



 International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

## Final Evaluation report: Madagascar Food Security Project



September 2017

**Author: Antilahy Herimpitia Estelle Rolande (Consultant)**

## **Acknowledgements**

The Malagasy Red Cross and the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) would like to express their gratitude to all those who participated in the evaluation mission of the FIHAVOTSE Project in Antananarivo, Amboasary Atsimo and Taolagnaro, from 9 to 27 July 2017. The evaluation team comprised of Ms. Herimpitia Estelle Rolande Antilahy (the National Consultant), Messrs. Sammy Fwanga and Geoffrey Odera working for IFRC Nairobi, Kenya as the Monitoring & Evaluation Officer and the Emergency Planning and Reporting Officer respectively, and Mr. Emmanuel Ntakirutimana, the Monitoring & Evaluation Officer at the Rwandan Red Cross Society (RRCS).

Special thanks to the project team who provided valuation information, and to the communities supported by the project with who the evaluation team spent time talking through the project interventions.

## Acronyms

<b>AINA</b>	<i>Action Intégrée en Nutrition et Sécurité Alimentaire</i> (Integrated Action in Nutrition and Food Security - Programme funded by the European Union in South and South-East Madagascar)
<b>ASARA</b>	<i>Amélioration de la Sécurité Alimentaire et du Revenu Agricole</i> (Improved Food Security and Agricultural Revenue- Programme funded by the European Union in South and South-East Madagascar)
<b>AtC</b>	Accountability to Communities
<b>AUE</b>	<i>Association des usagers de l'eau</i> (Water Users' Association)
<b>AVSF</b>	<i>Agronomes et Vétérinaires Sans Frontière</i>
<b>CRM</b>	Malagasy Red Cross
<b>CSA</b>	<i>Centre de Service Agricole</i> (Agricultural Services Centre)
<b>CSB (I – II)</b>	<i>Centre de santé de base</i> (Primary health care centre (level I and 2))
€	Euro (European Union Currency)
<b>IFRC</b>	International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
<b>IPC</b>	Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
<b>MAM</b>	Moderate acute malnutrition
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>ONN/ORN</b>	National Nutrition Office ( <i>Office Nationale de Nutrition</i> ) / Regional Nutrition Office ( <i>Office Régionale de Nutrition</i> )
<b>PPMH</b>	<i>Puits équipé d'une pompe à motricité humaine</i> (Well with a manually operated pump)
<b>SAM</b>	Severe acute malnutrition
<b>SAMS</b>	<i>Sécurité Alimentaire et Moyens de Subsistance</i> (Food Security and Means of Subsistence)
<b>SRA</b>	<i>Système de Riziculture Amélioré</i> (Improved Rice Cultivation System)
<b>SSD</b>	<i>Service de santé du District</i> (District Health Department)
<b>STD</b>	<i>Service Technique Déconcentré</i> (Devolved Technical Department)
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>US\$</b>	United States of America Dollar
<b>VSLA</b>	Village Saving Loan Association
<b>WASH</b>	Water Sanitation and Hygiene

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACRONYMS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2. AIM – OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.1. METHODS</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH</b>	<b>11</b>
3.2.1. SUPPORT ACCORDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM AT THE MALAGASY RED CROSS HEADQUARTERS	11
3.2.2. REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE	11
3.2.3. FINALISATION OF THE EVALUATION TOOLS	11
3.2.4. SELECTION OF THE AREAS TO BE EVALUATED	12
3.2.5. SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND RESPONDENTS FOR THE INTERVIEWS	12
3.2.6. PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS AND DEBRIEFING WITH THE MALAGASY RED CROSS TEAM	14
3.2.7. DRAFTING AND SUBMISSION OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT	14
<b>3.3. EVALUATION TOOLS</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.4. LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4. RESULTS OF THE FINAL EVALUATION</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.1. GENERAL INFORMATION: A PROJECT AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH MADAGASCAR</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.2. RELEVANCE: AN ACTION RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS OF THE TARGET GROUPS AND IN LINE WITH THE NATIONAL AND REGIONAL GOALS</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.3. EFFICIENCY: POSITIVE, BUT LARGELY DEPENDENT ON THE AGRICULTURAL POTENTIAL OF THE AREA OF INTERVENTION</b>	<b>17</b>
4.3.1. MAROTSIRAKA RURAL COMMUNE	17
4.3.2. TRANOMARO RURAL COMMUNE	20
4.3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGIONAL BRANCH OF MALAGASY RED CROSS	23
<b>4.4. EFFICIENCY: TRANSFORMING RESOURCES INTO TANGIBLE RESULTS AT ALL LEVELS</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.5. IMPACTS AND SUSTAINABILITY: ENCOURAGING EARLY SIGNS FOR MORE SUSTAINED SUPPORT</b>	<b>25</b>
4.5.1. MAROTSIRAKA RURAL COMMUNE	25
4.5.2. TRANOMARO RURAL COMMUNE	25
<b>4.7. COORDINATION: GOOD, BUT THERE IS STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT AT CTDs AND STDs</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4.8. COVERAGE: SMALL POPULATION REACHED, BUT A STRATEGIC LOCATION FOR A SNOWBALL EFFECT</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5. LESSONS LEARNT</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>32</b>

## Executive Summary

The Anosy Region is located in the south/south-east of Madagascar with a total population of about 671,000 inhabitants over an estimated area of 30,198 km<sup>2</sup>. It covers three districts namely Amboasary Atsimo, Betroka and the county seat of Taolagnaro Region. In 2013, the GDP per capita was estimated at USD 322 per capita, while the national average was USD 391 per capita<sup>1</sup>. Although this region is home to one of the country's largest extractive industries and has abundant natural resources, it is one of the poorest in Madagascar as manifested by the staggering level of food insecurity and the high rates of acute and chronic malnutrition among children under 5 years old in Amboasary Atsimo District. This district (see opposite map, in yellow), located between the Betroka and Taolagnaro Districts, has approximately 160,000 inhabitants, representing about ¼ of the total population of the Anosy Region and a relatively low density of 15 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>.



The southern part of Amboasary District is characterised by the presence of sisal plantations that have limited the space for household agriculture, while the northern part is predominantly composed of small household farms (in the Mandrare River valley and its tributaries), vast expanses of grazing areas for cattle, sheep and goats, and small-scale mining activities. The levels of poverty, chronic food insecurity, and moderate to severe acute malnutrition have been exacerbated by insecurity in the form of cattle (*zebu*) theft and killings. The northern part of Amboasary Atsimo District has borne the brunt of this insecurity. In 2015, over a dozen national and international humanitarian and development actors were operating in the Amboasary Atsimo District.

Considering this context, the intervention of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, through the Malagasy Red Cross Society (MRCS) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) in the implementation of the FIHAVOTSE food security project is more than justified.

