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Terms of Reference
Thematic evaluation Struggle for Land, Water and Food

1. Introduction

Oxfam Novib’s mission is to build a just world without poverty, on which Oxfam Novib has been working since its creation in 1956. In 1994 Oxfam Novib joined the Oxfam Confederation. In order to maximise the results of our efforts in fighting injustice, the Confederation is progressively harmonising processes and its work.

Currently Oxfam Novib is active in 28 Asian and African countries together with other Oxfam affiliates; in 12 of these countries Oxfam Novib has a leading role in the Oxfam Confederation.

The rights-based approach is one of the core principles of Oxfam Novib’s work. Partner organisations in the South and in the North are central to realising our mission, and civil society in countries in the South play a key role in achieving political change. This justifies Oxfam Novib’s focus on strengthening civil society.

We work on five programmes. They are all focussed on realising people’s rights: Right to a Sustainable Livelihood, Right to Basic Social Services, Right to Life and Security, Right to Social and Political Participation, and Right to an Identity. In most cases a mix of intervention strategies is applied: Direct Poverty Alleviation, Civil Society Building, Knowledge & Innovation Management; and Lobby & Advocacy.

In 2011 Oxfam Novib transferred a total amount of 154 million Euros to counterparts. Oxfam Novib’s current main donor is the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs: through the Co-Financing System (MFS-II) of its General Directorate for International Cooperation (DGIS), Oxfam Novib applied for a joint subsidy grant for the period of 2011-2015, as part of the IMPACT Alliance together with HIRDA, SOMO, 1%CLUB, Fairfood International and Butterfly Works.

As part of writing its 2011-2015 Corporate Plan, Priority Themes were identified as work areas that are highly instrumental to achieving the organisation’s overall goals. The “struggle for land, water and food” is one of the priority themes in the programme Right to a Sustainable Livelihood. Oxfam Novib explains its rationale in its Corporate Plan 2011-2015, as follows:

History has shown that agriculture and rural development are the most effective ways out of poverty. ‘Rural livelihoods are only sustainable when people have secure ownership of or access to livelihood assets and are resilient to shocks and disasters. The greater and more varied their asset base, the more sustainable and secure their livelihoods will be.’

This document presents the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Thematic Evaluation of the priority theme Struggle for Land, Water and Food.

Below you will find (2) some background on this evaluation, (3) objectives of the evaluation, (4) scope of the evaluation, (5) evaluation questions, (6) approach and methodology, (7) deliverables, (8) indicative time planning and (9) annexes.

---

The right to a sustainable livelihood, strategies, lessons learned and actions, Oxfam Novib policy paper, 2008.
2. Some background on this evaluation

While Oxfam Novib has been working on issues related to the struggle for land, water and food for a number of years, the theme as such is a new priority area for Oxfam Novib adopted in 2011. In preparing this evaluation and the position paper for this theme, the Knowledge and Program Management team revisited the Theory of Change and objectives as originally formulated in Oxfam Novib’s Corporate Plan 2011-2015. The team has made the change theory more explicit for the purpose of this evaluation.

The objectives as set in the Oxfam Novib Business Plan for the period 2011-2015 are:

• To increase the control that people living in poverty have over the natural resources and means of existence on which they depend and recognition of their role as change agents in using and protecting such resources.

• To prevent people living in poverty from being driven further into poverty as a consequence of current large-scale farming practices.

• To substantially increase government investments in production systems and in strategies from which vulnerable groups derive a large part of their income and food, and in the protection of these groups when their income drops below a specific minimum.

Oxfam Novib is one of the seventeen affiliates of the Oxfam Confederation. In Oxfam’s Strategic Plan 2007-2012 the Confederation set as objective for the joint work of affiliates:

“People living in poverty will achieve food and income security as well as greater protection of, and control over the natural resources on which they depend”.

This objective clearly overlaps with Oxfam Novib’s theme Struggle for Land, Water and Food and its objectives.

We believe poverty is a problem with multiple causes and for that reason a single intervention will not lead to sustainable improvements in the livelihoods of people. To have a sustainable impact on the livelihoods of smallholder producers, we:

1. support human, physical, social, natural and financial capital building of smallholder producers.
2. work towards the protection of assets of these smallholder producers from harm by others (by duty bearers) or by nature.
3. work towards investments in the assets of smallholder producers by others (duty bearers).

It is by combining these three strategies that Oxfam Novib contributes to the desired outcome:

Smallholder producers in rural areas have sufficient access to human, social, natural, physical and financial capital to develop a sustainable livelihood and to protect their livelihoods.

In order to contribute to these objectives ON strives for intermediate outcomes in the following five outcome areas:

---

2 Goals and objectives of the theme Struggle for Land, Water and Food as stated in the Corporate Plan 2011-2015
1. **Smallholders use improved techniques for sustainable livelihoods.** These techniques should be appropriate for the local context, take into account the risks in their environments, and should be affordable for the people involved. For example: training smallholder producers in improved techniques.

2. **Farmers are able to organise themselves.** This gives them as a collective a stronger position to buy inputs, to market their products or to have access to training sessions on improved techniques. This occurs by strengthening the capacity of civil society organisations and community-based organisations in terms of organisational development.

3. **Ensuring smallholder producers have a voice to hold duty bearers (different levels of government, companies and institutions) accountable for their actions and their impact.** This occurs by strengthening the capacities of civil society organisations and community-based organisations in lobby and advocacy strategies and in implementation.

4. **Duty bearers (governments, companies, institutions) invest in and protect the assets of smallholder producers.** This occurs through lobby by and with partners at the local, national, regional and global levels. For example: lobby for a rise in the budget for supporting smallholder producers, or for a better and equitable registration of land.

5. **Learning by Oxfam Novib’s partners is explicit, is put into practice and used on a wider scale (so learning in one country is used in another), not only by partners but also by duty bearers.** For example: experience of a project on agroforestry is used for the mapping of potential agroforestry projects in a neighbouring country.

See annex c for the visualisation of the Theory of Change.

Oxfam Novib monitors annually outputs and outcomes. See Annex 1 for the set of relevant indicators. Specific observations on the five outcome areas are:

1. **Smallholders using improved techniques for sustainable livelihoods.**

So far, the monitoring (Annual Report 2011) indicates results are especially high in terms of enabling people living in poverty to use sustainable production methods. Many partners reinforce people’s capacity in areas such as conserving seeds (Myanmar), participatory plant breeding, pest management and timing of planting. With many partners the focus is on low external input production systems accessible to poor farmers, and in some cases on organic farming, to reduce production costs and make farmers less dependent on external inputs. At the same time some partners provide inputs such as seeds and fertilisers to their beneficiaries (Angola, Niger). Community-based forestry and natural resources management are possible in other contexts (Cambodia, Myanmar).

A significant proportion of Oxfam Novib’s investments on this theme goes to training smallholder producers (especially in Uganda, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Myanmar). It will be interesting to learn (through this evaluation) about the quality and impact of this training. To what extent do these training sessions - often in combination with other strategies and involving project participants facing sometimes difficult circumstances like natural disasters and fragile states - have a positive impact on the sustainable livelihoods? Some of our partners report not only on the impact for those participating directly in the training, but also indirectly. E.g. Metta in Myanmar monitors if non participants to their Farmer Field Schools also have got an increased yield by using the techniques of the Farmer Field Schools. ACORD has a system of Training the Trainers that tries to put a chain in place of every trainee to train 10 other persons.

---

These examples show that currently the partners of Oxfam Novib use different types of training with different effects and costs. Oxfam Novib lacks information to compare the outcome-investment ratios of these different types of training. Oxfam Novib is interested in a comparison between and within countries.

2. Farmers are able to organise themselves. This gives them as a collective a stronger position to buy inputs, to market their products or to have access to training sessions on improved techniques.

Small holder producers often lack the skills, access and volume to influence important factors in their immediate environment. For instance they choose for the nearest market to sell their products, since they can’t afford on their own transport to a further market. Partner organisations often choose to play for this reason a key role in strengthening the organisations on community level. Social capital building is seen as a crucial investment for achieving sustainable livelihoods.

In West-Africa partner organisations play a key role in strengthening the organisations of pastoralists in production and marketing, e.g. milk in Nigeria. Farmer-led extension training and field schools have been established on a wide scale and report significant increases in yields.

In Angola, partner organisation LWF focuses on livelihoods of rural communities in Lunda Sul and Moxico provinces. They started their work by establishing Village Development Committees (VVDs). By supporting these committees, farmers associations and entrepreneurship women’s groups were set up, savings and micro-credit groups were formed. Advocacy for the needs of the villages was done through those VDCs. They exchanged information and lessons learnt by visiting other villages.

3. Ensuring smallholder producers have a voice to hold duty bearers (different levels of government, companies and institutions) to account accountable for their actions and their impact.

One common demand of smallholder producers to their governments is related to land. Land regulations often do not benefit smallholder producers. In most countries Oxfam Novib supports partners to advocate better access to land for smallholder producers, sometimes in coalitions. Pastoralist organisations in West Africa are an example of this. Their capacities were strengthened to make their voices heard at the national level.

Even though it is Oxfam Novib’s belief that the quality of lobby will be improved through joint lobby agendas (and not only with involvement of the members of partner organisations but also with the broader target group in a certain region), not all of these partners work directly with smallholder producers (e.g. by training). Does this affect the relevance of the lobby for the small holder producers?

4. Duty bearers (governments, companies, institutions) invest in and protect the assets of smallholder producers.

A recurring phenomenon is conflicts between pastoralists and agriculturalists. Partners of Oxfam Novib try to address these conflicts. For instance in Sudan where a cross-border eco-peace committee was established with representatives of pastoralist and farmers’ organisations and unions in Sudan and Ethiopia, the State Council for the Environment, and local leaders. The committee works towards the peaceful coexistence between pastoralists and farmers on both sides of the Sudan-Ethiopia border.

In most African countries (coalitions of) partners lobby for the implementation of the Maputo Declaration (2003) on allocating 10% of national budgets to agriculture and to smallholder producers in particular. In Burundi, for instance, a coalition of partners succeeded in lobbying for an increase in the budget share to 12%. Partners put the emphasis on empowerment, on people and communities in rural areas and seek relationships with diverse actors. In most countries collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture is
established, while relationships with research and knowledge institutes are also being sought. Also in this case, Oxfam Novib is interested in how the relevance of the lobby is increased by the participation of the small holder producers.

5. Learning by Oxfam Novib’s partners is explicit, is put into practice and used on a wider scale (so learning in one country is used in another), not only by partners but also by duty bearers.

So far, Oxfam Novib has some indications that learning by partners and/or Oxfam Novib improves the quality and impact of our work. The Annual Report 2011 observed that partners’ interventions related to agriculture adaptation gained force when backed up by scientific research and assessments (Bangladesh). And at this moment Oxfam Novib works with 20 partners and HIVOS on a learning process on agro-biodiversity. We expect to see a similar effect from this work. It will be interesting to understand better how the learning works in practise and identify some lessons learned.

6. Gender is integrated in all Oxfam Novibs strategies and the programmes and projects supported are benefitting vulnerabilities, especially of women.

Gender is one of Oxfam Novib’s cross-cutting change goals. For all of the above mentioned outcome areas, Oxfam Novib is interested in knowing how gender mainstreaming was put into practice, in other words whether and how possible effects of an intervention on women and their particular interests were taken into account. What difference did the gender mainstreaming made to the overall effectiveness?

3. Objectives of the evaluation

This evaluation is a stand-alone evaluation that will be a building block for a final evaluation to be implemented in 2014.

The evaluation has two objectives: 1) internal steering and learning, and 2) accountability, of which the first one is most critical at this stage. This means that we expect the results of the evaluation to give us insights on the progress and quality of our work on the theme. The evaluation report will therefore be an important source of information for Oxfam Novib staff for further guidance for the coming years (2013 up to 2015). In order to address both objectives, the first phase (including a desk-study) will provide a first analysis on the evaluation questions (see under 5 and 7 for details) for all countries or regions relevant for the theme struggle for land, water and food. An in-depth analysis will be undertaken for those countries and partners and projects at the global and regional levels that are of most importance for the internal steering/learning objective of this evaluation.

Use of this evaluation for internal steering and learning
ONL will use the conclusions of this evaluation to adapt its current Theory of Change and give further focus to the theme. The evaluation will identify in the theme’s Theory of Change issues that will guide the final evaluation in 2014. Some of our learning questions are on the quality of the training provided, on its contribution to improving sustainable livelihoods and their sustainability, on the inclusiveness of our lobby interventions, and on the integration of gender in our work. Secondly, the conclusions will be used to critically reflect on the different national programmes and on the global level of the programme Right to Sustainable Livelihoods. This reflection will lead to adjustments if needed and strategically steer where possible.

Use of this evaluation for accountability
The evaluation will help to collate information about the achievements of counterparts included in this evaluation. The evaluation will also zoom in on Oxfam Novib’s contribution to these achievements in the period 2011 to 2012.

The main internal users of this evaluation are the Board of Directors of Oxfam Novib, the programme manager and thematic advisors of the KPM department. Programme staff and (A)CD staff of Oxfam Novib’s country offices will be using the outcomes of the evaluation as well, in particular the people working in the countries to be visited by the evaluators.

Potential external users are donors and the Dutch public, as the evaluation report - even though not a formal obligation of the Dutch Ministry or another donor- may be shared with donors.

For reasons of accountability and transparency the evaluation report will be published on Oxfam Novibs website.

4. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation covers activities that were undertaken by partners in the period 2007 to 2012, while focussing on the period January 2011 up to end of 2012 (and possibly early 2013). It was at the start of the 2011-2015 Business Plan that the theme Struggle for Land, Water and Food became a priority theme.

Previous experiences of Oxfam Novib in the period 2007-2010 are included in this evaluation, but only when those partners and projects have ongoing project activities in 2011 and or 2012. This is in order to increase the understanding of the results of our work and to understand better how this is achieved under the new Theme strategy.

From the perspective of financial coverage, the money transfers from Oxfam Novib to partners for projects implemented in 2011 and beyond are the basis for defining the evaluation scope. In order to define the scope, we include the outcome indicators related to the theme and identify the partners which have received a transfer for their work on those particular outcomes. As a number of partners also received a transfer towards the end of 2010 for their activities in 2011, their projects too are included in the evaluation’s scope.

