result of the project (average)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (boys/girls) not attending school by age and sex and why?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (boys/girls) successfully completing defined school levels by age and sex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Efficiency

Table 5: Operational Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Status</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Income (UGX)</td>
<td>109,615,618</td>
<td>66,482,500</td>
<td>73,697,348</td>
<td>121,718,530</td>
<td>371,513,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (UGX)</td>
<td>99,751,719</td>
<td>46,959,974</td>
<td>105,342,940</td>
<td>104,555,342</td>
<td>356,609,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/Deficit</td>
<td>9,863,899</td>
<td>19,522,526</td>
<td>(31,645,592)</td>
<td>17,163,188</td>
<td>14,904,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Beneficiaries</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses by Household Beneficiary (UGX)</td>
<td>1,278,868</td>
<td>602,051</td>
<td>1,350,551</td>
<td>1,340,453</td>
<td>4,571,923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 above indicates the PCR proceeds to the assessment of efficiency in a summary manner. It uses two proxies, the cost per beneficiary household and cost to deliver the products. Taking the calculated per household cost of UGX 4,571,923 over project life. The PCR uses the effective total disbursement of Heifer and SACU combined, for the 78 beneficiaries. The cost per beneficiary is rather too high given the comparative allocation for government food security projects under NAADs. For each food security farmer, UGX 100,000 is provided for crop based commodities however this may vary especially with the involvement of livestock. These figures show that the scale of support under SACU is superior.

The project was well managed and the resources were utilized as per the project work plan. It used adaptive management extensively to secure project outcomes while maintaining adherence to the overall project design. A highly motivated and experienced project team implemented the project. SACU used short-term consultants extensively; mostly-national consultants.

Project finances were also well accounted for during the entire project period and periodical financial reviews were conducted to validate financial expenditure as per the project work out puts. The project was completed according to the original five-year plan.

Project Impact

The overall goal of the project was to improve food security and incomes of poor rural households in Bunyole sub region. The project aimed at improving the livelihoods of 78 households and, by project completion, households benefited from investments in livestock and livestock management, good farming practices, training in gender, and various agricultural inputs. The main impacts of the project investments are presented in the following paragraphs.

Household income and Nutrition: The evaluation results indicated that 75.8% of the households had an increase in income, 57.6% noted an improvement in nutrition. The evaluation noted that there was an 80% reduction in incidences of malnutrition in households attributed to a 50% increment in households taking protein rich foods such as vegetables, milk, eggs etc. At the start of the project only 32% of the households consumed 3 meals a day, however by the evaluation period, 68% of the households consumed 3 meals a day. Because of an increment in household income, 27.3% of SACU beneficiaries attested to the fact that they are able to afford children's school fees. Family cohesion and increased food production and good hygiene were both achieved at 24.2% and 21.2% respectively. Other changes in livelihoods included self-reliance of households, good livestock management practices, record keeping and time management. See figure 19 below.
Food security and agricultural productivity: Based on the evaluation, the PCR attests that 89.5% of the respondents confirmed that their capacity to buy and consume food had increased due to higher incomes from the sale of agricultural products. 97.4% noted that the availability of grain reserves was a contributing factor. Regarding agricultural productivity, 80% of the evaluation respondents noted that the diversified support of SACU was a determinant for improving productivity. The driving factors identified are improved farming techniques, the use of inputs due to the access to farm inputs from SACU, and a favourable climate.

Capacity and social Development: All project activities involved some capacity building of beneficiaries in livestock management and agriculture. These activities included training conducted by extension workers who met with all the farmer groups and model on-farm demonstration plots in an effort to increase productivity and make farmers more business oriented. The demonstrations were very important learning stations for farmers, in as much as they acquired the knowledge and skills needed to adopt the new farming methods. The demonstrations were also largely responsible for the high rate of adoption of various crops. Extensive training was also provided to farmer group leaders to enable them to more efficiently carry out their functions. All project-supported groups received several types of training as part of the enterprise development support. This included technical training in financial management and saving (65.7%), tree planting (62.7%), manure utilisation (57.1%), livestock management (51.4%) family cohesion and conflict resolution were at 20% and 5.7% respectively. This is as shown in figure 20 below.