The Malagasy Red Cross chose to intervene in two rural communes in the Amboasary Atsimo District, namely Marotsiraka and Tranomaro, located 4 hours and 2 hours away respectively in the north from main town of Amboasary Atsimo. Since 2015, the Malagasy Red Cross has been one of the few non-profit organisations operating in these two communes, enabling better coverage of the district, while most interventions are centred in the vicinity of the district's county seat which is deemed safer and easily accessible.

<sup>1</sup> Monograph of the Anosy Region, <http://www.regionanosy.mg>

***Relevance: Activities that meet the needs of target groups and are aligned with the national and regional objectives***

When the project was launched in 2015, the Marotsiraka and Tranomaro Primary Health Care Centres treated 70 and 140 children respectively per week suffering from moderate acute malnutrition. In addition, according to the IPC classification, food insecurity in both communes were at phase 3-4, thus requiring emergency food assistance. Diarrhoeal diseases, due to unsafe drinking water, are prevalent among children under 5 years during the hot and humid season from November to March, and households run out of money to buy food. The activities proposed by the FIHAVOTSE Project provided solutions to these challenges. It is relevant to the extent that **it attempts to resolve the problem by addressing the immediate and underlying causes of food and nutrition insecurity in the target households** in both communes.

***Efficiency: Positive, but largely dependent on the agricultural potential in intervention area***

**The activities carried out during the implementation of the project turned out to be effective in Marotsiraka Rural Municipality to the extent that they made it possible to attain the project's expected results, compared to the mixed results achieved in Tranomaro Rural Commune.** The weekly care for malnourished children at each primary health centre declined sharply to 4 and 40 in Marotsiraka and Tranomaro, respectively. In addition, although an IPC classification was not carried out specifically for both communes, the final assessment indicated that the hunger gap decreased to a maximum of 1-2 months in Marotsiraka, while it remained at 4-5 months for Tranomaro Rural Commune. Food diversification was combined with the diversification of sources of income. The Malagasy Red Cross introduced small-scale vegetable and pulse production in target households. For the 5 villages (*fokontany*) of Marotsiraka, garlic, onions, peanuts and white and red beans were found to be high value agricultural commodities which enabled households to buy rice during the hunger gap. 66% of fresh vegetables were consumed and the rest sold on the local market. Three villages in Tranomaro Commune were able to grow vegetables, but the lack of rainfall for two years negatively affected legume crops. Most of the production in Tranomaro's 3 villages is consumed because the agricultural produce (other than green leaves) is unknown to other villages and is therefore not sold. Regarding access to drinking water, all 5 villages covered by the Municipality of Marotsiraka will have access to drinking water, when the extension of the water supply system is completed. Twelve common water points will serve all the villages instead of the ten provided for in the project document, representing 1 common water point for 237 users. The project, in partnership with UNICEF, rehabilitated 6 hand pumps in the 5 villages of Tranomaro; one village received 2 pumps given its large population size. Currently, women in these villages can draw clean water within 500 metres of their home while previously they had to travel 1.5km to fetch unsafe water. The volume of water available to households increased 3 to 4 times compared to the availability prior to the project's implementation.

***Efficiency: Transforming resources into tangible results at all levels***

The development of local resources was one of the strong points during the implementation of the FIHAVOTSE Project just like was the case for agricultural activities, the promotion of the hygiene, access to clean water and basic sanitation and the promotion of good nutritional practices. The project is also efficient in its implementation. By way of illustration, the FIHAVOTSE Project's Team opted to train lead farmers leaders who, subsequently, not only transferred their know-how to other farmers, but also

distributed the seeds they received. This approach made it possible to monitor the level of assimilation of technology and optimise the limited human and material resources available for the implementation of the project. Another example is the reconstruction and extension of the water supply system of Marotsiraka Municipality for the 5 villages that cost the project € 14/user. The average cost of such a system can go up to € 45 per user served. This cost has been significantly reduced because the community and project beneficiaries/future users participated in the construction works by carrying out excavations, transporting materials, installing pipes, etc.

### ***Impacts and Sustainability: Encouraging early signs for increased support***

For a two-year project, it is a challenge analysing the impact and sustainability. However, the team of evaluators identified early signs of impact and sustainability that are worth highlighting, especially for the Marotsiraka Commune. The number of farmers who adopted improved rice cultivation techniques increased year after year, to reach a critical mass of adopters so that all rice farmers eventually comply. This critical mass is necessary to ensure proper use and control of irrigation water and the maintenance of the hydro-agricultural network in good condition. Garlic and onion growers in Marotsiraka began storing their produce for sale when the price is more attractive. Likewise, fresh vegetable producers are changing their timelines so that their produce reaches the market when vegetables become scarce and attract a higher price. The sale of fresh vegetables and pulses is essentially channelled to the payment of children's school fees.

### ***Coordination: Good, but there is still room for improvement at the level of the devolved technical departmentst***

Since the Malagasy Red Cross was the only player in the Marotsiraka and Tranomaro Communes at the beginning of the project, the coordination with the partners can only be meaningful through its active participation in the meetings of the various district clusters including the WASH, Nutrition and food security Clusters. These clusters are led by the Government's devolved technical departments, and support organisations are represented to share their progress, good practices and constraints that they face. Their active presence made it possible to mobilise other partners to intervene in these communes during the evaluation. However, the coordination with the representatives of technical departments in the communes could have been done more actively.

### ***Coverage: Low population reached but its strategic location has had a ripple effect***

Over the two years of the intervention, the Malagasy Red Cross targeted 10 villages and an estimated population of 7,700 people, representing 55% of the initial objective of the project. Although the number of villages was maintained, the population reached has been relatively low. To achieve the project's targets, an increase in the number of villages is required, which would result in a substantial increase in the cost of logistics and the local office. It was therefore prudent to maintain the current level of the intervention. The Malagasy Red Cross's intervention is nevertheless a trailblazer in the sense that other actors, namely AVSF and UNICEF, joined it in 2016, thus demonstrating its strategic location and choice.

## ***Lessons Learnt and Recommendations***

The coordination of this project not only enhanced the expertise of the other support organisations present in the area, but also made it possible to optimise the available resources of the Malagasy Red Cross. The partnership with development actors, including humanitarian organisations, specialising in sectors related to food security is recommended when the Red Cross intervenes in cross-disciplinary domain of food security to avoid the fragmentation of efforts.

The development of other revenue streams must take place in a context where support for agricultural activities is significantly limited by the scarcity of water resources available for agriculture. In the same way, support for post-harvest activities is necessary to reduce the risk of losses due to poor packaging and trade that puts small producers at a disadvantage. In addition, the construction of adequate crop production and management infrastructure is recommended once the level of local production has improved to ensure the continuity of good practices.

Behavioural change in nutrition and community health can only be achieved through an inclusive approach involving the key decision-makers in a household, in other words, both the man and the woman.