In 2011 and 2012 a total amount of EUR 40.4 million was transferred to projects which contribute to the theme struggle for land, water and food. Funds were spent in 27 countries, mostly in Africa and Asia. The funds concerned both funds we received as member of the IMPACT Alliance (funded by the Dutch government) as well as funds Oxfam Novib raised with institutional donors and its support-base.

The highest level of funding went to Pakistan, Mozambique and Cambodia ranging from EUR 4.3 million to EUR 1.8 million. An amount of at least EUR 1 million per country was transferred to partners in at least 12 countries during the first two years of the current Business Plan (i.e. in 2011 and/or 2012).

5. Evaluation questions

The evaluation questions are based on the OECD’s DAC criteria for effectiveness and relevance. The questions regarding effectiveness can be related to current outcome indicators used in the Management Information System (SAP), and these have corresponding targets for the period 2011 to 2015.

---

5 Note: From 2011 onwards Oxfam Novib has been registering per project the amount to be spent per outcome indicator.
6 The exact calculation for this part of the scope (the 2010 transfers) is to be done during the evaluation’s implementation period.
7 See footnote no. 4: an additional amount was transferred in the course of 2010 for projects implemented in 2011, possibly more in the last quarter of 2010 (in case a new project starts in January).
8 In 2011/2012 Oxfam Novib transferred to Pakistan an amount of EUR 4.385 million, to Mozambique EUR 2.665 million and to Cambodia EUR 1.821 million.
For each question, when relevant, the countries are mentioned which are relevant to look into for this evaluation.

When relevant each question also mentions those countries that need a closer look in this evaluation as well. By studying the evaluation questions below, we will look into some of the assumptions of the Theory of Change.

Effectiveness

1. To what extent have ONL’s intermediate outcomes been achieved during the evaluation period?
   a) To what extent were the training courses in sustainable production methods of sufficient quality? To what extent did this include specific attention to the vulnerability of participants and their environment (gender, natural disasters, or fragile or failed states, the context), and other risks? Can the lessons and suggestions provided during the training be applied at affordable costs? Related to outcome indicator 1, and in particular in the following countries: Uganda, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Myanmar.
   b) To what extent were the training courses in capacity building and organisational development of sufficient quality? To what extent has group building been instrumental in achieving access to other means of improving sustainable livelihoods?
   c) To what extent did these training courses contribute to building sustainable livelihoods for small-scale producers (for women in particular) after the training sessions had ended (about six to twelve months after training)? (IO9 1) To what extent did the training sessions contribute to the sustainability of livelihoods in countries where projects and programmes were implemented and people vulnerable e.g. to natural disasters or the effects of living in fragile and failed states? To what extent are differences observed between the different types of training? Related to outcome indicator IO 1, and in particular in the following countries: Uganda, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Myanmar.
   d) To what extend was cost-efficiency of training taken into account during the decisions on funding? What was the cost-benefit ratio (costs per beneficiary of training on sustainable production methods) and to what extent was there a variety in the ratios at the project and country levels? This is relevant for all countries, but in particular for: Uganda, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Myanmar.
   e) What were the outcomes achieved as a result of the lobby work by Oxfam Novib and Oxfam Novib’s partners? To what extent did the lobby work contribute to achieving sustainable livelihoods for smallholder producers, especially women? To what extent has the lobby agenda of Oxfam Novib and its partners been formulated in an inclusive way, i.e. involving right-holders (including women), and members and non-members of Oxfam Novib’s partner? IO 4 and 10 for national lobby. In particular in the following countries: Mozambique, Uganda.

2. To what extent has ON contributed to the changes?
   a) To what extent has ON assured that partners applied gender mainstreaming (in all intervention strategies)? And to what extent was this supportive in achieving the intermediate outcomes? Relevant for all countries, but in particular for Pakistan, Somalia, Afghanistan, Uganda, Rwanda, Zimbabwe and Mozambique.
   b) To what extent has ON facilitated exchange of knowledge and information through learning initiatives and linking local to regional/global levels?

---

9 IO = Indicator of Outcome
10 Note: lobby work by Oxfam Novib as part of Oxfam’s GROW campaign is not included in this evaluation.
c) To what extent has ON paid attention to efficiency aspects in the development and implementation of this priority theme? To what extent has ON paid attention to sustainability aspects in the development and implementation of this priority theme?

3. Relevance

a) What do the observed intermediate outcomes (or results) of Oxfam Novib’s interventions (as identified under the effectiveness question) say about the relevance and comprehensiveness of Oxfam Novib’s Theory of Change? What changes could be suggested by evaluators for adaption/modification for Oxfam Novib’s Theory of Change, if necessary?

All 28 countries where Oxfam Novib is working on the theme Struggle for Land, Water and Food will be included in the evaluation, with varying levels or degrees of detail.

Three categories of inclusion were identified. The category of the inclusion defines the country and the level of detail that evaluators will pursue in relation to the projects and programs. The preliminary study, a collaboration between the KPM and Q&C departments of Oxfam Novib, came to the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Burundi, DRC, Vietnam, Laos, South Sudan, Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td>Somalia, Pakistan, Mozambique, Cambodia, Uganda, Myanmar, Zimbabwe, Bangladesh, Sudan, Niger, Pan Africa Programme and Nigeria (excluding Netherlands and Internet Now).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most thorough</td>
<td>Uganda, and one out of following countries Myanmar, Bangladesh or Pakistan,</td>
<td>In order to minimize overlap and increase efficiency, where possible quick wins are to be made by using available data from other evaluation exercises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Approach and methodology**

The evaluation will be implemented in two phases. A start-up period is part of phase 1. Fine-tuning of the evaluation proposal takes place in the start-up period.

**Phase 1: (mainly) desk study**

a. *Kick-off meeting* with programme officer, member s of the internal steering group for the theme *struggle for land, water and food*, and Q&C’s evaluation manager.

b. *General analysis* of all countries and regions relevant for the theme *struggle for land, water and food* based on:
   - Financial data from the management information system (SAP)
   - Introductory paper for this evaluation.
   - Analysis of external project and programme evaluations (including relevant MFS-II baseline reports). Note: for counterparts Oxfam Novib worked with in the period 2007 to 2010 only external project evaluations referring to the period 2007 to 2012 will be taken into account.

c. *In-depth analysis of the relatively “high investment” countries* and regions that are of interest from a learning perspective.

For the in-depth analysis a number of partners, countries and regions are short-listed, based on the following criteria:

1. Financial. Expenditure on the outcome indicators is relatively high. Enough countries and regions are selected to cover 50% of all spending on the outcome indicators.
2. Regional spread. This criterion is used for learning and steering purposes.
3. Relative importance of the countries to the theme *struggle for land, water and food*

The in-depth analysis can potentially be based on:

- Interviews with KPM’s programme manager and advisor, and with thematic focal points in the countries and at regional and global levels, should provide insights into their views on the theme (Theory of Change, strengths and weaknesses in implementation, quality of available data).
- Analysis of (a selection of) narrative reports of counterparts who started as Oxfam Novib’s partner organisations in 2011 and 2012, in case there is no external project evaluation available
- Analysis of project appraisals of new partners in case no narrative reports are available
- Analysis of external evaluations and studies by third parties if available.

Furthermore, for projects and partners at the regional and global levels an analysis is needed in order to identify the projects to be included in phase 2.

The evaluation team will share progress and dilemmas encountered during the first phase in a meeting with the Steering Group and relevant KPM, Q&C and other staff. The updated planning and focus for phase 2 will then be discussed. Feedback can be used as input for the next phase of the evaluation: the visits to the countries. Also, possible country specific learning questions will be identified, if achievable within the approved proposal, time and budget.

**Phase 2: additional primary data collection in selected countries and at regional/global level**

---

11 Relatively high investments means here: Oxfam Novib transfers more than EUR 1 million each year.
• Visit to countries: For this phase Oxfam Novib has made a selection based on learning and steering criteria and pragmatic reasons. Additional primary data collection should be done in Mozambique, Uganda and Pakistan. Possibly Pakistan may be substituted by Myanmar and / or Bangladesh.
• For partners working at the global and regional levels video-conferencing and skype should be used when possible.

Per country visited, the evaluation team will organise a feedback workshop to discuss with interviewed country office staff of ONL and staff of partners the initial findings and conclusions of the country level evaluative research.

One of the preferred instruments to be used for additional primary data collection is stories of change or most significant change, plus additional external verification of those stories.

7. Deliverables

The evaluation team will prepare: 1) a proposal for implementing the evaluation based on the ToR; and 2) an evaluation report.

Each of these deliverables are to be:

• A maximum of 75 pages in English, including an executive summary of about 5 pages, excluding annexes.
• The report is to be submitted to Oxfam Novib (Q&C’s evaluation manager) by e-mail, and 10 versions in hard copy format.

8. Indicative planning

The thematic evaluation is expected to start as soon as the evaluation team has been selected.

Planning evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>When/deadline</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalise approach paper describing evaluation design and implementation plan</td>
<td>In early stages of start of the evaluation assignment</td>
<td>Approach paper ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share initial findings, discuss dilemmas and collect input for phase 2 (field visits), including country specific learning questions</td>
<td>Depending on the progress (before field visit part starts)</td>
<td>Workshop held with input assembled for phase 2 (field visits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share initial findings and emerging conclusions of the evaluation</td>
<td>Early June (to be decided depending on exact date of Oxfam Novibs Board of Directors meeting)</td>
<td>Short powerpoint presentation ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out evaluation study, coordination of input at Oxfam Novib, write draft report</td>
<td>4th of July</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report is ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make modifications to draft report on the basis of feedback of Oxfam Novib</td>
<td>1st of August</td>
<td>Final evaluation report is ready</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **Annexes**
   a. Output and outcome indicator list
   b. Available documents for the evaluation
   c. Visualisation of Theory of Change
Annex a: output and outcome indicator list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxfam International Change</th>
<th># outcome</th>
<th>outcome description</th>
<th>Intervention strategy</th>
<th>outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of women and men (small-scale crop farmers, cattle farmers, fisher folk) able to use sustainable production methods enabling them to better protect and use sustainably their livelihood resources</td>
<td>DPA</td>
<td>No. of partners that are supported in order to carry out projects focusing on land, water and food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No. of partner organisations better able to communicate at the national and international levels the voice of people in rural areas living in poverty</td>
<td>BCS</td>
<td>No. of partner organisations active in land, water and food, which get support in order to strengthen their capacities in the fields of lobby, networking, research and accountability. No. of local producers' organisations that have received support to strengthen their lobbying and networking capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No. of globally working partner organisations with stronger lobby capacity for getting onto the agenda of regional and international bodies (EU, AU, etc.), investors and internationally operating companies the issues emerging from national organisations and movements around land, water and food</td>
<td>BCS</td>
<td>No. of local partner organisations active on climate adaptation, which are supported in order to strengthen their capacities in the fields of lobby, research and accountability. No. of training courses and/or seminars about socially responsible entrepreneurship in food and farming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 For explanation of the abbreviations see next page
| 1.1 | 10 | No of **policy changes** regarding legislation, regulation and/or practices on access to property or inheritance rights and/or compensation mechanisms for loss, in the fields of land and water and preservation of biodiversity, in particular to the benefit of women | LA | No. of Southern partner organisations that are supported by the IMPACT Alliance to lobby their local and national governments for the improvement of legislation on land, water and biodiversity, in particular with regard to women. |
| 1.1 | 13 | No. of **policy changes** in internationally operating companies and international institutions on natural resources and biodiversity | LA | No. of annual campaigns on the theme of sustainability, natural resources and biodiversity held by the IMPACT Alliance in the Netherlands. |

No. of studies that collect evidence and describe cases which substantiate analyses and facilitate making specific recommendations about the external costs and benefits of different production systems.

No. of lobby processes around land, water and biodiversity issues.

No. of training seminars about socially responsible entrepreneurship that have taken place.

No. of organisations that have received socially responsible entrepreneurship training.

No. of studies that collect evidence and describe cases which substantiate analyses and facilitate making specific recommendations about the external costs and benefits of different production systems.

No. of lobby processes around land, water and biodiversity issues.

No. of training seminars about socially responsible entrepreneurship that have taken place.

No. of organisations that have received socially responsible entrepreneurship training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DPA</th>
<th>BCBS</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>KIM</th>
<th>No. of Southern social organisations that have been informed about and are effectively involved in socially responsible entrepreneurship initiatives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No. of cases (academic studies) on issues on struggle for land, water and food</td>
<td>KIM</td>
<td>No. of local partner organisations working on land, water and food that, in association with knowledge institutes, are involved in knowledge processes which focus on themes that are of importance to their activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **DPA**: Direct Poverty Alleviation
- **BCBS**: Building Civil Society
- **LA**: Lobby & Advocacy
- **KIM**: Knowledge and Information Management
Annex b: Available documents

Key documents (strategy & planning docs, policy docs etc)

- Oxfam Novib’s Corporate Plan 2011-2015
- Subsidy request for 2011-2015 submitted to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (in Dutch only)
- Oxfam Novib’s policy paper on food security: “Embedding food security within sustainable livelihood programmes” 2007
- List of Oxfam Novib’s output and outcome indicators
- Inception note Land Water Food, December 2010

Evaluation reports:

- Evaluation of Oxfam Novib’s Global Programmes (covers 2005-2008)\(^{13}\)
- IOB systemic review: Improving food security, a systematic review of the impact of interventions in agricultural production, value chains, market regulation and land security (December 2011).

Other data:

- It is assumed that in the course of 2013 and beyond more (good quality) project evaluation reports will be available, which can be used for collating evaluations.
- Other available data is to be used when relevant and available, such as data from the MFS-II\(^{14}\) evaluation currently taking place (possibly on Pakistan and Uganda among others)
- Midterm OI evaluation of the Grow campaign (if available)

Other conditions influencing the available data:

- The number of currently available external project evaluations is limited.
- The Theory of Change around this theme was made more explicit recently, and builds on current Oxfam Novib policy on sustainable livelihoods.
- Indicators and judgement criteria for the evaluation of this theme need to be elaborated in the early stages of the evaluation.
- Annual reporting on the theme has been done per outcome indicator and not per theme.