Figure 20: New skills and practices attained
**Project Sustainability**

The PCR focus was put on whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends. Beneficiaries were asked to mention some of the coping strategies they have put in place to ensure continuity of project interventions.

The FGD in Mudodo and Hadubi Hedala respectively highlighted the facts that at the group levels there was:

- Enhanced organic agricultural farming skills and livestock management
- Group loan accessibility such as Mary-Go-Around method of borrowing and lending money
- Strong family cohesion and empowerment of women.
- The gender and social development aspect contributed significantly in developing the social skills and practices of households
- Networking working with other agencies existent in the community which included; local government, NUSAF, World Vision and NAADs

The PCR acknowledged the fact that Government had placed the commercialization of agriculture at the forefront of its strategies for prosperity and for poverty eradication, and is unlikely to change them in that respect. The project’s group-based approach is believed to have created social capital, as have the pass-on scheme and the paraprofessionals who are village-based model farmers trained by the project.

Improved skills among local governments and the Government’s promotion of private-sector input suppliers and cooperatives, along with public-sector support of other up- and downstream activities of the value chains, are expected to improve institutional sustainability. As for the financial sustainability of the project’s groups, the PCR noted how important new market places and value addition mechanisms were to obtaining higher prices for farm produce.

The pass-on system, under which the beneficiaries were expected to give a female calf for distribution to new beneficiaries, seemed promising and the project authorities expected the system to become a genuine revolving supply, continuing far beyond the project period.

Figures 21 and 22 below highlight the growth in social capital by the groups developed over time for ability to access additional support and financial assistance.

Households mainly benefited from seeds distributed by NAADs followed by advice from other partner NGOs like world vision Uganda. Financial assistance was largely realised from government aided projects like NUSAF

**Figure 21: Major areas of support beneficiaries have acquired from external partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Help</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project visibility
SACU has realised visibility largely hinged on its historical reputation and the fact that it’s one of the few NGOs that have promoted agricultural development through livestock distribution. Through the use of SACU extension workers with in communities, involvement of local leaders and local government workers has greatly enhanced SACU’s visibility. Compared to other NGOs in the region and government aided projects, SACU lacked project identification signposts. However SACU has fully utilised the available means like vehicles, T-shirts, calendars with logos and images.

Lessons Learnt and Best Practices
Despite the fact that M&E activities were carried out, adequately, the log frame approach was not used as a tool for programming and sequencing activities of the project.

Although the BSAP emphasis was on empowering women, gender analysis was marginal at initiation. Gender analysis is critical in poverty directed projects for (i) work activities differentiated on the basis of gender, (ii) ownership of livestock in areas where the legal rights of women to own livestock are constrained through customs laws (iii) organisation of groups to design and implement projects in areas where the roles of men and women are rigidly defined.

Overall Assessment and conclusion
The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project were rated as satisfactory on the basis of its alignment to government and SACU strategies as well as the needs of the rural poor, the level of achievements of its objectives within the time span and budget, and high profitability of the groups/households it supported.

The rural poverty impact was also rated as satisfactory given the benefits that have accrued to the target groups in terms of income and assets, food security and agricultural productivity, human and social capital and empowerment, as well as institutions, policies and markets.