Three final key points are also recommended to develop a food security project in a context similar to that of the FIHAVOTSE Project:

- Communication activities combined with an internal monitoring and evaluation system would enable the Red Cross to improve its own learning and project implementation.
- The duration of the project should allow the target groups to be autonomous when the project team withdraws its support; an optimal duration of three or five years is suggested if funds permit.
- It is also recommended that a procurement procedures manual is developed taking into account the specific context of the implementation of activities to avoid delays that often undermine the project when it comes to supporting small family farms.

## Chapter 1. Introduction



The International Federation of the Red Cross and the Malagasy Red Cross secured financial support from the Spanish International Cooperation Agency towards the implementation of a food security project in the Amboasary Atsimo District, of the Anosy Region in Southern Madagascar.

The FIHAVOTSE Project was initiated in March 2015 and implemented for 24 months. At the time of conducting the project's final evaluation, the project Team was in the administrative closure phase of the project, and had a skeleton staff consisting of the Project Manager, the Agricultural technician, the WASH technician, an administrative and financial assistant, the driver and a caretaker.

Two rural communes marked by particularly alarming levels of food and nutritional insecurity were selected for this initial intervention. These were the Marotsiraka and Tranomaro Communes, which are both in the northern part of the Amboasary Atsimo District. At the time the evaluation was conducted, the Amboasary

Atsimo district had an IPC level of 4, which indicates an emergency phase in terms of food aid for about 100,000 to 150,000 people<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, the prevalence rate of chronic acute malnutrition among children under the age of 5 in Amboasary Atsimo district had attained an alarming level of 47%. The final evaluation of the project was therefore carried out in this context.

The evaluation team was made up of two members of staff from the PMER Department of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) Nairobi office, a monitoring and evaluation specialist from the Rwanda Red Cross Society (RRCS) and a national consultant with expertise in the evaluation of food security projects. The evaluation was conducted from July 9 to 21, 2017, including 7 days in the field and 2 days in Antananarivo, and excluding the time spent traveling to the site and returning to Antananarivo.

<sup>2</sup> FAO, April 2017, SISAV, Food Security Cluster, Integrated food security Phase Classification (October 2016 – April 2017), Computer graphics from the communes

## Chapter 2. Aim – Objectives of the final evaluation

The final evaluation of the FIHAVOTSE Project was conducted to assess the level of achievement of the objectives set for the project as well as the challenges faced by the Malagasy Red Cross while implementing a food and nutrition security project in the south of Madagascar. Subsequently, this analysis could be used for the development of a new food security project with a broader scope and a similar context that covers an area with vulnerable populations.

To conduct this evaluation, the following definition of food security formed the basis of our investigations:

***" Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life." (Definition from the World Food Summit, 1996)***

In more specific terms, the objectives of the evaluation were:

- **Relevance:** To assess the extent to which the activities identified met the needs of the target groups in relation to the expected results of the project
- **Effectiveness:** To assess the extent to which the activities implemented have achieved the expected results of the project
- **Efficiency:** To assess the extent to which the activities implemented have achieved the project's expected outcomes.
- **Early signs of impact and sustainability:** To assess the project's approach to reaching the most vulnerable groups and improving their level of food security, and determine the extent to which the expected outcomes make it possible to achieve the specific objective set by the project.
- **Coverage:** To assess the extent to which the project complements the geographic gaps among local stakeholders and targets activities in synergy with efforts already made locally, while focusing on the most vulnerable groups.
- **Coordination:** To assess the number and quality of local partnerships and coordination efforts that have created added value for the project and avoided the risk of duplication.

In a cross-cutting manner, the evaluation assessed the extent to which this project has improved the image of Malagasy Red Cross at the local, regional and national levels and has helped to strengthen the technical and institutional capacities of Malagasy Red Cross in the implementation of development projects through the establishment of a regional branch.

## Chapter 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Methods

Given the time allocated and the limited resources (human and financial) with which to conduct the evaluation, a method of seeking qualitative information was preferred for this final evaluation.

As a matter of fact, twelve work days were spent collecting information, including five days of data collection in the project intervention communes and two days of literature review at the Malagasy Red Cross headquarters. The remaining days were spent traveling between the capital - Antananarivo and the

communities (*fokontany*) in which the FIHAVOTSE Project was implemented, located around 1,000km away from the capital.

The qualitative research method comprised mainly of i) collection and analytical review of existing literature, ii) semi-structured interviews with key informants, iii) group discussions, iv) direct participant observation.

## 3.2. Methodological Approach

Given this methodological choice and based on the terms of reference presented in Annex 1, the following approach was adopted:

### 3.2.1. Support accorded to the evaluation team at the Malagasy Red Cross headquarters

The aim of this support was to standardise the information available from each consultant and to firm up on the methodology initially proposed. The Secretary General, the Programme Director, and the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer helped in completing this activity. It was held on 12/07/2017 and was concluded on 13/07/2017. The tools were then printed by the Malagasy Red Cross headquarters team.

### 3.2.2. Review of Existing Literature

The documents collected and available were:

- The initial Project proposal document
- The baseline assessment report
- The narrative annual reports produced by the project Team (2015 and 2016)
- The mid-term review report
- The dashboard of indicators
- Indicator monitoring data by activity sector
- The *Bulletin SISAV*, No. 29 (October 2016 – April 2017)
- Computer graphics from the communes – IPC (October 2016 – April 2017)

The review of these documents was carried out in Antananarivo and on the first day we went to Amboasary Atsimo. They enabled us to have an overview of the project after two years of implementation and an initial assessment of the evaluation criteria.

### 3.2.3. Finalisation of the evaluation tools

The evaluation tools used successively during the baseline study (August 2015) and the mid-term evaluation (November 2016) were adopted and refined to ensure their compliance with the objectives of this final evaluation and capture the information required for the analysis. The list of finalised tools is provided in section 5.2 of this report.

### 3.2.4. Selection of the areas to be evaluated

Given the time we had to carry out the evaluation, it was decided that the number of communities (*fokontany*) where evaluation measures would be carried out would be 6 out of the 10 in which the project was implemented.

The criterion of progress towards the achievement of indicators was applied. The next step was to identify a locality for each commune:

- having achieved the most indicators
- having achieved the least indicators
- defined as a “control area” and having made reasonable progress

The areas selected are presented in the table below:

Commune	Assessment criterion	Locality/ <i>Fokontany</i> selected
Marotsiraka	+	Mahatalaky Berano– Mitsinjo
	+/-	Analamena
	+/-	Ambinanivelo
Tranomaro	+/-	Tsilamaha II
	+/-	Tanambao Morafeno
	-	Amborompotsy

### 3.2.5. Selection of Participants in the Group Discussions and Respondents for the Interviews

#### 3.2.5.1. Group Discussions

Considering the prevailing socio – cultural situation in the Project’s area of intervention, it was decided that a “gender “marker be introduced in the case of those participating in the group. Subsequently, another discussion group was formed to understand the improved well-being in the target groups.