---

\(^{13}\) Information from this evaluation will be used only when projects evaluations are of partners with projects on the theme in 2011 and 2012

\(^{14}\) MFS-II refers to the subsidy system of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Dutch Development Sector (for the 2011-2015 period)
Annex c: Theory of Change
## Annex 2 Timetable of the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting</td>
<td>Internal steering group</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{th} March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General analysis and approach paper development</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>21 March - 3 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>meeting with internal steering group</td>
<td>Internal steering group</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In-depth analysis phase</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} April - 15\textsuperscript{th} May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>meeting with internal steering group for preliminary findings discussion</td>
<td>Internal steering group</td>
<td>26\textsuperscript{th} April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Country visits to Uganda and Cambodia</td>
<td>Evaluation team and national consultants</td>
<td>Uganda: 20-28 May Cambodia 26\textsuperscript{th} May - 3\textsuperscript{rd} June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Draft report writing</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Submission of draft report to ON</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} of July, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Feedback received from ON and external evaluators</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{th} of July, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Final report writing</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>July - August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Submission of final report</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>9 August, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3 Approach paper

For thematic evaluation “Struggle for Land, Water and Food”

4 April 2013

Ben Haagsma & Verona Groverman

1. Introduction

This approach paper marks the start of the thematic evaluation Struggle for Land, Water and Food. It builds upon the evaluation proposal, but it also highlights the results of the first step of the desk study phase, the general analysis of all countries and regions relevant for this evaluation. Based on the findings of this general analysis it endeavors to refine the approach for the next steps in this thematic evaluation, the in-depth study of the high investment countries and the country visits.

2. General analysis results

The purpose of this first step was to get a good insight into the quality of the available reports and documents and to lay the foundation for the best approach for the in-depth study and possibly even the choice of the visited countries. It formed the exploratory step in the process and will help to focus our attention on the best way forward. In view of the great quantity of documents available it constituted a quick scan in order to assess the relevancy and quality of these documents. Three types of documents have been studied: 1) annual reports (country, regional and global), 2) evaluation reports and 3) the various thematic and programme management documents of ON.

Annual country reports have a great variety of quality in terms of presentation, but more importantly in terms of quality of content. The focus in these reports is on Outcome Indicators 1, 4, 10 and 16. It is fairly easy to collect information according to these outcome indicators, as these are generally well clustered and categorized in the reports. But the quality of the analysis or appreciation of these outcomes is fairly limited.

The analysis in these reports focuses mostly on the WHAT of the final outcome of all different intervention activities underlying these outcomes. The reports simply compare the realized outcome versus the planned outcome, but the level of explanation is restricted. The level and volume of information on the WHAT also varies greatly between countries and is often of anecdotal nature. Outcome descriptions are mostly limited to number of men and women, but hardly describe any further analysis or appreciation. The analysis certainly does not consider the HOW of the outcome process nor the assumptions used. There is no reference to the intermediate - smaller - outcomes or changes, leading to the final outcome, and hardly any reference to quality and quantity of outputs. In that sense these reports do not provide inputs for the Theory of Change as included in the ToR for this evaluation. Only in a few exceptional cases reference has been made to some of the critical issues as raised by us in our proposal: such as the TOT approach.

Annual report regional PAF and Global Link programme. The focus is on information on OI 7 and 13. These reports are rich in terms of qualitative information, but also confusing as they fail to make clear and crucial...
distinction between outputs and outcomes. As is the case with the annual reports it is as yet not possible to understand the underlying or implicit “theory of change” for these programmes. But more than the annual reports, these reports seem at the first sight to offer greater and richer sources of information.

What has so far not become clear from these reports - nor from the annual reports - is how the regional & global programmes link with the country programmes. What constitutes the synergy and complementarity of both categories of programmes? That will be the main focus of attention for the next phases. More specifically, attention will be focused on how the lobby results at national level are being built upon the combination of local level interventions (evidence based cases) and regional & global lobby pressures at the higher policy levels.

**Evaluation reports** are more difficult to read as they do not distinguish between the various outcome indicators and the themes. The quality of the reports is highly variable and limited in terms of analysis. They suffer of the same limitation as the annual reports: as they only focus on the WHAT and rarely on the HOW. Results are presented in an aggregated manner often without proper analysis what worked best and what worked less well. Analysis is qualitative at best and mostly without proper validation. Interestingly, even the ON office in Uganda was critical on the quality and added value of external evaluations! In a few number of cases a critical look has been made at the quality of farming inputs and content of training (Zimbabwe, DRC).

**Monitoring reports** present more or less the same picture as stated for the evaluation reports. Because of the aggregate level of outcomes, it is virtually impossible to draw useful conclusions with regard to the evaluation questions.

**Gender mainstreaming**: this topic remains poorly covered in these different reports. It has a standalone character and it is not making a direct connection with the theme. On the positive note, women and men are distinguished as two categories in the outcome results, but without further analysis and appreciation of the underlying changes for each group and the possible dynamics between them.

Basically, the same lack of information holds for the other 2 questions concerning the contribution of ON to the changes: 1) exchange of knowledge and information through learning, and 2) efficiency aspects of this theme.

**Theme boundaries are blurred and overlapping.** What comes out clearly from the different sources of information is that the distinction between theme 1 (LWF), 2 (fair markets) and 3 (climate change) is often blurred. The description of outcomes of theme 1 often link sustainable livelihoods and increased production levels with assured access to markets, mentioning issues with regard to income security, building farmers’ groups as interest groups for specific cash crops. This does not only happen in countries which are usually seen as post-conflict (Uganda, Rwanda) but also in countries still in conflict (DRC). So, markets do play a role in securing livelihoods for vulnerable people. Climate change is another example from Bangladesh, Vietnam, Myanmar, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Uganda where all information on Outcome Indicator 1 is as a matter of fact identical to OI 3. These linkages cannot be denied and they have a strong rationale:

- **Access to markets** - also local and regional - constitute a strong pre-condition for smallholders for investing their time and labor in improved livelihoods and better & higher production.

  Control over natural resources is not the only condition to improve livelihoods; investing in more sustained livelihood requires the proximity of a suitable market.

- **Climate change** could be seen as a context factor that simply creates an extra complicating setting for proper adaptation and necessary improvement of land use practices. In some countries the climate
change debate is stronger felt - coastal areas under threat as a result of imminent sea level rise in the Asian countries or related to disaster risk management (Myanmar, Afghanistan) - than in others, but the pressure on farmers is the same. They have to adapt their land use practices in order to become more climate change resilient; and they are able to do so given the right support and incentives. At the beginning of 2011 it was decided to merge this theme with theme 1 because of MFS budget cuts.

In this way the themes are overlapping.

Target group boundaries are blurred. The distinction to different rural worlds mentioned by the policy paper (preliminary study for this evaluation) and helpful to understand the different target group categories is not used and referred to in any of the studied documents. Though it may have played a role in project identification, it remains nevertheless invisible in the description of results. Admittedly, this also may have led to the blurring at thematic level, mentioned above.

Critical issues. In our evaluation proposal we already highlighted a number of critical issues for different outcome areas (OA). To some degree these critical issues also emerged in the different reports and documents.

- OA1: The role of markets as a determining factor for successful application of new technologies is often referred to.
- OA 1: The TOT approach as a method to achieve greater outreach of new information and skills. Claims are made that this has indeed worked in practice, but they are not substantiated in terms of people who really achieved better production levels (Burundi, Zimbabwe)
- OA 2: the own organizational capacity of farmers is not directly referred to, but the results described point at this direction. It needs further questioning.
- An extra critical issue is the rationale of group formation. One example, group formation for the sake of joint management of assets, such as joint livestock management and ownership. Or another example, group capacity building where the membership of the group is too diverse: the group formation serves better the efficiency of training than the future effectiveness of results! Countries referred to are Zimbabwe, Uganda
- OA 3 and 4: the information collected (PAF and Global Link reports) need further questioning and interviewing. An extra question that comes to the fore in this regard is why governments would be interesting to invest in really marginal areas? It is a longer existing debate with regard to making the choice between investing in high versus low potential areas.

The LWF inception note makes us aware of the budgetary division in the MFS II between the different intervention strategies. It becomes clear how ‘dominant’ the investment is in training, more than 50% of total budget. A better insight and understanding of the effectiveness of this investment is therefore of crucial importance. From the evaluation reports it becomes clear that we may have to look in a more differentiated manner to training as such. It may actually cover diverse expressions of capacity building, not just technical training but also a range of other interventions, such as farmer exposure and sharing events, together with other stakeholders, Farmer Field Schools and learning visits, farmer-to-farmer facilitation (Zimbabwe and Myanmar good cases).

Summarizing, the general analysis has not provided the necessary answers to the evaluation questions: to some limited extent to the effectiveness questions, less so for the contribution question and indirectly to the
relevance question. Nevertheless the thoughts and findings presented by the various reports do present useful entry points for discussion and necessary deepening of insights with the staff concerned. The following phases of this thematic evaluation are therefore of crucial importance to make further progress.

3. Implications for the next phase

In view of the limited quality and relevance of the information studied during the general analysis, it has become evident that further insights and understanding of the results so far can only be achieved by direct contacts with ON programme staff, and possibly, staff of partner organisations. Learning what works and why, and what does not work, and why not, can only be done by careful questioning of persons and stakeholders directly involved. This also links with the learning approach already described in our evaluation proposal. The quality and depth of learning is based on direct contacts with people concerned in order to surface more tacit and implicit knowledge. The further use of written or documented information has too many limitations.

As agreed this evaluation does not have the character of a scientific research or the depth of a final evaluation. For the learning purpose of this evaluation a lighter character of this evaluation is sufficient, as long as plausible and reasonably validated answers on the evaluation questions can be found. We believe that the direct contacts with staff concerned will provide us with these plausible and validated answers. The next two steps are therefore essential in order to gather more in-depth information 1) in the relatively high investment countries, and 2) concluding with additional data collection in two selected countries.

The evaluation approach and methodologies

The approach and methodology as described in our proposal are still valid and relevant. The first findings from the general analysis do not as yet lead to an adjustment. The learning methodology must still focus on the correct and proper understanding of both the WHAT as well as the HOW of the results. These two dimensions cannot be separated.

WHAT:
- Attention for the invisible and implicit results that have remained hidden or not dealt with in the written documents. Results for each outcome area will be made as explicit as reasonably possible, moving away from vague or general descriptions, using clear and characteristic examples instead. We will look for the results (=changes or outcomes) in all three categories of evaluation questions: effectiveness, contributions of ON and relevance.
- Attention for a qualitative assessment of quantitative changes of outcomes indicators so that a better appreciation can be made of the effectiveness.
- Attention for the underlying assumptions as crucial inputs for understanding the - more detailed - intermediate changes towards the intermediate outcomes for each outcome area.
- Attention for the first indications of impact on the level of sustainable livelihoods of the final beneficiaries even at this initial stage of implementation. These first impact indications are needed in order to validate the relevance of the TOC of ON.

HOW
- Theory of Change will be used as our key instrument and analysis framework for learning to start with during the in-depth phase. This instrument is especially powerful to capture the assumptions and turn implicit results into explicit results (= changes). The TOC does not only look at the content of the change (= what), but also at the actor (= who) of that change.
- **Most Significant Change** will be used in addition to TOC during the two country visits. Because of the limited available time we suggest an adapted or simplified version of MSC. During the startup workshop the different stakeholders will be asked to share their most significant stories, focusing on the five outcome areas of the theme. Next, the differences between the stories will be ‘investigated’ during the field visits. In order to stimulate learning between partners it is suggested to look at the feasibility to form small teams composed of a mix of one or two staff per partner organization, visiting each other programmes or projects. The evaluators, together with the national consultants will take care of proper preparation and facilitation of these teams.

- The quality of both TOC as well as MSC will increase if the evaluators focus on **double loop learning** - looking for the real reasons behind the changes - use the simple **5 why question format** during interviewing and learning sessions, and make a clear distinction between implementation or design errors in order to explain (lack of) results.

- Use of **contribution analysis** approach in order to arrive at a credible contribution story with regard to the contribution of ON to the changes observed in 1) Gender mainstreaming, 2) Learning and 3) Efficiency dimension (se TOR). For this type of learning oriented evaluation this approach is very well suited. The result of this approach may lead again to confirm or revise the TOC.

4. **In-depth phase**

In this in-depth phase the focus will be directed to the group of high investment countries. The emphasis of the evaluation will be on ON country staff as a direct source of information. For that purpose we will prepare clear ‘**performance or learning**’ questions, directly focusing on the evaluation questions with proper attention for the underlying processes. The formulation of these questions must be inspired by the TOC concept, trying to get information on the intermediate, smaller changes and the assumptions held. The quality of answers will be validated each time with the “why question format”, so that in the end a joint understanding of the change process exists.

Next, we will use the available documents of selected partners (a.o. counterpart descriptions) to provide answers to the questions, and possibly, direct contact with partners. In consultation with the ON country staff we will decide on how best to approach these partners and which extra documents and reports are available at partner level. We will use cases from our own reading of the various documents during the interviews with the staff in order to get their comments and stimulate their learning as much as possible.

During this phase we will also include the interviews with regard to the regional and global programme.

- **Need for optimal contact and communication**

For the in-depth phase the best way to contact the staff concerned is through skype sessions. In our proposal we already indicated that we will refrain from surveys to be sent out to staff and/or partners. For these skype sessions the evaluation approach and methodologies as explained in our proposal fit best. It is relatively easy for and preferred by staff to have direct contact with the evaluators. It is less time consuming and more rewarding. The purpose of these skype sessions and the key questions will be communicated beforehand to the ON staff concerned.

To start with we assume that they are informed by ON about this evaluation. That will be the introduction for our communication and skype sessions. We further assume that the key staff contacted and interviewed will have most information available, though not always on paper or documented. And finally, we assume that they are familiar with the underlying processes and are able to explain how outcomes were (not) achieved.
and why (not). We will avoid as much as possible an extra burden on them for data and information collection, but will try to get the necessary information during these skype sessions. If they would indicate that extra information on good cases or specific topics can be mobilized fairly easily and they are ready to make that extra step, we may organize more than one skype session.

We acknowledge that ON staff outside the country office might be a valuable source of information, based on their accumulated knowledge and experience with that specific country. We will contact them only after consultation with the ON country staff in order to assure the transparency of the evaluation process. If, however, after all these efforts information is simply lacking, it will be noted as such and taken as a recommendation for further action.

- All in-depth country offices to be involved in next phase!