Sustainability was rated as satisfactory. The level of ownership by the local population and the financial sustainability of the project’s subprojects were high, but there were still challenges with regard to sustainability of the pass-on system. On the basis of the overall positive impact of the project on women, gender equality and women’s empowerment is assessed as satisfactory.
Recommendations
1. The BSAP was largely targeting women beneficiaries; SACU should consider involving men and youth in its projects. This should be coupled with a gender analysis before rolling out projects to its areas of intervention.
2. In order to improve accountability, SACU should consider investing resources in a robust Livestock management information system. This will be very helpful in the sustainability of livestock accountability and easy in tracking pass-on.
3. Market and value creation: SACU should include product marketing and value addition mechanisms during project initiation in its value chain. Farmers who had bumper harvests were affected by the low prices and limited availability of market avenues to sell their produce.
4. During the validation exercise, majority of the farmers noted a need for effective veterinary services such as artificial insemination, timely response for medication to ill cows. Thus SACU should consider adopting close monitoring mechanisms and routine field visits by its technical veterinary staff.
5. To enhance sustainability of agriculture and crop productivity, SACU should assist farmers in forming seed multiplication clubs and centres with in the communities. Focus should be on commercial crop varieties.
6. SACU should consider building more farmer capacity to meet the immediate and short-term needs of her beneficiaries through training to engage in income-generating small-scale agricultural diversification and sustainable means of livelihoods. This will not only encourage farmers to sustain their interest in maintaining livestock and agricultural inputs but would also have access to additional sources of income during the gestation period for the agricultural crops and livestock maturity.
7. Given the irregularities in rain seasons and scarce water sources, SACU should consider water harvesting subsidies to farmers during the planning stage of any project.
8. SACU should consider developing stronger partnerships with government agencies, local government with in project areas.
Annex A.
Success Stories

Tabitha Higenyi
Tabitha is 50 years old, is married to Higenyi and supports 7 people in her household. Her children dropped out of school due to lack of school fees before she joined the project. Her husband is a peasant.

Farm enterprise:
She grows maize, millet, G.nuts, rice and beans. Last season she got 10 bags of maize and sold surplus maize, each bag at Ushs.50,000/= . However, rice growing was poor because of floods. When the climate is favourable she gets 10 bags of rice un threshed. She grows tomatoes and amaranths.

She has planted a variety of trees and citrus like oranges, paw paws which she will sell to get money.

She got two local cows, 1 produced a female calf which is ready for pass on.

She has developed bio gas with support from World Vision. This has improved her cooking and lighting. She is very grateful to SACU for giving her cows which produce the cow dung for the farm and bio gas plant.

Tabitha operates petty business in vegetables and charcoal. She is now able to earn at least Ushs.5,000/= per day.

The family nutrition has improved because of the milk from the cow. Surplus milk is sold to earn an income for the family. She gained knowledge on nutrition from the project trainings and ensures that her family consumes a balanced diet.

Tabitha used to be very shy before she joined the project but she is now very assertive and acquired knowledge and skills and has gained self-esteem and confidence and is involved in leadership positions. She is the chairperson LC I Bubada and treasurer Hadubi Hedala Women’s project.

Margaret Mulomi
Margaret is 40 years married to Mulomi a primary teacher. Margaret is a mother of eight children and has one dependent.

Farm enterprise:
Margaret grows G.nuts, maize, banana and vegetables. Her produce has improved because of use of composed manure which she learnt from the group. She is able to harvest over 20 bags of G.nuts, 10 bags of maize. Surplus produce is sold while reserving adequate food for the family.

Margaret has attained food security and her income has more than doubled. She is building a permanent house, got a loan and secured a grinding meal where she earns at least Ushs.20,000/= per day and she uses part of her income to pay school fees for children.

She plants vegetables for home consumption and surplus for sale like tomatoes, egg plants and onions. She continuous keeps planting vegetables in season and out of season because of the knowledge from SACU and has been able to earn money from vegetable growing.

Margaret is a leader in church, NAADS project and a home visitor in World vision. Life skills training from SACU has given her leverage to leadership positions and she is now a self-confident person and a great resource to her family and community.
FAZILA YEREMIA:
Fazila is 37 years old with a family of 17 people. She had 6 children and 9 dependants (3 grandchildren, 3 relatives and 3 elderly people under her care).

She bakes bread as a source of income and is able to earn at least Ushs.4500/= per day.