In this regard, the three discussion groups created in each locality were:

- Direct beneficiaries - “men”
- Direct beneficiaries - “women”
- VSLA (village savings and loan associations) or IGAs (income-generating activities) Group or as the case may be

Commune	<i>Fokontany</i>	Number of focus group discussions		
		Men	Women	Mixed
Marotsiraka	Ambinanivelo			1
	Analamena	1	1	1
	Mahatalaky			1
Tranomaro	Amborompotsy	1	1	
	Tanambao Morafeno	1	1	
	Tsimalaha II			1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

The number of participants per group ranged from 9 - 25 persons (male - female). However, sometimes "mixed" groups of more than 30 people were formed. On average, the discussions lasted between 1.5 hours to 2.5 hours.

### 3.2.5.2. Semi-structured interviews

As regards the semi-structured interviews, the respondents were targeted on the basis of the information collected during the group discussions. They were people who have accurate and specific information on the project outcomes and the progress of the indicators.

The following table summarises the different key informants interviewed during this evaluation.

Category	Responsibility/ occupation /Position within (in relation to) the project	Surname and given names
Senior Manager at the Malagasy Red Cross Headquarters	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer – FIHAVOTSE Project	Raharison Heritiana
Member of the regional branch of Malagasy Red Cross	Regional Coordinator	Lucien
	Regional President	Vaviniriako Joliette
Executive Team of the FIHAVOTSE Project	Project Head	Randriatsitohaina Jean Marcellin
Actor in the project intervention zone	Local Representative UNICEF – Nutrition – Anosy Region (Amboasary Sud and Fort Dauphin Districts)	Razanamahefa Mamy <sup>3</sup>
Community Health Services – Marotsiraka	Community Worker– Health and Nutrition	2 Community Workers per <i>fokontany</i> considered in the evaluation, i.e. 12 CWs interviewed
Community Health Services – Tranomaro	Community Worker – Health and Nutrition	2 Community Workers per <i>fokontany</i> considered in the evaluation, i.e. 12 CWs interviewed
District Health Services	Medical Inspector of the Amboasary Atsimo District	
Regional Nutrition Office (Anosy)	Coordinator of the Nutrition Office in the Anosy Region	
Marotsiraka Commune	Mayor	Monja Tsilavenoke
	Second Deputy Mayor	Andriamahavelo
	Chairperson of the Town Council	Monja Edouard
	Town Councillor	Mahatondra
	Secretary Treasurer Accountant	Mahafeno Anselme
	Administrative Secretary	Koto Lambo Jean Baptiste
Tranomaro Commune	Mayor	Ramiandrinirina Rigdwil Dauphin

<sup>3</sup> He knows the Southern zone, having worked for several development NGOs for ten years, then with UNICEF for two years. At the same time he pioneered the FIHAVOTSE project.

Category	Responsibility/ occupation /Position within (in relation to) the project	Surname and given names
	Secretary	Monja Bienvenu
Chiefs of <i>Fokontany</i> – Marotsiraka Commune	3 <i>fokontany</i> chiefs– involved in the evaluation	
Chiefs of <i>Fokontany</i> – Marotsiraka Commune	3 <i>fokontany</i> chiefs – involved in the evaluation	

### 3.2.6. Presentation of the Results and Debriefing with the Malagasy Red Cross Team

An initial debriefing meeting was held on July 19, 2017 with the FIHAVOTSE Project manager in Fort Dauphin to present the results of the evaluation.

A second sharing and debriefing meeting was held at the Malagasy Red Cross headquarters, Tsaralalana - Antananarivo, on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2017 for one hour. The Secretary General, the Programme Director and the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer were in attendance. After the presentation of the results of the evaluation, the officials at the headquarters of the Malagasy Red Cross informed the team of evaluators about the ongoing restructuring process and the commitment of the Malagasy Red Cross to take the recommendations into consideration during the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of future projects.

### 3.2.7. Drafting and Submission of the Final Evaluation Report

The report was drafted as the data was being collected and shared within the evaluation team. It was produced in one Microsoft Word document. A draft version was submitted to the Malagasy Red Cross on July 26, 2017, while the final report was submitted on September 4, 2017. A reprinted version and a CD were submitted to the Malagasy Red Cross on September 13, 2017.

## 3.3. Evaluation Tools

The evaluation tools used in collecting primary data in the field are presented in Annex 2 of this report. As a reminder, these were:

- The semi-structured interview guide for the community leaders
- The semi-structured interview guide for the Project’s Executive Team and members of the regional branch of Malagasy Red Cross
- Group discussion Guide for the Project’s stakeholders
- Group discussion Guide for the Project’s direct beneficiaries
- Questionnaire for the IGA groups

**N.B:** The tools were developed in English. They were verbally translated into French during the data collection in the field, according to the respondents’ ability to provide answers.

### 3.4. Limitations of the methodology

In view of the time allocated for the evaluation and the available budget, the evaluation team used a qualitative methodology. Although the tools were used in a systematic and rigorous manner, some information, such as the number of volunteers and supervisors from the Malagasy Red Cross whose capacity has been enhanced and those who have been trained as part of this project, could not be systematically triangulated. Indeed, due to the lack of information on this aspect at the beginning of the mission, the evaluation team did not systematically ask for this information during the interviews and focus group discussions in each *fokontany*. However, the District Branch President and the Regional Coordinator claim that this team of volunteers existed - at the end of the mission - without initiating any further verification.

Considering that the project is in the administrative closing phase, it has not yet been possible to produce a narrative or financial report for the first half of 2017. However, we would like to point out that the two project reports for 2015 and 2016 are available on request. They provide an accurate picture of the project. The time allotted for the evaluation did not make it possible to exhaustively identify all the achievements of the first half of 2017, which is also the final phase of the project.

## Chapter 4. Results of the final evaluation

### 4.1. General information: A project and development opportunity for the people of South Madagascar

The FIHAVOTSE Project was developed and implemented in accordance with the mandate assigned to the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in particular, for the Malagasy National Society. The Red Cross as an auxiliary of the public authority acted in compliance with its 7 principles in the exercise of its mandate and substantially improved the living conditions and the level of food security for the population targeted by the project.

The FIHAVOTSE Food Security Project was implemented for the benefit of the most vulnerable populations in the Marotsiraka and Tranomaro communes, where very few humanitarian and development actors have systematically intervened since 2008. The conditions for implementation - among others, the state of the road necessitating at least 2 hours<sup>4</sup> travel to the nearest village – were difficult, but tangible results were achieved in the two communities. Innovations, which can be replicated by the beneficiaries, were introduced: new agricultural activities, new agricultural practices, hygiene and sanitation practices. At the end of the evaluation, it was acknowledged that the expected results were attained, with the exception of supply of clean water in Marotsiraka Commune which is still awaiting finalisation.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tranomaro is located 62km in the North of Amboasary Atsimo and is accessed through an untarmacked road, while Marotsiraka is located 152 Km in the North-West.