It is observed that the process of decentralization and building up of the ON country offices varies between the different countries in the in-depth countries’ category. It is also observed that in some country offices longstanding staff with institutional memories is stationed. The quality of the annual reports may well be a reflection of the current status and quality of the decentralization process of the ON country offices. However, we feel that the quality of the reports is not a good indicator for the real results achieved in the field by the various partner organisations. For the purpose of this learning oriented evaluation we still strongly feel that all ON country offices must be contacted for the in-depth analysis regardless of a lesser quality.

- Possible involvement of partner organisations?

Attention: Only in exceptional cases - and only after introduction by the country office - will we approach selected partners ourselves, if this would provide better quality information. Any information gained though this channel will be shortly validated with country office staff.

- Sampling during the in-depth phase

The in-depth phase covers 12 so called ‘high investment’ countries, including the regional and global programmes. The criteria used for these countries were based on 1) finances, 2) regional spread and 3) relative importance for this evaluation. But also within these 12 countries it is impossible to study all implementing partners. Choices have to be made in order to further shortlist partners within these 12 countries. Sampling is therefore necessary. We wish to propose a rough sampling with the purpose to maximize or optimize the learning character of the evaluation. This sampling will foremost look at the potential contribution of these implementing partners to the learning process, either because they illustrate a particular failure or a success. The choices for potential partners will be made on basis of the documents we have studied, but preferably in consultation with ON country staff. We will try to avoid a particular bias in this partner selection.

We realize that a fully representative sample will hardly be possible in view of the time limitations. So a more qualitatively selection must be made. Looking at the two categories of remaining countries 1) in-depth and 2) most thorough, then it would be appropriate to select from the most thorough category a number of partners more or less in line with the total number of country partners: 25%. From the in-depth category the sample could be more modest, limiting itself to 1 organization per country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of countries</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Nº partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most thorough</td>
<td>Pakistan (15 partners)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the final choice of partner organisations we propose to look at the following criteria:

- Coverage of the different outcomes areas for the most thorough countries;
- The relative importance of the partner for a country programme; looking at bold partners in annex 4 of inception note that have particularly interesting work for the theme; we know that this table is incomplete, as a number of partners have been phased out;
- The type of partner organization: Producer’s organization, services providing NGOs, NGOs focusing on lobby, etc.; and the type of land users they are dealing with: farmers, pastoralists and fishermen. Might the classification as used in the MFS proposal (p. 22 of the copy given to us), distinguishing two dimensions - strength of civil society and stability of the state - still form an useful criterion?
- The initial insights from available documents, evaluation reports in particular;
- Additional learning questions raised by ON country staff in line with the evaluation questions in relation to specific partner organizations.

Country visits

For the in-depth country visits in phase 2 we envisage to have two workshops: one at the start and another at the end. The initial workshop will be as broad as necessary with ON country office staff, key partners, smallholder representatives and other important stakeholders in order to assess and discuss the quality of implementation, the emerging results, key weaknesses, etc. As stated above MSC will be one of the main tools applied. This will lead to key evaluation questions and key issues that will then be examined in the field. Thereafter a feedback workshop will take place with a restricted audience of ON staff and key partners.

So apart from the two previous data collection methods - desk review and skype sessions - additional primary data collection will take place during these two country visits. Each consultant will visit one country, prepared and accompanied by a national consultant.

- Choice of countries

For Africa the choice appears to be evident: Uganda. There is a high number of bold partner organisations, covering the technical and lobby oriented outcome areas.

For Asia - after joint consultation with the internal steering group - the list of suggested countries now consists of Bangladesh, Myanmar and Cambodia. All factors, ranging from thematic, organizational,
operational, financial, and all other criteria linked to partner selection see above, have been discussed. The final decision will be made by ON.

- **Role division**

Thus far the role division between the two main evaluators has been clear: each one focusing on one continent: Africa and Asia. Intensive contacts between the two evaluators took place. In this next in-depth phase the inputs and contribution from the lobby specialist will be looked for. At the same time the identification of the national consultants will be explored, even though the final choice for the countries visited has not been made.

**Data analysis and report writing**

After all rounds of data collection completed, data analysis and report writing will start. It is noted here that a good and essential part of data analysis has already taken place during the two previous stages: the in-depth stage and in particular the country visits. For the final report this data analysis refers to the highest level of data analysis comparing all different data analysis inputs, putting them together and drawing conclusions and formulating recommendations. At the early stage of report writing, the initial findings will be submitted to the ON country staff, (A)CD and programme staff, in order to get their feedbacks and, if needed, their inputs for clarification will be sought for.

During the next stage of report writing the feedback at ON HQ, including the steering group, will be obtained.
Annex 4 Documents reviewed by evaluators

Myanmar

KESAN
- KESAN. 19/11/2010. Counterpart and Project Description
- KESAN. Not dated. KESAN PROGRESS REPORT 2011. Building Self-Sufficient and Disaster Resilient Rural Karen Communities
- KESAN. April 2013. KESAN PROGRESS REPORT 2012. Building Self-Sufficient and Disaster Resilient Rural Karen Communities

METTA
- Oxfam Novib. 28/02/2013. Opportunity and risk appraisal Metta Development Foundation
- Metta Development Foundation. Regeneration Initiative April 2012 - September 2012

Bangladesh

HKI

GUK

Cambodia

PADEK
- Counterpart and Project Description PADEK Strategic Plan 2013-2016. Final, 06/11/2012. Partnership for Development in Kampuchea (PADEK)

Mlup Baitong
- Mlup Baitong. 2011 NARRATIVE REPORT TO OXFAM NOVIB: 01-January to 31 December 2011
- Mlup Baitong (MB). 30/11/2012. Counterpart and Project Description

DPA
- DPA. Partnership and Development Education and Advocacy Programmes. Annual report 2011

BCV
- Diokno, Maia. August 2012. EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED BY BUILDING COMMUNITY VOICES (BCV) 2010-2012
Pakistan
SCOPE
- SCOPE Annual report 2009-2010 (correct year?)
- http://www.doaba.org.pk/

SUNGI

Somalia
Candlelight
- CLHE. Opportunity and Risk appraisal, April 2012. ON
- CLHE. Counterpart and project description. April 2012, ON
- CLHE. Opportunity and Risk appraisal, September 2008. ON
- CLHE. Counterpart and project description. September 2008, ON
- REGLAP newsletter; disaster risk reduction in the drylands of the Horn of Africa. Edition 3, December 2012,

Sudan
SECS
- SECS. Opportunity and Risk appraisal. November 2012
- SECS. Counterpart and project description. November 2012
- SECS. Community Environmental Governance Initiative (CEGI). 6 months report ( January-June 2012)

Zimbabwe
FACHIG
- FACHIG. ON narrative report. Jan-June 2012
- FACHIG. Final narrative report on EU funded project: Sustainable Agriculture contributing to enhanced livelihoods among FACHIG members in HIV/AIDS affected farming systems in Zimbabwe. 2007-2011
- FACHIG. Opportunity and Risk appraisal. June 2012

Nigeria
NANTS
- NANTS. Project Progress report Nigeria plan 2010-2012. 2011
- NANTS. Opportunity and Risk appraisal. June 2010
- NANTS. Counterpart and project description. June 2010
- Aderemi Medupin and Godswill Aguiyi. Evaluation of Agric Intervention Project 2010-2012; published by NANTS
- NANTS. A case study on women VC. NANTS take action in Ruwanwayo in Nasarawa state of Nigeria. February 2013.
- Nants 3rd Quarter Report On Weman Project, 2012

Niger
Mooriben
- Mooriben. APPRÉCIATION des OPPORTUNITÉS ET DES Risques. Projet promotion des filières agricoles de Mooriben. Feb 2013
- Mooriben. Description du partenaire et du projet, 2013

Mozambique
ORAM
- Intake ORAM ZAMBEZIA, Nov 2011
- ORAM. Apresentacao da avaliação de oportunidades e risco. March 2009
- ORAM. Descrição da contraparte e do projecto. Dec 2011
- ORAM. Relatorio annual de actividades 2012
- ORAM. Relatório de Avaliação do Plano Estratégico 2006 - 2011

Uganda
ACORD
- ACORD. Opportunity and risk appraisal. June 2009
- ACORD. Counterpart and project description. June 2009
- ACORD. Annual Report 2011
- ACORD. Annual Report 2010

EA
- EA. Counterpart and project description. Jan 2009
- EA. Opportunity and risk appraisal. Feb 2008
- EA. Annual report 2011
- EA. Annual report 2010

PELUM
- PELUM. Opportunity and risk appraisal, Jan 2010
- PELUM. Annual report PELUM Uganda. 2012
- PELUM. Annual report PELUM Uganda. 2011
- PELUM. Counterpart and project description. Dec 2009
SACU
- SACU. Annual report 2012 Rebuilding Communities in war torn Northern Uganda 2011
- SACU. Annual report 2011 Rebuilding Communities in war torn Northern Uganda 2011
- SACU. Opportunity and risk appraisal . Nov 2010
- SACU. Counterpart and project description. Nov 2011

SEATINI
  - SEATINI Opportunity and risk appraisal. Jan 2010
  - SEATINI Counterpart and project description. Jan 2010
  - SEATINI Annual narrative report 2011
  - SEATINI Annual narrative report 2010

VEDCO
- VEDCO Counterpart and project description. Jan 2010
- VEDCO. Opportunity and risk appraisal. Feb 2010
- VEDCO annual report 2010. Equitable and sustainable wealth creation among farmers in Uganda
- VEDCO annual report 2011. Equitable and sustainable wealth creation among farmers in Uganda

Other documents consulted
- KIT, Faida MaLi and IIRR. Chain Empowerment, supporting African Farmers to develop markets, 2006. Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam; Faida Market :Link, Arusha, and International Institute of Rural Reconstruction.
Annex 5 Overview of countries and partners involved in the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of evaluation</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Burundi, Rwanda, DRC, South Sudan, Vietnam and Laos</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>SCOPE, Sungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>KESAN, METTA, KBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>HKI, GUK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>SECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>FACHIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>NANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Mooriben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Candlelight (CL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>ORAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country visits</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>ACORD, VEDCO, SEATINI, PELUM, SACU, EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>PADEK, Mlup Baitong, DPA, NGO Forum, BCV, ADHOC, CLEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation:** the study included the RESOLVE programme in which GUK and other ON partners are involved
Annex 6 Performance questions for Skype interviews

1. **EFFECTIVENESS - QUALITY OF TRAINING FOR 1) SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION METHODS AND 2) CAPACITY BUILDING AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.**

**Note:** quality of training refers to 1) set up/ design; 2) implementation; and 3) application or use of training. One could argue that this last aspect can be read as a proxy indicator for quality of training; likewise, the use of indigenous knowledge into the training content is another quality indicator.

**Key objective:** Trying to cover aspects of differentiation of target groups, farming systems and context; level of adaptation of training courses to these aspects; sustained character of production improvement; efficiency versus effectiveness.

**Target group** for interviews: 1) ON country office staff and 2) selected partner organisations

The questions are intended to be **open questions**, inviting persons to tell what they know about these questions. Wherever needed we will ask questions for further clarification. **Whilst formulating their answers, the persons interviewed may already give answers to other questions in this list.** So, the sequence of this questions is not prescriptive and rigid, but depends on the course each interview takes. It rather serves as a source of inspiration for harvesting as much as possible relevant information.

**Observations for all questions:**

- We will constantly check with the interviewee whether other persons are better sources of information. Or whether we should be directly or possibly be referred to the staff of selected partners
- We have to see whether this list can be answered by skype (one or two sessions) during the in-depth phase. We will learn as we start applying it with the first interviews
- For the two country visits this list can be seen as a good basis for information collection.
- Check question 1b with regard to precise meaning of group building and other means for sustainable livelihoods

**a), b) and c) Training courses**

1. Which were the **main** training topics - production methods, capacity building - implemented/organized in the period 2011-2012? What were the main aims: change in Knowledge, Skills and/or Attitude? Why were these topics chosen? What was the form of ‘training’: classroom teaching, field visits, farmer-to-farmer exchange, Farmer Field Schools, etc? Who provided this training?

2. Who were the producers as **participants**? Reference to gender, categories of farmers, specific farming system (or natural environment), and/or other criteria? Why were these participants included? Which were the organizations as participants? Reference to producer (interest) groups, lobby organizations, CBOs, etc. Why were these organizations and the specific staff included?

3. How were participants - producers and organisations - for these training courses selected; **selection criteria**? Attention for self-selection mechanisms. Were there any barriers to different categories of
people and organisations to participate that the project had anticipated overcoming - and how did it work out in practice?

4. Was the content based on a needs assessment among potential participants and organisations? How did this happen? Any attention for existing indigenous knowledge of producers and organisations? To what extent was the content of training adapted to these different categories of participants? Please explain how, specific example.

5. What was the number of participants trained - directly or indirectly through TOT approach - and how much did this training cost? (Efficiency dimension); why did you choose this number of participants? What was the number of organizations and number & levels of participating staff per organisation trained and how much did this training cost? Why did you choose this number of organisations and number of staff per organisation?

6. What can you share with us on the way the knowledge or skills was applied by the participants? If expected, was a difference in attitude/ behavior noticed? What happened as a first step? Could any difference in terms of outcomes between types of training be observed - if yes, in what way, which was more effective and why? Is information available on who - reference to different categories of producers - applied this knowledge/skills or showed a different attitude on their fields?

**Remark:** at this point we may touch aspects of applicability in terms of extra costs participants may have to make by buying inputs, tools, equipment which may negatively or positively affect the cost-affordability of the new information and skills; see also next point 7

What can you share with us on the changes in the performance of the organizations due to the training (related to the aims of the training). What happened as a first step? Is information available on how the organizations - reference to different types of organizations - applied their learning?

7. If they - producers and their organisations - applied this, which were factors of success? If they did not apply this, which factors were obstacles? Possible reference to political context: fragile/ failed states; risk of disasters. Were you surprised by this 'failure'? How do you explain this lack of success? Which assumptions may have been wrong by hindsight? What do you suggest should be done differently next time?