Farm enterprise:
She grows maize, G.nuts, and a variety of vegetables. Surplus produce is sold to earn income for the family. Her family has very good home hygiene and nutrition. She earns a daily income from sale of vegetables. When the season is favourable she gets 4 bags of maize and 4 bags of G.nuts. Fazila is now able to meet the family basic needs and used proceeds from agriculture to buy household essentials.

She looks after one cow she got from SACU but has not delivered yet.

Fazila is the vice chairperson of Hadubi Hedala women’s project and a secretary for women at LC I, treasurer LC II and a member of another group and a member of Parents, Teachers’ association (PTA) Buwesa Primary school and a mobilizer at the mosque.

Beatrice Bulanga:
Beatrice is 63 years married to Bulanga a retired worker of Uganda Railways Corporation and a mother of four children. She takes care of 3 grandchildren.

Life before the project:
Beatrice says that life before joining the project was miserable with hardly adequate resources to support the family. She was lonely and was unable to meet her basic needs. Their marriage was on the rocks.

Life after the project:
Beatrice is a very happy and self-sustaining grandmother. She received a crossbred cow from SACU which gives her milk. She sells surplus milk. Beatrice has been supporting the family and maintained the husband while he was sick. She sells the agricultural produce to earn money for economic support of her family. She testified that her marriage has been rekindled and works hard to support her family members.

Her husband is very grateful to the project for empowering them. He retired from Uganda Railways and had sunk back into poverty and despair but SACU has shown a ray of hope for them. When healthy, he helps his wife with domestic chores and feeding of the cow. He comments with a smile while working in their garden from morning till evening that SACU has given him a job on their farm. He noted that he has granted his wife permission to participate in project work for community development and while the wife is away from home, he takes charge.

Beatrice has developed a high sense of belonging and no longer faces stigma. Beatrice is a Kenyan by origin married in Uganda and actively participates in the project activities as a group secretary Hadubi Hedala Women’s project, secretary in Mothers Union, secretary for child sponsorship and village health team (VHT) in charge of nutrition with World Vision.

Because of the cow she received from SACU, Beatrice has become empowered and gets milk from the cow. She is able to keep her grandchildren and husband healthy because of the milk and vegetables. Beatrice’s home hygiene has greatly improved and she practices farm planning. She had to relocate her kitchen away from the pit latrine and cowshed as well. Beatrice is now a very hard working woman and her family survives from her sweat and is very supportive to her and the family works as a team. The family cohesion is exhibited with enthusiasm about the project. Gender good relationships are evident with husband and grandchildren helping with domestic chores.

Beatrice has been identified as a beneficiary of bio gas and is busy constructing the bio gas plant so that she makes maximum use of the cow dung from her cow. He is very hopeful to lead a high standard of living and enjoy life with a financial breakthrough while commending SACU for uplifting her standard of living.

She operates petty business of making mats, fish mongering as income generating activity. She is grateful to SACU that she has been able to get money needed for medication of the husband.
Beatrice has planted a variety of crops like maize, G-nuts, sweet potatoes, beans and cassava. She has adequate food and at the time of visiting her in November 2011, she was harvesting maize out of season.

Her future plans are to improve on the family house and education of her grandchildren.
### Table 6: Interpretation of ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome rating</th>
<th>Rating implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unsatisfactory (MU)</td>
<td>The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderately satisfactory (MS)</td>
<td>The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Highly satisfactory (HS)</td>
<td>The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References

## Annex C: Project activity schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sensitisation and mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Baseline evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Selection of beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Farmer Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Livestock placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Purchase of motorcycle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Terms of Reference Of The End Of Project Evaluation For Bunyole Sustainable Agriculture Project

Background

This grant was a result of contact made between Send a Cow UK and Heifer Netherlands. It covered two (2) groups in Butallejja district (Eastern region) that have been especially selected to participate in a livelihood project financed by Heifer Netherland through Send a Cow Uganda (SACU).