However, the evaluators would like to point out that the target groups in Tranomaro Commune do not have as many sources of income as those in Marotsiraka Commune. Since the latter have huge tracts of productive and irrigable farmlands, agricultural support activities provided adequate solutions, but this same solution seemed less efficient for the Tranomaro Commune. In a nutshell, the communes do not have the same exploitable natural resources and the livelihoods of each target community are also different. It is evident that prescribing similar solutions would lead to two different results for the target households.

The number of households that are beneficiaries of the project, grouped in 10 *fokontany* in these two communes, is estimated at 55% of the total number of the beneficiaries projected in the initial project document. However, this part of Anosy Region has a relatively low population density per km<sup>2</sup> and an increase in the number *fokontany* in the intervention would lead to a significant increase in the operational costs.

In view of the encouraging results obtained by the FIHAVOTSE Project and the need to consolidate its achievements, continuation of these activities is highly recommended to get a return on investments agreed by the project's partners and promoters since 2015 for the benefit of these two communes.

#### 4.2. Relevance: An action responding to the needs of the target groups and in line with the national and regional goals

The FIHAVOTSE Project is relevant in the sense that the proposed activities address the needs of the groups targeted by the project, namely the most vulnerable in the community: households with a high level of food insecurity and in particular women and children.

Food insecurity in the two communes involved in the project is essentially caused by inadequate or lack of agricultural production in each household. This low level of production is mainly because of rudimentary farming techniques and low-quality inputs leading to low productivity, less diversified livelihoods and a market which is often to the disadvantage of small scale farmers. The proposed activities which target improvement of productivity and diversification of agricultural activities at the level of family farming constitute a sufficient response to this need.

Severe and moderate acute malnutrition affecting children aged below 5 years and poor health standards are caused by lack of food with high nutritive value in households, inadequate access to clean water, and limited knowledge of hygiene. The project also seeks to address this issue by proposing activities aimed at changing the culinary practices, the provision of clean water and behaviour change on matters pertaining to hygiene.

During the last two years of project implementation, the environmental, economic and social context in which the project conducted its baseline study has not changed, and therefore the project remains relevant in addressing the needs of the target groups.

### 4.3. Efficiency: Positive, but largely dependent on the agricultural potential of the area of intervention

#### 4.3.1. Marotsiraka Rural Commune

The project is efficient to the extent that:

##### **Result 1: Target households increase and diversify their production for food and nutrition**

New agricultural practices were introduced, in the form of techniques (improved rice cultivation, mulching, crop rotation, no-tillage) and new crop varieties (fruit, pulses, vegetables, rice variety X265). The beneficiaries not only acquired the necessary skills, but the productivity also increased and losses arising from insufficient water supply reduced substantially, through techniques such as mulching on the parcels.

Consequently, the total volume of agricultural production intended for food almost doubled in the target households. For example, a household living in Mahatalaky which produced 1 tonne of paddy rice between 2015 and 2016 produced 1.75 tonnes of paddy rice from the same area of rice growing fields in 2016-2017. The households generally plan to stock paddy rice or white rice, maize and groundnuts during



Two women in Marotsiraka – Analamena Commune (left) and Mahatalaky (right) who have a stock of paddy rice, maize, groundnuts for the coming months. **Photos:** 14-15 July 2017

the hunger season. Results from group discussions demonstrated that the hunger period<sup>5</sup> reduced significantly, from 6-7 months to 1-2 months maximum, during this year.

**Result 2: Target households improved access to clean water for domestic use, irrigation and their livestock.**

During the project evaluation, the water supply system in Marotsiraka was not yet fully operational. Although the project had envisaged wells equipped with manually operated pumps, the depth of the water table was estimated to be over 50m which would significantly increase the investment made. The Project Team, therefore, decided to renovate the existing system and extend it to all the 5 *fokontany*. Two villages out of the five have now been connected to the distribution network, the others are waiting for the delivery of distribution pipes.

At a training, members of the water management committee participated in the technical operations of the system and rules for the management of water points were established and validated by an assembly of users in each *fokontany*.

The irrigation of agricultural plots was not an activity identified within the framework of this project. However, the Project Team is collaborating with AVSF, an NGO which is currently operating within the context of a food security programme run by the European Union – to construct a hydro-agricultural network that will directly benefit the households targeted by the FIHAVOTSE Project.



**Left:** Group discussion in Mahatalaky; in the background, a newly constructed water reservoir with a capacity of 20m<sup>3</sup>. **Right:** One of the operational water points in Berano Fokontany.

**Result 3: The target households adopt improved nutritional practices, in particular men and women taking care of young children.**

The series of trainings in culinary techniques conducted improved the nutritional value of the foods consumed daily by the target households and resulted in a drop in the number of malnourished children referred to the Primary Health Care Centres. Every day, the meals in the target households have a variety

<sup>5</sup> The hunger period is principally equated to a reduction in the rice consumed per household per day.

of raw and cooked vegetables (carrots, tomatoes, onions, garlic, etc.), and fruits like paw paws. According to information obtained from the Primary Health Care Centre II of Mahatalaky, 70 children were admitted every week in 2015, while there were only 4 in the health centre during the final evaluation.

During the final evaluation, most of the households had a wide range of food items with high nutritional value like white cassava, groundnuts, paw paws, tomatoes and green leafy vegetables. In the agricultural plots, varieties of vegetables and legumes like garlic, large onions, cabbages and beans continued to be tended to by the target groups.

Breastfeeding mothers are convinced of the benefits of exclusive breastfeeding for six months and have abandoned practices of weaning their babies at 3 months.

Although the water supply is not yet fully operational, the households interviewed and visited adopted appropriate practices to have clean and safe drinking water: i) drinking water is boiled, ii) breastfeeding mothers clean their nipples before breastfeeding, iv) women wash their hands before preparing meals, v) target households have constructed and use pit latrines.



Visual improvement of community health, particularly for children and expectant and breastfeeding mothers.

#### **Result 4: Target households improved their sources of income.**

According to the Project Team's internal monitoring and evaluation document, about 34% of the vegetables produced are sold as an extra source of income, essentially for buying food and basic household items. Investigations done during the final evaluation demonstrated that production of paddy rice, groundnuts and beans is clearly divided into two: one half is reserved for food and the other half is for reconstituting productive capital for buying cattle (zebu), carts, land parcels, etc. As pertains to food, the households sold their produce from groundnuts, garlic, onions and beans to buy white rice in preparation for the hunger period. Other households invested in poultry farming and goat and sheep rearing to earn an extra income.

**Opposite:** A household that sold half of its harvest of groundnuts to buy white rice.

**Below:** A young producer planning to sell a half of his harvest from rice to buy zebu.



#### 4.3.2. Tranomaro Rural Commune

The project, though efficient, has its limitations.

#### **Result 1: Target households increase and diversify the production for food, nutrition and income**



**Left:** Production of groundnuts prepared by some women in Amborompotsy. **Right:** A parcel of land of legumes completely dry during the flowering and the first pods at Tanambao Morafeno.