**Remark:** At this point we may come with our own critical examples or cases which we got from different reports: poor technical quality of training, bad quality of inputs provided next to training, absence of markets, too high labor requirements for application, lack of differentiation of target groups, too high abstraction level, internal organizational conflicts or weaknesses, etc

8. After starting applying this on their fields how did this affect the production levels of their produce? Do you have specific examples? Look at different types of land uses: farming, livestock and fishing. How did this affect the relation with the (different categories of) farmers, pastoralists, fisher men, men/ women? Do you have specific examples? Explain story of (the lack of) this success!

How did producer organisations finally improve their performance? How did this improve their reputation as seen by other stakeholders? What happened as a result of this improved reputation?

9. Do you have information about the sustained character of this new knowledge/skills and higher yields? Does this sustained improvement apply for all different categories of persons or only some of
them: men/ women!)? Similarly, for organisations and possible differentiation among them. How do you know this? Reference: this must somehow refer to M&E over a series of seasons!

10. Any information available whether the positive effects have been multiplied among more farmers, either directly via TOT type of training, or indirectly via copying effects. Also check whether government staff and/or private sector have ‘taken over’ training! Similarly, have positive effects been multiplied among more, other organizations – if yes, how did this happen?

11. Check on the linkage between PAF and country / selected partner, where applicable. How would both actors describe the added value of PAF in terms of quality and quantity of results at partner level? How has the content of the PAF been identified and planned? What has been the role of the partner organisations? What was level or content of collaboration: planning, implementation, M&E and learning, etc?

d) Cost efficiency of training

1. With regard to the selected partners can you provide us with information on the costs of training vis-à-vis the number of persons trained? Did you have any discussion with the partners with regard to this issue? Which were the questions and/or concerns you discussed with them? Why or How did these questions and/or concerns emerge?

2. Have you notice differences between cost efficiency and different partners? How do explain these variations?

3. How has cost-efficiency of training played a role in funding decisions? Which were your specific criteria to arrive at your decision?

4. How did you try to reduce the cost efficiency of training? What was successful and why? Why not?

e) Outcomes achieved as result of lobby by Oxfam Novib and partners

See further annex 8 for the detailed questions!

2. TO WHAT EXTENT HAS ON CONTRIBUTED TO THE CHANGES?

a) Gender mainstreaming (GM)

In the first place these questions are meant for the ON country staff. But staff of the selected partner can be interviewed too, if and when needed. Evaluation reports are also a source of information.

Main question is: How ON has assured gender mainstreaming: in the various stages of project [related to sustainable livelihood/ theme Struggle for LWF] identification & formulation, implementation and M&E. Has GM contributed to better reaching the intermediate outcomes concerning thematic issues .

1. Which ‘gender mainstreaming’ support to livelihood related programmes has been provided by ON to the partners? Why was this support needed? On whose request was this support provided? Has ON made an adequate assessment of the results of the previous interventions in this topic? How did this support acknowledge specificities of culture, context, current situation? How did this support fit into the different programmes these partners implement? Please, explain.

2. Who provided the support? What was the quality, duration, timeliness, process of the gender mainstreaming?
3. What was the number of and level & function of the staff members of the partners targeted with this support? Reference to specific staff within partners that may have been appointed or recruited; or to all programme staff.

4. What have you seen changing and improving in the understanding of GM in livelihood programmes of the partners? What difference did it make in their programmes? What happened as a first step? Can you provide specific examples? Reference to concrete changes in design/implementation/ME.

5. If the staff trained applied this GM knowledge well, what were the factors of success? If they did not apply this, which factors were obstacles? Possible reference to internal partner organisation constraints, several forms of lack of commitment; or external factors. Were you surprised by this ‘failure’? How do you explain this lack of success? Which assumptions may have been wrong by hindsight? What do you suggest should be done differently next time?

6. Present possible own critical examples or cases. Or ask the following question: looking at your key livelihood activity, have you ever seen a difference in applying knowledge between men and women? If so, how did you explain this? Reference to absence of gender differentiated analysis in reports: did you indeed never assess such gender differences? Why not? Please, explain.

7. In your view, how did this GM mainstreaming possibly contribute to the final success or outcome of the programme? What difference did this make in the quality and relevance?

8. Do you have any suggestion how this GM could be done better or differently?

b) Exchange of knowledge

These questions will be relevant for both ON country staff and selected partners; both can be participants to learning events and activities [related to sustainable livelihood/ theme Struggle for LWF]. So questions have to be slightly adapted depending on who will be interviewed.

1. Which activities (events, seminars, learning visits, webinars, learning communities, etc.) has ON (specify the ON level: global, country) facilitated for exchange of knowledge and information in the period 2011-2012? Describe format, length, place, etc.

2. What was the content of these activities? How and by whom was the content decided upon? How relevant was this topic for the partners or for your programme? Please, explain.

3. Who were invited in these events? How many ON staff, persons, organisations attended? Degree of diversity of participants and organisations? Local, national or regional level

4. How did you (ON staff or partner) contribute to these events? Resources, presentation of cases, etc.

5. Did you (ON staff or partner) ever decide not to attend such an event? Why?

6. How did/do you (ON staff or partner) appreciate this exchange of knowledge and information? How do you describe the added value for your thematic programme, partners or your own programme (as a partner)? How did this exchange contribute to your programme design/implementation/ME? What did you do differently thereafter as before?

7. What are reasons for (lack of) success?

c) Development and implementation of the theme: Efficiency and sustainability
The information concerning this topic will be mainly collected from ON country staff, inviting them to reflect on the quality of this theme based on their experiences with the selected partners. For those in-depth countries, where more than one partner will be selected and especially for the countries that will be visited, this reflection may gain more quality. We would aim to arrive at a fair assessment to what extent the current (mix of) partners are indeed able to make a difference with regard to this theme, possibly per country.

Suggested questions or topics we are looking for to get feedback on, are

1. **General**: How you feel about this theme? How do you monitor and evaluate progress of this theme? How can it further be developed in the near future? How do you feel about the linkage between land, water and food? Is this linkage clear and strong enough? Any suggestion how this linkage can be improved? In which way could partners be best involved to develop this theme? Have you observed that partners developed this theme themselves? How did they do this?

2. **Choice of target group**. For which target group is this theme relevant? Why? For which target groups is this theme not or less relevant? Why? Here reference can be made to categories: hanging in, stepping up and stepping out. How does staff reflect on these categories?

3. **Choice of current partner network**. Elements to look at are: the quality of their problem analysis with regard to this theme; the specific focus of partners on this theme; their track record; the organizational strength (or sustainability) of partners; right mix of partners: combination of implementation and lobby & advocacy.

4. The **content** of the theme: balance between the 5 different outcome areas; also in budget terms; this is part of the previous question. We need to take care that ON staff is fully informed on the meaning of the TOC and the 5 outcome areas; check with the TOR.

5. Content, intensity and quality of **communication** on the theme between ON (HQ/ The Hague and country) and partners: is it sufficient, timely, consistent? This aspect also relates with the previous evaluation question on learning. It also relates to the quality of the feedback mechanisms between the different ON levels and partners with regard to evaluations above partner level.

6. **Theme ownership** by the partners. Do partners take own initiatives to carry the theme or certain aspects of the theme forward in their own area of intervention, independent of ON support or ‘pressure’? How have they done this? Would they be interested in developing a programme addressing the inter-related key issues of the theme?

7. How does ON support the **sustainability** of this theme, looking at development and **implementation**? What are the prospects of the theme considering partner-related factors, such as the quality of partner network; their capacity to describe, report and be accountable for results; their linkages with other external (beyond ON) thematic networks, with other but similar thematic programmes, with relevant government departments, with research or innovation centers; the level of donor diversification and financial sustainability, so that they can continue with the theme for a longer period?
Annex 7 List of people interviewed

Apart from the internal Steering group: Kirsten Tinnemans, Maarten de Vuyst, Paul van Wijk and Gine Zwart the following persons were interviewed during the in-depth evaluation phase:

- Gertjan van Bruchem
- Marjolijn Verhoog
- Clarita Benzon
- Nienke Smidtman
- Asuntha Charles
- Ifitkhar Ahmad Khalid
- Thur de Kuijer (Uganda)
- Jan Vossen and Marina van Dixhoorn (Sudan)
- Jos van der Zanden Zimbabwe
- Monique van Es PAF
- Rakiatou Gazibo Niger
- Richard Mulandi Somalia
- Austin Terngu and Noura Nigeria
- Helder Paolo Mozambique

During the country visit phase the national consultants - In Uganda Joseph Ssuuna and in Cambodia Chanthy Sam - interviewed the following persons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uganda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEDCO</td>
<td>Mrs Agnes Kirabo</td>
<td>Advocacy officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Christine Kaaya</td>
<td>programme Administration officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACORD</td>
<td>Mrs Dinnah Nabwire</td>
<td>project officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Mugisha</td>
<td>Advocacy officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Stella Lutalo</td>
<td>Country coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEATINI</td>
<td>Mrs Bridget Mugambe</td>
<td>Programme officer Trade &amp; ESC Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Jane Nalunga</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Mr. Mwebe John</td>
<td>Advocacy officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambodia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEC</td>
<td>Mr. Yeng Virak</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCV</td>
<td>Mrs Pry Phally Phoung</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Ran Sopheak Pagna</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Chea Sopheak</td>
<td>Community Mobilization Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOC</td>
<td>Mr. In Kea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Chan Soveth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 8 Performance questions for lobby interviews by national consultants

For interviews of ON country office staff and/or counterpart organizations.

e) Outcomes achieved as result of lobby by Oxfam Novib and partners

Current situation
1. What do you do regarding lobby [in the field of sustainable livelihoods/ land, water, food]? What is your objective and who do you target? With whom do you work together on lobby? What is the value added of working together?

Outcomes – related to sustainable livelihood/ the theme land, water, food
2. What were the main outcomes you have achieved during 2011 - 2012 at policy level (e.g. changes in laws, in policies, in the implementation of policies, in budget allocation for policy areas, etc.)? Can you differentiate between local and national level?
3. Do the outcomes achieved contribute to better livelihoods for (women) small holders producers? Can you explain why and how (process)?
4. What were the main outcomes at CSO level (e.g. regarding enhanced collaboration on lobby, joint monitoring of government policies, enhanced capacity on lobby, contacts created with decision makers, capacity to propose realistic policy alternatives)?

Ways of working
5. What was the intervention logic of the lobby? How does this connect to the current political agenda (priorities at political level)?
6. How have you identified the lobby issues you are working on? Did you undertake a context analyses? Did you realise a stakeholder and power analyses?
7. In what ways did you involve Oxfam partners and other stakeholders (e.g. other CSOs working on the same lobby topic, other relevant lobby groups, relevant decision makers) in the strategy development process?
8. Do you consider your organisation to be a legitimate, credible organisation regarding this lobby topic? How is your lobby linked to your work in the field? To what extent do you realise evidence-based lobby?

Factors of influence
9. What factors have been of influence on the level of success of your lobby (e.g. available capacity and knowledge on lobby, availability of funds to implement lobby activities, level of coordination, timing (pro-active or re-active) of the lobby activities, link with local and national lobby initiatives, level of monitoring and adjustment of the lobby strategy)?

Degree of continuity
10. Will you / your organisation continue implementing the lobby process?

Assessment by local consultants
11. What is the opinion of decision makers you targeted about the lobby activities you carried out?
12. What is the opinion of the media of the lobby activities carried out by you / your partners?
13. What is the opinion of other CSOs of the lobby activities carried out by you / your partners?
Annex 9 Five Discussion questions for country initial workshop

1. Five main concrete improvements in the living situation of small-scale producers related to land, water and/or food issues.
   - Try to be as specific as possible, such as stable high yield; food secure during 10 months; sufficient income to cover education and health expenses; access to irrigation water; control over land through land titles; etc. etc.
   - Indicate clearly which small-scale producers you talk about: men, women; landless/landowners/tenants; ethnic groups; certain socio-economic strata and/or marginal farmers, etc.

2. What specific activities (related to lobby or capacity building) have contributed to the improvements.

3. The extent of which the small-scale producers can now cope with changing circumstances (sustainability issue). Please give a clear example to illustrate your point. Also here, indicate clearly to which small-scale producers this applies (perhaps not to all!): men, women; landless/landowners/tenants; ethnic groups; certain socio-economic strata and/or marginal farmers, etc.

4. What 5 main factors have contributed to these improvements. This could be internal factors (re: your organization, programme) or external, contextual factors.

5. What 3 main factors have frustrated the process of change. To what extent were you able to influence these factors or to anticipate?
Annex 10 The MSC question for community visits

1. Looking back over the last two years what do you think was the most significant change in your living situation related to land, water and/or food?

2. This change you mention - do you mean it is a change for yourself or for your household or for the whole community?

3. The changes that you mentioned were (all) improvements to your situation. Is that correct? Are there also negative changes related to land, water and food that occurred? Do you mean negative changes for yourself, your household and/or the community?

4. We like to talk about a change that is most significant to all of you - which change can we select? Now let’s talk about this improvement - which groups in your community have also improved their living situation in this way?

5. Do or did certain groups of community members face specific obstacles which made it difficult to make progress? Please give a few examples.

6. Can you explain what factors have made the improvement to your living situation happen?

7. Has the improvement in your living situation be the result of any training that you received? If no, skip the question.
   If yes, can you tell us about the training: what did you learn, who provided the training, how did you apply the learning, with whom did you work together, what happened after you applied the learning? How important was it to cooperate with other community members - why?

8. Is the improvement in your living situation due to better access to resources, for instance land or other inputs (perhaps this is already mentioned so adjust the question accordingly)? If no, skip the question.
   If yes, can you tell us more about it: what resource is it about, how did you get more access, who supported you, what did you do yourself, what did you do when you got access to the resource, how did it help your family? How important was it to cooperate with other community members - why?

9. We talked about your present living situation compared to the situation two years back. Now we like you to look at the future. Do you feel that this improved living situation will persist the coming two years? Why? Are there any issues you are concerned about that may negatively affect your living situation? Do you expect that it will affect you and/or your household and/or the community at large?