SACU worked with 78 households to implement the proposed program activities to strengthen its pro-poor interventions in two sub counties in Butalejja district. The project aim was to improve food security and incomes of households in the intervention areas. It is anticipated that this initiative will result in households becoming economically self sustaining and raise their living standard. Furthermore, that the successes registered by the project may resonate and trigger similar developments in the area.

To achieve the above support was given to agricultural production to enable the affected households to fend for themselves. Improving crop yields will be achieved through the provision of improved quality seeds, improvements in farming techniques and integrating livestock into the systems to improve soils with manure. With the incomes gained from milk and sale of surplus crops as a result of increased crop productivity they can turn their lives around. Environment protection was key for improved land use and sustainable productivity. Gardening will be promoted to extend the production of fresh vegetables well into the dry seasons and this will help in improving the nutrition status of these people.

The project targeted woman of the household as the entry point of the intervention. This was the case because having empowered the woman in the household and taught gender equity, and then the women have been a better vehicle of achieving change within the household compared to the men.

Aims and Objectives of the Project

1. To double household incomes of target beneficiaries by 70 percent (%) in five (5) years
2. To improve the food security and nutritional standards of target beneficiaries by 75 percent (%) in five (5) years

Purpose of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the HPIN project to the participating women and their families;

Specific Objectives

Specifically the study will:
1) Investigate the impact of the project against set objectives;
2) Examine whether the capacities of target beneficiaries have been met;
3) Inform whether the original objectives have met the priorities of the target beneficiaries
4) Understand how cost effective and sustainable the project has been; and
5) Capture lessons learnt in order to inform future plans and projects

What impact did the project have against set aims and objectives?

Capacity of women’s organizations to plan and manage development projects
- How many women’s community groups were supported under the project
- How was the capacity of the groups built
- What were the changes in group structure during the project
- How many women participants have held positions of leadership within their groups
- Did project leadership committees demonstrate accountable management of time and resources
- Were regular leadership elections as stipulated in the group constitutions
- What were the changes in relationship between women’s community groups and SACU during the project
- Have groups developed the ability to access additional resources from outside the project
- Percentage (or fold) increase in crop production
- Change in diversity of crops, vegetables and fruit grown
- Change in productivity of livestock

**Increase in Income levels**

- Number of income generating activities practiced by project households
- Percentage (or fold) increase in household income
- Percentage (or fold) increase in household expenditure
- Investment in other income generating activities by type
- Number of participating women with a savings account
- Number of participating women with access to credit
- Number of assets bought by type
- Number of households able to invest in improved housing

**Livestock practices**

- Number of women participants who received livestock gifts (by livestock type and numbers)
- Number of livestock now owned (vs. before the project)
- Number of women participants now able to open up land using draught power
- Number of women participants who have passed on the gift of livestock to another farmer (by livestock type and numbers)

**Nutrition practices**

- Number of meals consumed by the households per day now (vs. before the project)
- Number of times animal protein is consumed per week now (vs. before the project)
- Number of women participants reporting a reduced incidence of malnutrition-related diseases in their family members.

**What level of capacity has been built among target beneficiaries in Social development, organic agriculture, and livestock?**

**Women's confidence and capacity**

- Number of women participants reporting increased confidence and self-esteem
- Number of women making decisions on all fundamental concerns in the home
- Number of women making decisions on family planning and childcare
- Number of women participants now owning assets (by number and type)
- Number of women reporting reduced conflict
- Number of women participants reporting a reduction or cessation of domestic abuse

**Family cohesion in managing household chores and child education**

- Number of women / men participants reporting improved relationships in the home e.g. better care from spouse, spending time together, working together, no harassment/intimidation,
- Number of children (boys/girls) attending secondary school by age and sex as a result of the project
- Number of children (boys/girls) not attending school by age and sex and why?
- Number of children (boys/girls) successfully completing defined school levels by age and sex

**Did the original objectives meet the needs and priorities of the women?**

- Was the project design appropriate to meet the needs of target beneficiaries?
- Were the women able to fully participate in and influence project planning and implementation?
- Were any additional components introduced during the project to meet the needs
- What activities were planned in the original proposal?
- What changes to project implementation were introduced?
How cost effective and sustainable was the project?