In respect of the diversification of production, the introduction of vegetables and legumes was of interest to the target households, who continue to grow them on productive land located close to water sources. At the time of evaluation, the target households continued growing green leafy vegetables (*bok-choy*, etc.), carrots, zucchinis, tomatoes and cabbages which require regular watering. This practice enables target households to eat fresh vegetables every day, but currently their sale is not a good source of income since the vegetables – except for green leafy vegetables – do not get buyers in the local market. The local population does not yet know how to cook them. However, the farming method (for legumes)

highly dependent on rainfall has been a failure. The agricultural land dried up despite irrigation since the ground temperature was extremely high. The target households introduced mulching techniques and know the advantages of this technique during the dry period.

Some target households, however, decided to acquire bigger land parcels in a neighbouring *fokontany* known as Anjamiary to cultivate beans since they had acquired good seeds and improved farming techniques. According to their testimony, these parcels of land also served as rice growing fields because there is a water source available but it is rudimentarily developed and deteriorates rapidly in the event very light showers.

**Result 2: Target households have improved access to clean water for domestic use, irrigation as well as watering their livestock.**

Six wells equipped with manually operated pumps were rehabilitated by the FIHAVOTSE Project – in partnership with UNICEF – in the 5 village of the intervention in Tranomaro Rural Commune. Each *fokontany* had a well rehabilitated except in one where the population is too high necessitating the rehabilitation of two wells. The Malagasy Red Cross rehabilitated the wells, while UNICEF provided India Mark III pumps and catered for their installation. The training of local technicians for the repair and maintenance of pumps has not yet been done. However, the users have come up with clear management rules to preserve their functional state.

According to testimonies by women who fetch water from these wells, the quality of the water is better (Tanambao Morafeno) because diarrhoeal diseases are rare among children since the pump was put into operation. Moreover, they have two to three times bigger volumes of water (Amborompotsy) during the day since the time to fetch water has been greatly reduced. Before it used to take three hours for a 20-litre jerry can, while currently it takes 20 minutes for the same volume. They can therefore fetch water at least 3 times before getting tired.



**Left:** A young mother fetching water 150m away from her home in Tanambao Morafeno.

**Right:** Mother accompanied by her children fetches water 500m away from her home in Amborompotsy

**Result 3: Target households adopt improved nutritional practices, particularly men and women taking care of young children.**

There are numerous children suffering from acute malnutrition in Tranomaro *fokontany*. According to the community health worker in Amborompotsy, 140 children were treated in 2015 and all of them regained their normal weight within few months. At the same time, the production of vegetables and legumes was also introduced. During the evaluation, 40 tested positive for moderate acute malnutrition due to lack of good agricultural production in households.

Nevertheless, good nutritional and hygiene practices were observed among breastfeeding mothers and those taking care of young children, namely exclusive breastfeeding up to the age of six months, cleaning of nipples and cooking fresh vegetables daily when they are available.

It was noted that despite the construction of pit latrines in most villages, children continue to defecate in the open. It could be assumed that the latrines are not really adapted to their small size or they have not specifically been taught on how to use the latrines.



**Above:** Mature zucchinis **Opposite:** New plantation of carrots and tomatoes (Tanambao Morafeno)

#### **Result 4: The target households improved their sources of income**

Regarding the activities conducted under the FIHAVOTSE Project, there was no tangible improvement in income.

Small-scale livestock keeping would have been a good response to the extent that some villages have large tracts of pastureland for sheep and goats. For example, the Amborompotsy *fokontany* receives several hundreds of zebu herds from Amboasary Atsimo during the rainy season in the pasturelands and the park bearing in mind that pasturelands are used for agriculture during this period in Amboasary Atsimo.

#### **4.3.3. Development of the regional branch of Malagasy Red Cross**

#### **Result 5: The regional branch of the Malagasy Red Cross is engaged in an institutional development process**

In terms of institutional development, the Malagasy Red Cross Society undertook re-energisation and training of volunteers and local leaders. The branch has been actively involved in the local activities of the Red Cross including the implementation of this food security project in Amboasary Atsimo District.

Within the context of re-energising volunteers, the IFRC team organised a training session on Accountability to Community (AtC) for trainers, local leaders and FIHAVOTSE Project team. Unfortunately, midway through the activity, it emerged that the re-energising has not yet taken place. Consequently, this aspect was one of the recommendations of the evaluation mission in November 2016.

During the final evaluation, the following points were highlighted:

- **Volunteers registered in the project's intervention sites** but due to the lack of registration forms, the District Chairlady- as well as the facilitator- provided exercise books in the community for this purpose. The Regional Coordinator of the branch, based in Taolagnaro, confirmed the non-existence of an up to-date database of volunteers. Funds for the branch's operational costs- almost solely drawn from contributions, possible donations and small income-generating activities – are modest and limit the regular coordination with the local volunteer team.
- **Volunteers were trained on 'first-aid techniques'**. Although other training activities are in the pipeline, there are no resources available. Early warnings on climatic shocks and community training on health and nutrition are among the themes which have been identified.
- **Two monitoring missions of the activities of FIHAVOTSE Project were conducted by the Regional Coordinator and governing members**, were deemed inadequate in view of the volume of work undertaken by the project among the Marotsiraka and Tranomaro communities. At the end of the monitoring missions, annual reports were sent to the Regional Coordinator and discussions held with the Project Manager.

**The regional branch is facing a huge challenge:** lack of strategic planning tailored to its context drawing from the strategic plan of the Red Cross developed at the national level. The Anosy regional branch must, for instance, evolve in a context where the head office of the branch is very remote compared to other districts and even some communes of Taolagnaro District, to which it belongs at the administrative level, which could lead to extremely high logistical costs in terms of communication and coordination. It should therefore develop a communication and coordination model which takes into account the very limited resources.

#### 4.4. Efficiency: Transforming resources into tangible results at all levels

**FIHAVOTSE is efficient** in more than one respect:

- FIHAVOTSE's total budget is € 500,000 including operational and administrative costs. This is equivalent to € 64.70 per person on average in order to obtain the aforementioned results. Strictly speaking, € 64.7 per person is an investment which can enable an agricultural family to improve its livelihood, level of food security and hygiene practices for a period of two years. In a family of 6, € 389 is the investment required to improve the level of food security in this area.
- Nevertheless, it is important to note that investment in clean water is higher since it is € 14 per user, which is approximately 22% of this amount, excluding operational and administrative costs of MRCS and IFRC. Considering that infrastructure is the costliest component in development projects, in this case, the project demonstrated its efficiency by using the local human resources to reduce to the maximum the expenditure incurred by the project, while at the same time training local maintenance technicians on how to operate the water supply system equipment.
- Concerning agriculture, the project encouraged the target households to also use local resources to protect biodiversity. The use of rice straws for mulching to preserve soil moisture and prevent growing of weeds for market gardening has been widely adopted in Marotsiraka Commune. Savanna grass is also used for the same purpose in Tranomaro. According to the testimonies of the people interviewed, the interest shown in grass significantly contributed to the reduction of bush fires in the vicinity of the project's areas of intervention.