10. You have told us many things. Thanks so much for this. Is there anything that you still like to add?

Thanks again for your time and contribution.
## Annex 11 Report of the FGD Uganda, Cambodia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>M or F</th>
<th>Organization A - Palaro sub county</th>
<th>Organization B - Gum Peloke</th>
<th>Organization C - Itiriklia</th>
<th>Organization D - Metu, Patabo village</th>
<th>Organization E - Gwere Luzira village; Amamaa farmers group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q 1:</strong> What was the most significant change related to land, water, food?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Increased access to land</td>
<td>Three meals per day, balanced diet, enough food in home, effective cultivation in groups</td>
<td>Increased food production, from one meal a day to two meals, honey harvesting and collection, farm surplus marketed, incomes acquired, land titles acquired, saving culture, new crops, like pineapple, reduced soil erosion, reduced domestic violence because of enough food</td>
<td>Increased food availability</td>
<td>Increased food availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Better crop cultivation practices, higher crop production, reduced land conflicts, crops for food and some for selling, own market decision and not by buyer</td>
<td>Enough food for families, livestock and milk available, grow own vegetables instead of buying it</td>
<td>Food reserves 6-10 months, reduced domestic violence because of enough food</td>
<td>Improved soil management, erosion control on slopes, drainage on flat land, mulching, line growing makes crop management easy, improved nutrition, more meals per day, women have own plots, planting in time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q 2:</strong> What change for who?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Question Skipped</td>
<td>All changes are community based</td>
<td>All changes are for individuals and households; not each person is a member of a group, so they have not benefitted</td>
<td>Changes moved from individual to group members and partially to community</td>
<td>At household level mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Question Skipped</td>
<td>Changes are for group and other community members are copying it</td>
<td>Question Skipped</td>
<td>At all levels</td>
<td>Group members pass knowledge to other community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. 3 were there (unintended) negative changes? for yourself, household or village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>Poorly answered, wrong interpretation</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>Land acquisition by bribery On-going cases of land wrangling</th>
<th>Emerging land conflicts, as land value has raised due to increased production. Family conflicts due to confusion on sharing principle within group Jealousy to farmers who are selected for pilots whereas benefits come slow</th>
<th>NAADS sub-county only attends to selected farmers Transport of increased production Youth dislike farming, but rely on bodaboda and petty crime Men leave land opening to women</th>
<th>Land grabbing as a result of increased value, since 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poorly answered, wrong interpretation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Conflict arose because of lack of transparency on livestock distribution would they all get it? Some cows died</td>
<td>Community from Amuru district came to grab their land Invasion by wild animals and destroying their crops Resettlement led to difficult transition: lack of commitment to men to work in farming. Drinking instead, especially Youngsters</td>
<td>Community members evicted from land claimed by National Forest Authority, which they cultivated already for 30 years Water source suddenly dried up, forcing women to spend time</td>
<td>Eviction of community from farm land by NFA Jealousy of men on our success in groups and time we spent there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 4 which change was most significant? Which groups benefitted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>Enough food in hh Everybody was trained and so are enjoying enough food!</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>Improved access to and control over land</th>
<th>Increased food production (2 -&gt; 6 acres Increased hh incomes: school fees and savings (500,000 Sh) Some farmers and groups are benefitting from more than one partner</th>
<th>Three meals a day Changes have been beneficial for the poor: widows and the women</th>
<th>Increased food, Everybody has benefitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Improved agric production Vulnerable persons, orphans, CHH helped by group to get enough food</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poorly answered: WASH improvement Economic empowerment such that members rely on group savings instead of going to credit facilities or banks!</td>
<td>Widows have improved living conditions most, followed by FHH who have taken FAAB (selling to Sudan)</td>
<td>Increased food Women, widows and elderly improved their situation</td>
<td>Increased production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 5: which specific obstacles encountered?

<p>| Question | MO | Groups also supported vulnerable members: widows, orphans, H/A | MO | Question Skipped | Not all members are active, hence obstructs progress of group Uganda Wildlife Authority chases farmers from land after | High consumption of alcohol, using bad language, Lazy group members | Elderly lack energy to cultivate Youth do not want to participate in farming, crops take a minimum of 3 months to mature |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Contributing Factors to Improved Livelihoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 6</td>
<td>Different stakeholders played their roles well Community cohesion and unity Working in groups Good Leadership of sub-county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support by SACU Commitment of group to put training in practice Peace Extension services of govt. Training on diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills enhancement training Farm inputs provided by extension staff Group organisation Resettlement to ancestral homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on soil management, crop practices, group dynamics, PHH Joining the group and sharing ideas and knowledge More security leading to farming in more places possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulation of groups, problem solving easier, sharing knowledge, mobilizing collective labor Support from other partners Regular group meetings to make plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
<td>Growing different crops (fertility) Seed selection skills Mon crop stands instead of mix crop stands Early cultivation and planting Tree planting, fruit trees Better drought adapted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on land rights Gender training: increased access and control over assets Training on bulk marketing, post harvest handling, value addition Training extended to other community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on land preparation and SWC, basic agronomic practices Spacing at planting Beekeeping, hive construction PHH, drying Weed and pest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on growing cassava, groundnut with proper spacing Group dynamics and leadership Training provided by VEDCO, NAADS, WFP, EA, ACORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training in Agro-forestry, SWC, row planting and spacing, animal management, intercropping, manure production Joint working with community members to apply skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8 access to resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Question Skipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q 9 view on sustainability in two years time possible?**

<p>| M | Farmers intend to grow more crops If war comes back or climate changes Developing Other IGA, transport Trees seen as important for sustaining incomes and production Even without NGO they continue to grow crops | More organic farming Plans to start value addition and packing maize flour Processing orange flesh potatoes More bulk marketing Possible concerns about: - Market info - Lack of electricity to | Farmers will protect their assets and farm inputs provided by them Need for additional training for more knowledge Stronger group Adopt new technologies introduced. Possible concerns about: | We can manage production as VEDCO laid foundation of group We can invest some money in farming We can hire tractors | Group will persist as skills will continued to be used, seed security improved varieties secured |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>for markets; even though they have not yet secured markets</th>
<th>Networking for market prices sharing</th>
<th>operate machines - Lack of transparency by group leaders and members - Lack of knowledge to handle big finance</th>
<th>UWA will extend their claims - Conflicts with border districts over land in forest zone</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Open bigger acreages by their assets (oxen and ploughs) Plans for other IGAs to assure education for children New stimulus to develop differently to avoid poverty as it was before Livestock keeping and multiplication for food and income</td>
<td>There is nothing that can prevent them to achieve their dream of marketing association with truck, store, grinding mill, permanent houses They train young ones to take over!! Concerns: rebels come back and if group breaks up</td>
<td>They will continue because - Availability of modern and indigenous seeds - Marketing capacity of groups, bulking produce - Land availability to be opened up Concerns: land claims of other communities, Kony not yet captured</td>
<td>Improved living situation will persist based on sufficient training received, seed availability, village savings will continue access to loans Concerns possible lack of improved seeds (ISSD is out)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10 extra info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grind mill should be completed</td>
<td>VEDCO should support groups in diversification within farming so that climate change less felt: small animal component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results of the focus group discussions in the visited communities in Cambodia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading question</th>
<th>Organization/ Date</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To all group participants: Looking back over the last two years what do you think was the most significant change in your living situation related to land, water and/or food? | Organization X Prash Sophea village 29 May 2013 (morning) | Men: The men listed changes over the past 2 -3 years that are significant to them in positive sense, which apply to many members of their community. These changes resulted in improvement of the livelihood which is tangible in the higher numbers of motorbikes, cars, big houses, and tractors.  
  - There is more productive forest. But they added that it is difficult to protect the forest from forest fires.  
  - The biodiversity is increasing: wild animals in the community forest have increased.  
  - Members of the Forestry Community extract forest resources such as non-timber forest products for domestic use.  

   The change mentioned by all women is increased food for the family due to higher rice yields. They further added the income from their small-scale cashew plantations. |
| 2. This change you mention - do you mean it is a change for yourself or for your household or for the whole community? | Organization X Preah Sophea Village 29 May 2013 (afternoon) | The men listed the following significant changes in their livelihood related to land, water and food issues over the past 2 - 3 years:  
  - Some families have been able to buy tractors and motorbikes.  
  - Also, some families have constructed bigger/new houses from income gained through animal raising (roaming around in the forest) and cashew nut plantation. The women said that the cashew nut production is better than previous years due to the trainings from NGOs.  
  - There are more interventions from NGOs – awaking and supporting the local villagers for positive change through vegetable growing and trainings.  
  - Forest resources can be extracted from the forestry community i.e. NTFPs.  
  - Villagers work on the farms or in the vegetable gardens, but the yield is not very high. The women said that there are more vegetables gardens.  
  - The livelihood has improved not due to increase in agricultural production but due to outside labour migration.  
  - Food is available almost throughout the year.  
  - Poultry raising is not very profitable because the chicken are easily affected by diseases.  
  - More children are going to school.  
  - The women added that there are more NGOs providing drinking water filters. All these changes can be found among almost everyone in the community. Poor households are the most vulnerable in the community since they have health problems, sell their land and seek labour elsewhere and their knowledge and skills are still low and poor. Additionally, widows are vulnerable because they do not have labour to help them on the farms. |

Organization Y - Don Peng commune, Angkor Chum district 30 | Men plus women: The first change was that due to improved farming techniques, in particular SRI (System of Rice Intensification), through which their yield increased 2,5 times (2,5 ton/ ha). They use it for consumption, keep seed for next season and sell the surplus. Middlemen buy the rice at the gate against a good price. Over the years they diversified their activities which... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Y - PongRor village, Angkor Chhum District, 30 May 2013 (afternoon)</th>
<th>According to the women and men various important changes had taken place over the past 2 - 3 years. They grow vegetables for sale at the local markets, a profitable vegetable is water melon which they sell in the dry season (2 harvests, 2,500,000 Riel - 4,000,000 Riel)). They also mentioned rice farming and animal (pig) raising as areas of change. These changes took place in each household and the community as a whole. It resulted in increased food availability and higher income. The men added that there is a saving group through which the villagers can borrow money for growing vegetables, animal raising, and rice farming. They also mentioned transportation means (almost twice as much motorbikes). There are larger houses as well. The (female) deputy commune leader added a few more changes taking place in the community: more children are sent to school, people drink more bottled water instead of water from the rice fields, more people are engaged in small businesses and, moreover, she felt that the gender relations have improved: men and women work more together than before. These changes have happened for the whole community because there is a wider training and dissemination about the skill and knowledge through the efforts of the NGOs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organization Z - Boeung Porpol Village, 31 May 2013 (Afternoon) | According to the women and men there are a number of significant changes related to land, water and food issues in their community:  
- All the community members increased their rice yield: from 1.5 t/ha to 2.6 t/ha and their income through sale of the rice.  
- A number of families raise more animals (i.e. chicken, pig, cow) for consumption and sale.  
- Increase in other crops such as maize, sesame. Sesame gives 2 crops per year.  
- Land titles have been registered by the students but they await the official certificate by government.  
The women said that through these changes the income has tripled. |
| Organization Z - Somnang Preah Srey Village, (01 June 2013, Morning) | Men and women listed the following changes:  
- There is a water canal since 2010 from Boeung Sangker to Boueng Pram (before that, water was bought) and a pond which is better than before. The water from canal benefits only a few families who stay closed to it, who use it for their crops (vegetables, corn) and poultry.  
- The yield of rice, vegetables, fruits (mango e.g.) and other crops is higher.  
- Housing land was already registered and 3 Rai (40x40m) of land is given to villagers for...
farming. This is done through the Social Land Concession for 1,600 families (=800 ha)

- The handicapped and former military groups (250 families) received houses built by the government.
- The infrastructure (main road since 2012 and some side roads to villages) has improved, which provides easy transport of agricultural products to the town. Some villages do not have good entrance roads which is a constraint (also for health emergency).
- In February 2013 land titles of community members were registered for production land (3 rai per family) but they are awaiting official certificates. One family was given 1 ral.
- The women added that more animals are raised (i.e. chicken, duck) due to the trainings from CEDAC.
- They also mentioned the existence of a saving group of which the interest rate is 10% lower the MFIs (organize meeting one time every month).
- Some people sell their labour on farms which gives them income.

These changes happened for the whole community mostly small-holder farmers. The changes resulted in better income, which is spent on education, health and nutrition.

3. Are there also negative changes related to land, water and food that occurred? Do you mean negative changes for yourself, your household and/or the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Men: Challenging and negative developments came up as shown below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Prash Sophea village 29 May 2013 (morning) | - The rice farms are not very fertile since there is loss of forest cover due to the logging for cashew nut plantation  
- Rice farming totally depends on the rainwater. Water for irrigation is not enough since the pond dries up in the dry season.  
- For rice farming, the cost for labour is very high. Therefore, they feel that broadcasting better than transplanting  
- Insects increasingly affect rice leaves and vegetables.  
- The use of chemical fertilizer is increasing. Land is not fertile due to the excessive use of chemical fertilizer is negatively affecting the soil fertility. They can resolve is by using natural fertilizer or other biomass.  
- The yield of cashew nut decreases due to erratic rain.  
- Rice farming, pig raising and cashew nut is not much profitable because labour and seed are costly and the price of the products is low.  
- There has been an increase in outside migration for more income.  
- The forestry community committee does not have regular meetings.  
- There observe more diseases among chicken because they lack technical skills on how to properly manage them.  
- Their debts to the Micro Finance Institutes have increased to that extent that land has to be sold, this happened especially in 2010.  
- A negative development mentioned by the women is that some farmers from the village and outsiders burned pieces of forest land for farming (slash & burn)  