- What was the final cost of the project?
- How does this compare with the project budget?
- What was the reason for any variance?
- What was the cost per household/beneficiary?
- Are the changes and impact brought about by the project sustainable in the long term?
- What external factors may affect sustainability of project impact?

What lesson and best practices were learnt?

- Were there any unplanned or unexpected benefits from the project?
- What were the challenges faced and how were these addressed?
- What were the key lessons learned during project implementation?
- How were / will these be shared with other stakeholders?
- What are the strengths/weaknesses of the SAC approach to working with women and girls?

Evaluation Team

- External Consultant
- Elizabeth Okware – SACU Social Development Manager
- Christopher Kyeswa – SACU Projects Manager
- Daniel Ekude, SACU Projects Coordinator East & Central region
- Research Assistants

Proposed Methodology for Data collection

Review of documentation

Review of documents relating to the HPIN Project and supplementary information will include:

- Original proposal
- Budget
- Gender Strategy and Plan for HPIN
- HPIN Bi - annual reports Year 1- 5
- Other Core documents

Household Evaluation

Household evaluation questionnaires will be completed for all participating households. This will include qualitative and quantitative data and a retrospective baseline. The questionnaires will be developed by the evaluation consultants with participation from community groups and staff.

Focus Group Discussions

Focus group discussions will be held with members of the HPIN community groups, their leadership, spouses and associate members (men), partners, SACU staff and community leaders and government ministry officials.

Key informant Interviews

Key informant interviews will be held with identified individuals to investigate specific aspects of the HPIN project on a deeper level, assessing their view of impact on participants and the wider community, challenges, solutions and potential for work going forward.

Participatory methodologies

HPIN community group members will take part in a range of participatory methodologies designed to explore aspects of project delivery and impact. These will include transect drives, and ranking exercises plus additional methods proposed by the evaluation consultants.
**Farm visits**

Farm visits will be carried out by evaluation consultants in all 6 project districts to validate data collected from household evaluations and to capture the view of participating families. Farmers to be visited will be randomly selected and case studies of successful, and less successful households collated.

**Control Group**

Select a control group will be possible if the respondents accept to be interviewed. However, the experience in the past is that the non-beneficiaries and the indirect beneficiaries decline to be interviewed. A control group would consist of people who did not benefit from the project. I am talking about the indirect beneficiaries. If they don’t want to be interviewed, I assume there are other ways of getting some information on this. For instance the observations of trainers, extension workers, and the evaluators themselves on how many people copy lessons from the project. Also, you can ask participants how many other villagers they have demonstrated or taught new methods to

**Report documentation**

The report will be written including executive summary, project impact and recommendations for future work. The report will be shared with community groups, participating partners, SACU staff, Heifer Netherlands as well as other partners in development and will be made available on the SACU website.

**The Deliverables**

**Role of the consultant**

The consultant will conduct interviews and meetings involving staff, partners and stakeholders. The evaluation and planning process participants will include extension workers; target beneficiaries and key partners in all key evaluation tasks. A suitable tool for data collection will be designed by the consultant and administered to the evaluation participants.

As methodology, the consultant will therefore undertake a desk review of the available literature; interview SACU staff, interview some of the key actors in the supported agencies (local government’s field staff) talk to other stakeholders, as appropriate, at the regional level; visit and talk to people or graduated groups

The consultant is expected to produce the following:

**Work-schedule for End Project Bunyole Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity for Bunyole 1</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22nd January</td>
<td>Agree on ToR and sign a contract</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Evaluation team and consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th January</td>
<td>Desk Review: strategic plan, baseline, midterm review</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th January</td>
<td>Review and Finalize with tools</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping out the scope-sampling size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct orientation with team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print out tools</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Evaluation team consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design software for data entry tool - SPSS</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th to 9th February</td>
<td>Data collection in Butaleja</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Judith and Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th to 15th February</td>
<td>Data entry</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data analysis and report development</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th to 20th February</td>
<td>Feedback meeting</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final report submitted to HNL</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Expertise required**
The evaluator is expected to be familiar with the organisation and have basic knowledge of the Project area relevant to the Project objectives and outcomes, with the following expertise below:

- Post-graduate qualification in statistics, Agriculture, Development Studies, Strategic in planning, or a related field;
- Good report-writing and computer skills.
- Relevant evaluation and consultancy experience;
- Hands on experience M&E and relevant experience in project design, management, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Relevant experience in engaging with local government, civil society sector;
- In-depth knowledge of the NGO sector and current challenges facing livelihoods of rural areas in Uganda;

**WORKPLAN AND SCHEDULE**
The strategic plan review and planning process will be carried out in the month of January to February 2013 for the task

**Proposed Work Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of TORs</td>
<td>SACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and recruitment of consultant</td>
<td>SACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of TORs and relevant documents</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of inception report including methodology and tools</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents, development of study tools, evaluation framework and report layout and inception report detailing the agreed upon activity schedule</td>
<td>SACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work involving data collection and initial data analysis</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation &amp; presentation of report</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising of the draft report and submission of final report</td>
<td>SACU/Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Target Users of the study report**

- Primary user will be SACU and Heifer Netherlands
- Send a Cow Ambassadors, International Team, Board, Staff, and SAC group
- Send a Cow Key stakeholders in development including Civil Society Organisations
- Donor Organizations
- Government (Higher and Lower Local Governments)
- Non-Governmental Organisations

**Budget notes**

1. The budget is based on the assumption that the assignment will take 5 working days by one consultant. Professional fees are charged at 500,000/= shs per day
2. Transport is budgeted on Wet-lease basis (vehicle, driver and fuel). The SACU may provide transport in kind for the duration of the fieldwork and as such item costs related to transport will be removed from budget. In the alternative, transport may be budgeted on Dry-lease basis (i.e. vehicle only usually at UGX 170,000 per day) in which case the SACU will meet the cost of fuel. Where the latter is the case, fuel becomes reimbursable cost on production of fuel receipts.
3. Administration expenses except where transport and telephone costs are specified are usually considered reimbursable in which case payment will be made on the basis of related receipts.
4. The budget is activity based on number of days to be taken and this conforms to the activity plan and plan for implementation of the assignment. Any changes that will arise thereafter will be adjusted with the consent of the contracting parties.

5. Should the SACU wish to have the final report presented to a stakeholders’ workshop, all costs related to that is the responsibility of the SACU.

**Layout and structure of the final report**
The final report should not be longer than approximately 15 pages. Additional information on overall context, project or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to annexes.

*The main sections of the evaluation report are as follows:*

1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
   This will be no more than 2 pages of succinctly clear and to-the-point comment. It should focus mainly on the key issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations.

2. **INTRODUCTION**
   This part should provide a short description of the project, the evaluation, and methodological explanations.

3. **FINDINGS**
   This part of the report should present conclusive factual and well-reasoned answers to the various evaluation questions. It should focus on the following evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

   **3.1 Problems and needs (Context and Relevance)**
The relevance criterion will explore the extent to which the objectives of the project intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements. This analysis will focus on the following design issues:
   - Was the project adequate in addressing the felt needs, priorities and rights of the target beneficiaries?
   - To what extent were the needs in line with the development frameworks of the MDG, Uganda’s NDP, and the district and lower local government development plans?
   - Were the felt needs based on relevant studies and baselines studies?
   - The consultants should also present a brief overview of the policy environment and the economic and business conditions that have had an impact on the environment during the project implementation period.