## 4.5. Impacts and sustainability: encouraging early signs for more sustained support

For a project implemented for just over two years, the impact and sustainability analysis can neither be fully objective nor appropriate. However, the evaluation team identified some early signs of impact and sustainability which should be highlighted during the final evaluation.

### 4.5.1. Marotsiraka Rural Commune

In terms of impacts, small scale farmers adopting new agricultural techniques introduced by the FIHAVOTSE Project increased significantly during the 2016-2017 crop season. For instance, 117 first time adopters used improved rice cultivation, and market gardening is being currently used in the *fokontany* neighbouring the sites of intervention. For the first group of small scale farmers who had been targeted by the project, market gardening has become a permanent source of income because they succeeded in growing off-season crops and getting better prices. They have been able to save for their children's higher education (junior secondary school and high school).

**In terms of sustainability**, 6 savings and credit societies exist in the 5 *fokontany* in Marotsiraka Rural Commune (see photo opposite). The weekly savings amount for each member is MGA 500. The total savings range from MGA 5,500 to MGA 200,000 depending on the length of time the group has existed. According to members, these savings will be used to develop the existing sources or new sources of income. The majority of them are planning to invest in small scale livestock rearing (chicken, sheep and goats) for which the area is well known. It is also acknowledged that the produce from market gardening can be combined with small scale livestock keeping because they are sources of quality food. Small scale farmers prefer practising market gardening to feed their own livestock instead of selling the produce at a loss. On the contrary, the prices of poultry, sheep and goats never drop.



Lastly, small scale farmers – among the target households and adopters – learnt how to structure themselves, develop mutual assistance methods and identify themselves using by the project's approach. This new form of 'solidarity economy' is a strong base for the sustainability of FIHAVOTSE Project's results.

### 4.5.2. Tranomaro Rural Commune

The impact and sustainability of the project in Marotsiraka is not similar to what happened in Tranomaro. It is evident that some positive aspects are visible in the communities: i) the determination to develop market-gardening crops, ii) the acceptance by the target households to diversify food, iii) the determination to reverse the inflationary trends of acute malnutrition among children aged under 5 years through the improvement of family agriculture, and iv) the conviction among parents to change hygiene practices for their well-being and that of their families. However, this determination is only present in a

small number of target households and a critical mass is necessary to ensure the sustainability of these positive aspects.

#### 4.7. Coordination: Good, but there is still room for improvement at the devolved technical departments.

The FIHAVOTSE Project is particularly known by the local players for its intervention in an area which is renowned for all manner of banditry and violence and zebu rustling. The Anosy Region Nutrition Office was among the first government agencies to collaborate with the FIHAVOTSE Project to monitor its activities in the area of intervention. The Agricultural Services Centre (CSA) of Amboasary Atsimo District has provided its technical support to select the appropriate agricultural activities. Lastly, the district health services and primary health-care centres (CSB I and II) have been coordinating with the project for medical evacuations to the nearest referral hospitals. During the implementation of the project, the MRCS saved the lives of 24 young girls during delivery when they required emergency caesarean operations.

MRCS is a member the nutrition, WASH and food security clusters in the Amboasary South District. It therefore provides data on these sectors and also receives advice and technical support through the members of these clusters. This is how, for example, UNICEF was able to supply India Mark III pumps which were installed in the five *fokontany* in the Tranomaro Rural Commune. It is also through the active presence of MRCS in these clusters that the launch of the exclusive breastfeeding week and maternal and child health week was celebrated in these two communes, not only enhancing the visibility of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and its actions, but also the visibility of these communes which have for far too long been 'side-lined' from development interventions.

The working relations between the commune and *fokontany* are in the form of daily support for the facilitation of activities of the target communities.

#### 4.8. Coverage: Small population reached, but a strategic location for a snowball effect

The FIHAVOTSE Project targeted a total 7,721 people in its intervention areas. This number is equivalent to 55% of the initial targets of the project. Although MRCS maintained the number of *fokontany* in accordance with the criterion of prioritisation, these villages are sparsely populated, thus reducing the total number of target households. An increase in the number of beneficiaries will involve more villages in the intervention, resulting in an increase in local logistics costs.

Located respectively at 152km and 62km from the county town of Amboasary Atsimo along an earth road where the project office is found, the MRCS's intervention in Marotsiraka and Tranomaro communes has eliminated the geographical coverage deficit in the entire Amboasary Atsimo District. The continuity of such an intervention will facilitate the elimination of multiple pockets of poverty in remote areas and engage a process of sustainable development.

The activities carried out by the Red Cross are guided by the principle of complementarity with partners who came late onto the scene. In this regard, UNICEF, for instance, intervened at the tail end of taking care of children suffering from severe and moderate acute malnutrition, whereas the Red Cross intervened upstream, in the community to raise awareness and prevent occurrence of these cases.

Similarly, the Red Cross has invested widely in the improvement of agricultural techniques and development of market-gardening, while the intervention of AVSF in Marotsiraka focuses on the rehabilitation and extension of hydro-agricultural infrastructure to enable the communities to improve their livelihoods.

## Chapter 5. Lessons Learnt

Food security is composed of 4 main dimensions: accessibility, availability and utilisation of foods, with a cross-cutting pillar on sustainability. On behalf of the MRCS, the evaluation mission compiled the following lessons based on these four pillars and the concept of food security addressed at the beginning of this report. This chapter also highlights the lessons on the standards for management of the development and humanitarian project.

- The immediate, underlying and root causes of food insecurity stem from multiple interlinked social, economic, political, environmental and technical factors. The players who are able to provide solutions to this problem are diverse and varied. Therefore, the local coordination of activities is of primary importance to achieve concrete results which impact positively on the level of food security of the target groups. The FIHAVOTSE Project was involved in the coordination during the implementation that led to a synergy of water supply activities with UNICEF. The synergy made it feasible to construct more than the total of number of water points envisaged (12 instead of 10 in Marotsiraka Commune and all those planned in Tranomaro Commune) demonstrating the efficiency of the implementation of this action.
- When the prerequisites for agriculture are met, food accessibility can be achieved within a relatively short period. These preconditions mainly include the availability of water for irrigation, adoption of good farming techniques and access to selected seeds and inputs, especially fertiliser. This project indicated that subsistence farming is very vulnerable to rainfall variation and rise in temperature, as was the case in Tranomaro Commune where in two consecutive years the small-scale farmers' efforts were in vain. The communities in Tranomaro have mitigated this kind of risk by basing their means of livelihood on small scale livestock rearing. However, the project did not consider support in this sector of activity, that comprised a different but potentially effective mode of operation, enabling the target groups to have access to food through other means other than subsistence farming.
- In the same vein, subsistence farming is not the only means to access food since the availability of food must also be perceived from several angles. In the case of this project, food would be available in the market before the individual household level. An important lesson is to seek other sources of monetary income when the target groups are in a situation where it is impossible to have their food through the 'farm to the table' process.
- Food preparation sessions were primarily used by the project to demonstrate the adequate use of food, particularly for people taking care of young children. However, the project was also an opportunity to select in consultation with the participants, the types of crops they would wish to plant on their own land parcels. The approach based on the preference of each target group seemed efficient because it ensured ownership. For the Marotsiraka Commune, the ownership of this new agricultural practice was such that the target groups avoided the period of low market prices and changed their production seasons to avoid overproduction. Nevertheless, unfamiliarity with fresh

agricultural produce (zucchinis, cucumbers, carrots, etc.) among consumers shopping in the market constitutes a big obstacle in improving the income of the small-scale producers. The small-scale producers of Tranomaro Commune were confronted with similar challenges despite their production of good vegetables. The behaviour - change goals need to be extended to non-agricultural consumers who also do their shopping in the local market.