Organization X -
| Organization X - Preah Sophea Village | The women talked about negative changes which are more problems concerning their livelihood in general:  
- The hygiene is bad - they do not boil water before drinking because they are too busy with their work and have not time.  
- The lack of proper latrines because they have limited budget to improve them, therefore they go to the nearby forest or bush. There is a saving group from which they can borrow money to get a latrine (400,000 riel = 100 USD).  
- Chicken suffer from diseases and because they cannot treat them in time they die.  
- More forest is encroached to get land for rice farming.  
- They lack water for the families and for the cattle. |
<p>| Organization Y - PongRor village, Angkor Chhum District, 30 May 2013 (afternoon) | As a negative change the women experienced the shortage of water which they related to change in the weather. The men saw outside labour migration to Thailand as a negative change. |
| Organization Z - Boeung Porpol Village, 31 May 2013 (Afternoon) | The women also mentioned negative changes such as a lower rice yield due to inappropriate seed selection and water shortage because the forest land is all cleared. The men told about some other negative development: an increase of insects destroying rice and other crops; limited land while there are more people who need farms; and the excessive use of chemical fertilizer, most farmers use chemical fertilizer because according to the women they do not know how to make and use compost and they said that weed easily grows on cow dung, while according to the men composting is difficult since there is less biomass in the village due to use of machines and deforestation. |
| Organization Z - Somnang Preah Srey Village, (01 June 2013, Morning) | The women mentioned some negative developments as well, such as although they got land they lost the forest, which affected the water situation; land conflicts between groups in the community due to new boundaries drawn through the concession by government. |
| 4. Which of the changes you mentioned is the most significant to all of you? Which groups in your community have also improved their living situation in this way? | The women elaborated on the factors that contributed to the higher rice yield. They use natural fertilizer (compost) because they had realized that the yield reduced due to the use of chemicals. They had copied this practice from other farmers whose yield had increased. The women collect the leaves for making compost. They look around for the leaves on their way to the fields and collect them when they return from the farm or pay a special visit to the place where they grow. For women with small children this is an extra effort since they have to bring the children elsewhere. |
| Organization X - Prash Sophea village 29 May 2013 (morning) | The men elaborate on cattle raising as most significant change - the participants own between 3 - 6 cows/ buffaloes. Cattle is roaming around in the fields in the dry season, while in the rainy season they are kept in a safe place. They sell the offspring against good market prices which contributes to higher income. Before there were more cattle but the number has decreased |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Fieldnotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y - Don Peng</td>
<td>commune, Angkor Chum district</td>
<td>30 May 2013 (morning)</td>
<td>Ten year</td>
<td>Men plus women: The most significant change according to both men and women was the increased rice production resulting in increased income and better livelihood. The discussion further focused on the topic rice production. They cultivate three different varieties: a long duration (6 months variety), a medium and a short duration (3 months variety). There is no irrigation system, therefore, rice farming has to take place in the rainy season which gives one harvest. The last two years the rainfall was sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y - Pong Ror village, Angkor Chhum District</td>
<td>30 May 2013 (afternoon)</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>To both men and women rice farming concerns the most the significant change because it contributed to a general improvement of their livelihood. Widows are in a less favourable position than households composed of spouses. They have to work harder on their farms and in their home gardens because they do not have men to help them. Other community members that face more constraints to improve their livelihood are the landless. They usually rent land from other farmers for rice farming and vegetable growing (surplus they sell). The women referred to one family in particular that does not farm productively as they have little land, limited capital and, also, do not take care of their farm properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z - Boeung Porpol Village</td>
<td>31 May 2013 (Afternoon)</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>The women and men felt that the higher rice yield was the most significant change. Due to lack of labour force (family members seek work elsewhere) broadcasting is more practiced than transplanting which need more hands in the field. To harvest, they can hire a machine (400,000 Riel/ha =100USD).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z - Somnang Preah Srey Village</td>
<td>01 June 2013, Morning</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>The most significant change is the land titles issued for residence. They grow rice (and vegetables) on this land as well and on land rented elsewhere which resulted in an increase in rice production. The yield has increased from 300kg - 400kg per rai to 700-800kg/rai. This change contributed to improved livelihoods of the whole community due to higher incomes, to reduced outside labour migration, and to improving food security for year round.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization X- Prash Sophea village</td>
<td>29 May 2013 (morning)</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>Men: Some people face more challenges than others, such as widows, members of poorer households and unemployed, those households that suffered from domestic violence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization X Preah Sophea Village</td>
<td>29 May 2013 (afternoon)</td>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>5. Do or did certain groups of community members face specific obstacles which made it difficult to make progress? Please give a few</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Final report Thematic Evaluation - Struggle for Land, Water and Food*
### Men plus women: The discussions did not reveal whether certain categories of people such as old people, FH, poorer and less poorer households faced specific constraints or progressed less than other villagers. The men told that widows are helped by other community members. Generally, community members appear to assist each other.

### Widows are in a less favourable position than households composed of spouses. They have to work harder on their farms and in their home gardens because they do not have men to help them. Other community members that face more constraints to improve their livelihood are the landless. They usually rent land from other farmers for rice farming and vegetable growing (surplus they sell). The women referred to one family in particular that does not farm productively as they have little land, limited capital and, also, do not take care of their farm properly.

### Men: diversification of the livelihood options, for example, combine rice farming, work in the factory, home gardening, selling labour (planting rubber or cassava), engage more in animal raising, or doing small businesses.

### Men cattle raising: Factors that have contributed to this change are their enhanced technical knowledge and skills to protect cattle from diseases although there is still much to improve; they have better information about the market prices and they can use the existing forest: cattle can feed themselves. Women rice farming: The factors that have contributed to this higher yield are the use of more fertilizer both chemical and natural; good seed selection (short duration variety - Romdul); training in agricultural practice; good water management and weeding. Only one family applies SRI. The families help each other on the rice farms. There are family members who return from their outside labour to help on farms.

### Men plus women: The increased rice yield was the result of various factors, such as

- Improved farming techniques (proper preparing and maintaining dikes around the fields);
- Selection of good (local) seed varieties that give higher yields. Families exchange seeds among themselves when needed.
- Use of natural fertilizer: cow dung and compost from domestic residue only. The discussion was unclear about the use of chemical fertilizer which according to the women is usually applied shortly before ploughing. The men also spoke of increased use of chemical fertilizer but later in the discussion they said that they changed to natural compost because chemical fertilizer destroys the quality of their land and, moreover, is very expensive.
- Availability of tractors due to assistance from NGOs
- Access to loans for farming through the savings of the farmer group
• Hardly any damage of the crop by cattle because the commune council had declared that families should be fined when their cattle was found in a field. Concerning the labour availability statements contradicted each other, which could be related to differences in landholdings. The majority of the community members have between 0.5 and 2 ha of land, but few villagers own 5 - 6 ha. The men stated that labour availability was not a constraint but the women mentioned that in case of larger fields the farmers broadcast the seed and do not transplant because there is not enough labour available.

**Organization Y - PongRor village, Angkor Chhum District, 30 May 2013 (afternoon)**
- They use natural fertilizer (compost, cattle biomass) which as they said does not reduce the quality of the soil. This fertilizer is applied shortly before ploughing. They use less chemical fertilizer: 1 bag/ ha to add more nutrients to the soil.
- They start the work in time, i.e. at the beginning of the rainy season. The women said that the families help each other to get everything done in time.
- They properly manage the farms (SRI) i.e. weeding in time, maintain the right water amount, and apply pest management.
- The men added that they apply good seed selection and the market prices are good.
- The men also explained that the commune has issued a declaration that villagers whose cattle is found in the rice fields will be fined which appears very effective. Men are mostly responsible for all the farming activities and women support them. But they added that both men and women work in the farming equally.

**Organization Z - Boeung Porpol Village, 31 May 2013 (Afternoon)**
- Sufficient water for irrigation
- The new land through social land concessions is very fertile (top soil of previous forest land).
- Proper preparation, water management through dikes and good farm management. They flood the field to kill weeds.
- Good seed selection (hybrids). Phka Romdul is a common species because of the high yield, high selling price (1,300,000Riel/t = 280USD), weather resistance and the short duration (4 months); Neang Rith is common due to its heavy weigh, weather resistance and high yield (2.6t/ha).
- The use of fertilizer to produce more yield
- The use of pesticides and herbicides since they cannot weed the high and tough grass and other weeds (male family members spray 2 times, before ploughing and during growing).
- They know the symptoms of diseases.

**Organization Z - Somnang Preah Srey Village, (01 June 2013, Morning)**
- The water canal providing part of the fields with water
- Proper preparation and care taking of the farms
- Good seed selection (i.e. Neang Rith because it takes only 5 months to harvest, and is resistant to weeds, drought and flood
- The land is fertile (top soil of previous forest land).

7. Has the MSC been the result of any

**Organization X - Prash Sophea**
Different organizations/ institutes provided trainings to both men and women: Mlup Baitong, District Agriculture Office, World Vision, Oxfam GB, an Cambodian NGO, District Women Affairs
training that you received? If yes, can you tell us about the training: what did you learn, who provided the training, how did you apply the learning, with whom did you work together, what happened after you applied the learning? How important was it to cooperate with other community members - why?

<p>| Organization X | village 29 May 2013 (morning) | Office. They concerned trainings on rice farm preparation, seed selection, use of fertilizer, and vegetable growing. However, the participants hardly applied the learning because they did not have enough resources to follow-up. The women explained that the training participants shared information between husband and wife and with others, which they feel is very important. Not everybody is interested though and some find it difficult to apply even with the help of others. The women made some extra efforts to attend training than men - arrange their domestic work and look for transport (her motorbike or that of others). |
| Organization X | Preah Sophea Village 29 May 2013 (afternoon) | The men received training from HARVEST and Women Affairs District Office on vegetable growing in both dry and raining season; from World Vision on animal raising; from the District Agriculture Office on rice farming, IMP and SRI; and from Mlup Baitong on agriculture and forestry. The women mentioned the same training but added training on fish and pig raising, compost making and breeding plants. After the training, the participants villagers practice the learning except for community members who have limited resources. Earlier the men had remarked that they still follow the traditional way of farming because they are not fully trained yet. They explained that they now know about diseases and regularly check their animals. The NGO that trained them also gives follow-up. (only men, cattle is not women’s business) There is a volunteer-vaccinator supporting them. |
| Organization Y - Don Peng commune, Angkor Chum district 30 May 2013 (morning) | Men plus women: Over the years the men and women in the FGD have followed several training related to land, water and food issues. They mentioned rice cultivation techniques, such as SRI, broadcasting, seed selection, compost making, pesticide management; vegetable farming; fish raising, and, added by the men, animal raising (making cages, management of diseases. The men said that first they did not belief much about the usefulness of the training topics but after trying they observed that SRI techniques worked well. They compared and discussed with each other. The women explained in more detail what they learnt from the training on SRI: how to make proper planting rows, how much seed they need to transplant seedlings for a certain field size, how many years a field can be used for transplanting, and what seed variety to use on what land. These trainings were mostly offered by NGOs (CEDAK (Centre for Training in Agriculture), Crowak Baitong, Plan International, PADEK and also the District Agriculture Office. The men mentioned GTZ, Habitat for Humanity ADB as well. After training they practiced the learning by themselves and disseminate the information to other community members. |
| Organization Y - PongRor village, Angkor Chhum District, 30 May 2013 (afternoon) | The women and men followed many trainings, for example about vegetable growing (i.e. maize, bean, cucumber, pumpkin, etc.); composting; rice farming (soil fertilizing and farming techniques (i.e. how to plough, how to make seedbeds, transplant, use fertilizer, natural pesticides) and animal raising. NGOs and other institutions provided the trainings, among which CEDAC, PADEK, GIZ, Habitat for Humanity, and the District Agriculture Office. After the trainings, the participants applied their learning, for instance, on how to prepare for rice farming including composting, weeding, seed selection, growing seedlings, etc. People in the same community are said to have good relationship with others. They for example help each other when needed on the farms. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Z - Boeung Porpol Village, 31 May 2013 (Afternoon)</th>
<th>Trainings have been provided on agriculture including rice farming and seed selection, pig and poultry raising by the District Agriculture Office and ADOVIR. Most women could not recall what they learnt during the training but they remarked that they are now able to select the good seeds that also give good price, able to prepare and take care the farms, go to the shop to buy fertilizer, and know on which soils how much fertilizer to apply. The men added that they can treat the animal diseases. They usually share their knowledge and experience with their neighbours, for example how to use fertilizer. Contrary to the men there is on women’s group - the women are too busy to meet, they say.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Z - Somnang Preah Srey Village, (01 June 2013, Morning)</td>
<td>There are many trainings on rice farming (SRI), composting, growing mushrooms, vegetable gardening, fish and animal raising, rice bank, techniques to select seeds. CEDAC provided the trainings on agriculture (ADOVIR focuses on land issues). After the trainings, villagers applied and gained more production. The women especially mentioned vegetable growing. It appeared that few people (about 20) were trained but that other farmers consulted the trainee and copied the techniques (among the 6 women only one was trained and two women went for advice on vegetable growing and copied). Concerning SRI, the farmers have not yet applied it since there is not enough labour available. One trainee, focal point of CEDAC explained in detail how she grows vegetables and applied SRI (seedbeds, transplanting and its advantages). She was also the only one who made compost. The women said that they support each other in farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the improvement in your living situation due to better access to resources - land, water, seed, fertilizer, and other relevant resources? If yes, can you tell us more about it: what resource is it about, how did you get more access, who supported you, what did you do yourself, what did you do when you got access to the resource, how</td>
<td>Organization X - Prash Sophea village 29 May 2013 (morning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization X Preah Sophea Village 29 May 2013 (afternoon)</td>
<td>Forest is an important resource for timber and non-timber products (no notes written down about how they got access and ownership of the forest). The men feel it is important to lobby to ensure community ownership of the forest together with other communities. They said that some community members who are not member of the CF think the forest is owned by Mlup Baitong so still awareness raising work needs to be done by the CFMC. The women told that fertilizer is bought at the Kampong Chhoer Teal market. Composting they make themselves, collecting leaves from the nearby forest and some places in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Y - Don Peng commune, Angkor Chum district 30 May 2013 (morning)</td>
<td>Men plus women: The land the people cultivate is inherited land. Some land is cleared from the forest which is greatly reduced in size. At the moment a process of handing out proper land titles is going on. The men said that they buy more land from other farmers, social land concession is not available in the area. Concerning water, there is a shortage for irrigation. Many households have a well on their compound for drinking water while some water is used for irrigation. About 5 - 10 years ago a canal was dug with labour input of villagers through a project but many discontinued their participation because they would not benefit from the way the canal was designed. According to the men and women rice seed is available and accessible to the farmers. They received good varieties when starting with SRI (unclear from whom) which they keep aside for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>PongRor village, Angkor Chhum District, 30 May 2013 (afternoon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Boeung Porpol Village, 31 May 2013 (Afternoon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Somnang Preah Srey Village, (01 June 2013, Morning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Prash Sophea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. We talked about your present living
situation compared to the situation two years back. Now we like you to look at the future. Assume that the NGOs supporting you would discontinue their support now. If we would come back after two years what would happen to your living situation: would the present situation remain as it is now, would it have been developed further, or would it have stopped? Why? Are there any issues you are concerned about that may negatively affect your living situation? Do you expect that it will affect you and/or your household and/or the community at large?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village 29 May 2013 (morning)</th>
<th>They also expect that more animals will be raised. When NGO support would discontinue their livelihood would still improve for the simple reason that there are no NGOs that support them currently. The women - unclear to me, some said they will continue farming in the traditional way, others said that they have now so much experience with new practices, they can even support others. Concerns were also expressed: there will be less fertile land, water will be less due to the disappearance of the forest cover and with increasing population the forest will not fulfil the needs of the people. Moreover, the forest management will not sustain because the committee still has too limited capacity to manage the forest well. A few women expressed concern about the spraying of pesticides on some farms which affected their fields.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization X Preah Sophea Village 29 May 2013 (afternoon)</td>
<td>If NGOs support would discontinue the men expect that after two years from then the livelihood will be better in the future since villagers unite and gain more knowledge. They also expect that the forest will still be there. Women think that they will still make compost because it helps to get better yields and will reduce the costs of chemicals. The men and women expressed concern about the government policy that may affect them later for instance logging or economic land concession. The Community Forest Management Committee still has insufficient capacity to deal with the issue. A concern to them is that there is less water available due to the decreasing forest cover which is affecting the yield of the crops. It is hard to dig a well. Another concern of the men is that some farmers have sold their cattle because of the good price and bought a tractor. They did not realize though that a tractor needs maintenance and that they do not have cow dung anymore to fertilize their fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Y Don Peng commune, Angkor Chum district 30 May 2013 (morning)</td>
<td>Men plus women: they will continue to use the farming practices - since there is no other option to them than farming they have to continue. They expect the yield to remain as it is; if rainfall will be less they will grow the shorter duration varieties (medium and short). They will produce more compost which will make their land more fertile. Concerning the availability of land they expect that the size of landholdings will decrease due to division among the children (inheritance) and the lack of land available in the area. The men expect that more labour will be available because the migration will reduce (not clear why they stated this). The men stated that if no capacity building by NGOs community they cannot depend on themselves. A few concerns were expressed about the future among which the outbreak of a disease they had heard about, affecting the rice in other areas of the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Y PongRor village, Angkor Chhum District, 30 May 2013 (afternoon)</td>
<td>The women and men believe that in future there will be higher yields in the rice cultivation, but, added the men, only if labour migration will stop otherwise the yield will decrease. The argument of the women was that they can use water from the ponds to irrigation, since more pumps will be available. They expect to produce twice as much as they do now. One of the reasons that the ponds will contain more water is that there still exists forest land. They also shared the demand for rice farming and other concerns with the commune council. PADEK staff has trained the CC about the roles of a CC (info PADEK: CC are trained on their role as duty bearer being accountable to the people. The CC advocates at the government to get irrigation...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sources for the communities). However, the men and women felt that the community cannot stand on their own feet if NGOs and government do not provide training.