   **3.2 Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)**
The effectiveness criterion, concerns how far the project results and specific objective(s) are being achieved. The analysis of Effectiveness will therefore focus on such issues as:
   - To what extent the planned outreach (beneficiaries, activities, budgets) have been achieved;
   - Whether in the key stakeholders’ views the planned benefits have been or are being delivered;
   - whether the intended beneficiaries participate in the intervention;
   - Are the beneficiaries satisfied with the quality and delivery of services? If not, in what way did the services not meet with beneficiary expectations and why?
   - How effective has the elements of training, capacity building and use of IEC materials like posters been throughout the project (adoption rate, behavior change etc.)?
   - How robust were the project logframe, M&E system in capturing project outcomes/impacts?
   - To what extent did the project show “innovation”?
   - The factors that were/are crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the project objectives.
   - If and how have other wider community members have adopted lessons from the project as well? This will be a control group of non beneficiaries.
3.3 Sound management and value-for-money (Efficiency)
The efficiency criterion concerns how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended outputs and outcomes, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. The assessment of Efficiency will therefore focus on such issues as:
- the quality of management (operations, personnel, assets, budget, and reporting deadlines);
- Were the project resources adequately identified in the planning and utilized to achieve the intended purpose?
- Value-for-money and cost-benefit- analysis for the project outcomes compared to other similar projects.
- The extent to which capacities and potentials in service provision were improved and used to achieve project objectives.
- The extent to which the project used monitoring of progress to inform programming, learning and accountability.

3.4 Achievements of wider impacts (Impacts)
The term impact denotes the relationship between the project’s specific and overall objectives. At impact level the final evaluation will make an analysis of the following aspects:
- What has been SACU’s performance with respect to their projected performance indicators (as stated in the Baseline Evaluation Report)
- From the above performance, what concrete changes, positive or negative, planned or unplanned, do the target beneficiaries attribute [in their households, groups, gender relations, markets, governments, etc.] as a direct result of the project?
- To what extent has the project contributed to the capacity of the [sector, market, beneficiary groups, and beneficiary households]? 
- To what extent were synergies sought with other actors/stakeholders to assist SACU in having the expected impact? Did new opportunities arise during the project implementation that were not originally anticipated, but subsequently pursued? To what extent did the project who “ability to adapt” and flexibility?
- What best practices and lessons/case studies can be learned from the project.

3.5 Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)
The sustainability criterion relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding ends. The final evaluation will assess the sustainability of benefits on basis of the following issues:
- the ownership of achievements by the local actors; farmer groups
- supportive policy to food security and livelihood projects;
- the institutional capacity of the farmer groups and SACU to technically, financially and managerially support implementation;
- financial sustainability of the targeted groups to cover all their operation and project costs;
- whether SACU devised a sustainability strategy/plan, its performance, and challenges?
- Replicability potential of SACU in SAC Family’s global strategy?

4. VISIBILITY
The consultants will make an assessment of the project’s strategy, activities, the results obtained and the impact achieved in the field of visibility, information and communication.

5. OVERALL ASSESSMENT
This chapter will synthesize all the answers to evaluation questions into an overall assessment of the project with articulate findings, conclusions and lessons.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
6.1 Conclusions
This chapter introduces the conclusions relative to each question. The conclusions should be organized in clusters in the chapter in order to provide an overview of the assessed subject. It should features references to the findings (responses to the evaluation questions) or to annexes showing how the conclusions derive from data, interpretations, and analysis and judgment criteria.

The conclusion chapter should feature a balanced view without any bias to only the successes
observed but also the issues requiring further thought on modifications or a different course of action.

6.2 Recommendations
The ultimate value of an evaluation depends on the quality and credibility of the recommendations offered. Recommendations should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the project, and of the resources available to implement them. They should also be targeted with clear indications of how the project’s performance can be improved.

7. ANNEXES TO THE REPORT
The report should include the following annexes:
- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The name of the evaluator and his/her company (CVs should be shown, but summarized and limited to one page)
- Detailed evaluation method including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations. Detail of tools and analyses.
- Logical Framework matrices (original and/or improved/updated)
- Map of project area
- List of persons/organizations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses and figures)