| Organization Z - Boeung Porpol Village, 31 May 2013 (Afternoon) | If NGOs should stop their support the women expect that after two years from now the livelihood will be improved because they have enhanced technical skills and knowledge. Both men and women said that assistance from government or NGOs in supporting the livelihoods is still needed to speed up development. Only business men and families who have members sending remittances can do without outside support. The women also have some concerns such as climate change, rice diseases, and flood. Both men and women expressed concern that in the future land would be less fertile due to overuse of chemical fertilizers and pesticides. |
| Organization Z-Somnang Preah Srey Village, (01 June 2013, Morning) | If NGO support would stop what would the situation be in two years from now? The men are still pessimistic that they would be able to produce the same or higher yield. Maybe they will have mobilized resources to construct the water canal and small irrigation systems. The most important concern for both men and women is insecurity regarding land ownership for farming and cropping. The women added that the support of NGOs is very important to monitor the situation. Another concern is the conflicts that are emerging due to the new land boundaries. |
Annex 12 Participants during country visits Cambodia and Uganda

CAMBODIA

Field interview team names
Field team inclusive staff of partners joining the trip: Ms Seang Sorya, Mr Eau SamAn, Mr Chhun Vanthoeurn, Ms Seang Sokleng, Mr Bun Sothun, Mr Chhor Vandy, Ms Lim Socheat, Mr Sao Vanna, Mr Im Narith, Mr Puthy…, Mr Sinuon…, Mr Horm Reaksmeay, Mr Soun Sarin, Mr Om Sophana, Mr Kuy Sophal, Ms Dim Samphors; Chanthy Sam - national consultant

Workshop participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>initial workshop</th>
<th>final workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sambath Mam</td>
<td>DPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kuy Sophal</td>
<td>DPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Dim Samphors</td>
<td>DPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chheth Bunloeuer</td>
<td>DPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Om Sophana</td>
<td>Mlup Baitong</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Va Moeurn</td>
<td>Mlup Baitong</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Im Narith</td>
<td>PADEK</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ke Kannaro</td>
<td>PADEK</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chhith Sam Ath</td>
<td>NGO Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Pry Phally Phoung</td>
<td>BCV</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Im Dhallay</td>
<td>NGO Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Pen Bomnner</td>
<td>ADHOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sam Soveth</td>
<td>ADHOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Yeng Virak</td>
<td>CLEC</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Ran Sopheak Pagna</td>
<td>BCV</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertjan van Bruchem</td>
<td>Oxfam Novib</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maarten Vuijst</td>
<td>Oxfam Novib</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Eijkemans</td>
<td>Oxfam Novib</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UGANDA

Participants of initial workshop in Gulu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akwero Jacinta Ojara</td>
<td>ACORD</td>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>Programme manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achen Santina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>Government Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Drani</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>Programme officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceasar Kimbugwe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>Programme officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur de Kuijer</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiku Didi Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>LC5 Secretary Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajavu Alabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>Production Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lawu</td>
<td>VEDCO</td>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaaya Christina</td>
<td>VEDCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Mobilisation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omara Boniface</td>
<td>SACU</td>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidega Simon Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turutto Elly</td>
<td>ACORD</td>
<td>Kitgum</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neole David  Gulu  LC3 chairman
Loum Bernard  ACORD  Gulu  Project Officer
Okaya James  Gulu  Production_Marketing officer
Simon Peter  Amuru  Production Officer
Innocent Masika  Kampala  Social worker
Kakeeto James  Kampala  Project officer
Chombe Aggrey  SACU  West Nile  Project officer

Field visits interview teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner visited</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Notekeeper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Participants of Final workshop in Kampala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaaya Christina</td>
<td>VEDCO</td>
<td>Resource Mobilisation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turutto Elly</td>
<td>ACORD</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnah Nabwira</td>
<td>ACORD</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama Omonya</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>Campaign Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Mbabazi</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>Programme officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Modernmott</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>GROW Campaign Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ssuuna</td>
<td>CDRN</td>
<td>Executive director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Tino</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>Agric. Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Mugambo</td>
<td>SEATINI</td>
<td>Programme officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birabwa Klubrod</td>
<td>SEATINI</td>
<td>Programme coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur de Kuijer</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>ACD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mugisha</td>
<td>PELUM</td>
<td>Advocacy officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwebe John</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Programme officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 13 Our experiences with the Skype interviews

- The performance questions served well to structure and guide the interviews. However, a single Skype interview appeared not sufficient for obtaining all and, in particular, in-depth information. After 1.5 hours the Skype sessions were usually closed with the agreement on which extra information would be sent to the evaluators and on how to continue, if necessary. In a few cases (Sudan and Nigeria) the first Skype session led to the identification of better contacts and persons, and certainly to additional documents and reports.

- Especially in the case of Africa, the first interview was often followed by a second Skype interview. This extra step therefore required extra work and time. This second interview clarified gaps in information, or answered new questions, that arose from the first interview. It also offered an opportunity to validate the information obtained.

- For Africa, we spoke with representatives (ACD or programme officers) of all 7 country offices, except for Mozambique. In two cases - Sudan and Nigeria - persons were interviewed with strong historic partner knowledge, as the present country office staff indicated their limited information on that specific partner. In the case of Asia 4 people from Oxfam Novib HQ (two of which going to work soon in a country office) and 2 ACDs from a country office were interviewed. Most but not all had a good institutional memory but all were willing and enthusiastic to tell their stories. Some experienced the interview itself as a learning opportunity. We realized that from the enthusiastic stories it was not always easy to conclude what was wishful thinking and what was based on reality on the ground. A few interviewees shared their future plans in which the theme-related issues appeared to have a prominent place.

- The interviews clearly showed that ON staff involved did not have the full knowledge and insights in the work of the partners. This had partly to do with the established lack of outcomes data at partner level and (consequently?) at HQ level, but also with the different way of working of a country office. For example, one office stated that it employs generalist staff with regard to the various aims they intervene in, while in another office specialists on ‘their’ aims have been recruited. The latter approach promotes, according to the CD, more focused interaction with partners.

- During the interviews we also discussed the ON livelihood concepts: 1. Rural Worlds and 2. Hanging in, stepping up and stepping out. It appeared that most persons interviewed did not know nor were familiar with these concepts. But it was quickly ascertained that the content of these concepts can be easily applied to their own situation and context.

- An enormous diversity. The variety of contexts between (and within) the different countries is enormous in terms of target groups (from which Rural World are they coming?), type of land uses, mix of land users, ecological contexts (semi-arid, sub humid, humid), population density, proximity to markets, strength of producer organizations, roles of CBOs, democratic space and political context. At the physical level of intervention not one selected partner is working within a context that allows direct comparison with another one working elsewhere.

- The evaluators have followed different approaches in their Skype interviews. Verona Groverman dealt with the Asian countries and interviewed ON staff at a general level, dealing with all partners selected for the in-depth analysis (phase 1) at the same time. Ben Haagsma interviewed the ON country staff in the selected African countries, focusing on the selected partner only. The difference is partly due to the fact that for all 4 Asian countries the number of partners was more than one. In each of the selected African countries
countries only one partner was selected, except for Uganda, but that country was part of the country visit step. Though the Asian staff interviewed was very well informed on these partners, holding separate Skype interviews for each partner, would have required too much time of the persons involved. For the African countries the Skype interviews could easily focus on the selected partner only. As a consequence the level of details from the African Skype interviews was greater than for the Asian interviews. This was partially balanced by the greater availability of evaluation reports for Asia as compared to Africa.

Our methodological experiences with the Focus Group Discussions in the communities during the country visits:

The MSC tool and the related organizational aspects of the field visits were communicated before the country visits took place. In Cambodia all the field visits were well-organised: six communities were selected (2 for each selected partner); 5 men and 5 women per community were asked to participate in the FGD at a set time; each partner had made available four staff to facilitate the FGD (one discussion facilitator plus one note keeper for the women and same for the men); and time was planned to make the team and accompanying staff (one or two per partner) familiar with the method. The national consultant played a guiding role in the FGD. One staff member translated the main issues discussed for the evaluator.

- The simplified MSC served well as a basis for data collection on changes in livelihoods of smallholders. Due to the focus on general changes the men and women spoke freely about positive and negative changes and factors of influence. Also, the inputs of other NGOs than those of the ON partner only easily came to the fore.

- The MSC has the potential to highlight positive and negative (unintended) changes, thus assisting the partners to adjust the implementation of activities. Some NGO staff acknowledged and appreciated the potential contribution of MSC, ‘discovering’ a few unintended negative changes which was surprising and revealing for them.

- The practical experience of NGO staff with the MSC methodology was very limited. The short ‘training’ provided and the daily reflections were insufficient to provide overall and consistent good quality of information during all group interviews. NGO staff appeared strongly geared towards handling the MSC questions as an ordinary questionnaire instead of using it as guiding and probing questions. Moreover, the skills in note keeping left to be desired which resulted in superficial reports insufficiently catching the views about underlying reasons for certain developments and trends. More time and practice is needed for assuring better quality of use of MSC (for instance a one-day training with practical exercises).

- In Uganda, the FGDs facilitated as a joint effort by staff of various NGOs worked out well. It made them aware of the specificities of the programmes of other ON partners. They strongly expressed the need for more organized exchange visits and meetings for learning purposes. A finding also recognized by the ON Country Office staff.

- In Cambodia, because of cultural reasons staff of the partners implementing activities in an area facilitated the FGDs (community members do not easily trust outsiders who come to discuss issues with them). It well-resulted in highly participatory and open exchange of views and experiences.

- Even restricting the discussion to the key outcome areas of sustained livelihoods, the time available was too limited (about 1 ½ hour FGD and 1 -2 hours reflection with the facilitating staff) to collect all necessary information and to reconstruct the TOC of this change. It is difficult to sufficiently validate all impressions. Nevertheless, it was surprising to experience how productive this short community
visits are in spite of their short duration. They generated a lot of good responses and demonstrated their potential if a bit more time would be available.

- The information on the character of the evaluation and the various practical organizational issues (especially the joint community visits in Uganda) was not easily understood. Any evaluation is firstly seen as an organizational or programme/project evaluation; the thematic character of the evaluation was something new for the partners. In Cambodia this challenge was anticipated by sending information beforehand and explaining the MSC tool in the initial workshop to NGOs staff at HQ level who spoke English well. In Uganda it was explained on the spot, if and when necessary.
## Annex 14 Rural Worlds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural worlds (derived from OECD):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural World 1</strong>: Large-scale commercial agricultural households and enterprises with an influential voice in national policies, political affairs and ties to buyer driven value chains. These enterprises also provide employment for members of the other worlds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural World 2</strong>: Traditional agricultural households and enterprises, not internationally competitive but with sizeable landholdings devoted to both commercial and subsistence production. They have few ties to agribusiness supply chains, although some are learning from Rural World 1 and becoming more commercial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural World 3</strong>: Agricultural households and micro-enterprises, including those with limited assets (land, credit), living in fragile ecosystems, with small units producing food for consumption and for sale on local markets. Members of this group, which include many women and female-headed households, are dependent on off-farm employment for a significant part of their incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural World 4</strong>: Landless rural households and micro-enterprises, whose labor and community ties are their major assets. Women head many of these households. Sharecropping and migration are livelihood options. Rural World 4 relies on Rural Worlds 1 and 2 for employment and income-generating opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural World 5</strong>: Chronically poor rural households, many of which are no longer economically active, and have sold off or have lost their assets during periods of crisis. Increasing numbers of households find themselves in this situation due to HIV/AIDS. Social exclusion and gender inequalities are rife. Safety nets for this group are essential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>