- Sustainability should be analysed from the perspective of food availability throughout the year, and in any case for this action, keeping in mind that this analysis is not appropriate given that the project has been implemented for less than two years. In Marotsiraka Commune, the hunger period reduced from 6-7 months to 1-2 months during the evaluation, while agricultural production increased exponentially. The local market volatility has been one of the causes of the lack of sustainability. Small scale producers who do not have a diversified source of income are subjected to these market setbacks and consequently lose money. Market volatility manifests itself as follows:
  - The prices of agricultural produce are low from the harvest period while the prices of basic commodities and other supplies are excessively high.
  - Six months later, the prices of agricultural produce double and inversely the cost of basic products and supplies are halved. To acquire expensive food, small scale producers forgo supplies, bought at twice the amount, six months earlier.

The storage of agricultural produce or diversification of income sources could contribute to fully achieving sustainability.

Additional lessons were learnt during this evaluation. They pertain to the management of the development project (cycle):

1. According to the FIHAVOTSE Project Team, two new communes were identified to replace the communes in the project proposal, delaying the actual commencement of the implementation by at least three months. One of the communes initially proposed is already enjoying the support of two food security projects by the European Union (AINA and ASARA) while the other one is a concession for sisal production where the local residents are the employees of this company. Considering that the two EU projects began in the second semester of 2013 and the sisal production company has been in operation for over ten years, it shows poor or lack of needs assessment during the formulation of the project. Although there are huge food security needs in the South of Madagascar, there are big variances in the communes and villages in these communes, which justifies that this step of an in-depth needs assessment should not be skipped since it is fundamental for the success of the project. In the case of FIHAVOTSE, the implementation of this essential activity delayed the supply and distribution of seeds and inputs. An opportunity for a crop year was missed.
2. Operational decision-making, operational communication and coordination with the local players [such as civil servants, locally elected leaders, local representatives of the United Nations agencies, representatives of Malagasy NGOs and associations and international NGOs working in the District] were managed by the Project Team, contributing to achievement of the project's objectives, in Marotsiraka Rural Commune. A committed and professional Project Team essentially adds value to the project.

3. In view of the foregoing, well-targeted operational communication largely contributed to improving the image of Malagasy Red Cross in Amboasary Atsimo District. The Project Team undertook several initiatives to promote activities in the communes by piloting or hosting regional events. These operational communications also contributed to advocacy for an intervention in communes which are deemed remote with serious insecurity challenges and populations who have huge food security needs. An international NGO is currently working in Marotsiraka Commune and in the villages where the MRCS is operating to rehabilitate a hydro-agricultural network which will subsequently improve results.
4. Lastly, lengthy procurement procedures constitute a big challenge given the short project duration. The late delivery of seeds once forced the target groups to store the seeds for the next planting season. The project lacked an opportunity for experimentation and learning, but worse still, the beneficiaries missed a crucial planting season for their livelihoods. The gravity-fed water supply system in Marotsiraka is also another case for which the project may lack the time to support the users manage this delicate infrastructure. The delay arising from this lengthy procedure made it impossible to verify the effective operation of this system in all the villages because three out of the five were not yet connected at the time of the final evaluation.

## Chapter 6. Recommendations

The following recommendations have been formulated to enable the MRCS and its implementation partners to improve the formulation, performance, monitoring and evaluation of future projects conducted in a similar context to that of FIHAVOTSE:

- **Modus operandi:** The participatory approach is recognised as a foundation for ownership of activities and the corresponding results by the target groups. Consideration of the contextual specificity and an inclusive approach also contribute to success. The intervention in the Tranomaro Commune did not consider the contextual specificities: support to small scale livestock keeping would have led to better results rather than insisting on subsistence farming yet all the preconditions were not met. A food security project, focusing on household agriculture, should target the two main basic sectors namely, agriculture, and small scale livestock rearing, and propose specific solutions. Moreover, the inclusion of men and women in awareness campaigns is recommended to get better results in terms of the acquisition of new skills, change of attitude and behaviour for the well-being of young children. In their daily lives, women take care of children, but they are connected to men (their partners) when a decision on change influencing the family must be taken. Beyond gender, inclusion is highly recommended to obtain sustainable behaviour change.
- **Implementation of activities:**
  - Food security will be achieved by involving several players from various sectors of activity. The idea of the intervention of food security players is increasingly directed towards building partnerships for the complementarity of actions, right from formulation of the project instead of one actor delivering a package of activities. In future, the MRCS is

encouraged in this sense either (i) by intervening or targeting communes where actors that specialise in basic health care, access to clean water and basic sanitation, local governance already intervene, or (i) by having a series of activities with corresponding funds to actively look for partners during the implementation of the project.

- Reaching a high proportion of the target groups requires investments for the construction of infrastructure for hydro-agriculture or for livestock. They must be part of activities aimed at improving productivity and the volume of agricultural production. Generally hydro-agricultural infrastructure leads to the acquisition of more land for (i) the same land owners, or (ii) new land owners who will be involved in the implementation of the project, while improving productivity. Investments in hydro-agricultural infrastructure, if the conditions allow, should be among the activities and constitute 15% to 25% of the budget allocated directly to the target groups. Developing such infrastructure is similar to the activities conducted by FIVAVOTSE during the two years of its implementation.
  - Post-harvest activities are highly recommended at least during the last year of the project. The objective is two-pronged (i) to influence price variations so that they are beneficial to producers, (ii) to reduce post-harvest losses. Post-harvest activities can be (i) improved storage conditions for dry agricultural products, (ii) giving loans for diversification of sources of income in order to avoid selling agricultural products during a less favourable period, (iii) organising storage or, if necessary, group sales. Other post-harvest activities can always be developed depending on the context.
  - Operational communication and the monitoring and evaluation plan should be formulated in the initial proposal or allocated a specific budgetary line to make them more available from the first quarter of implementation. It is also necessary to provide for a position of a communication and monitoring and evaluation officer in the implementation team to avoid overburdening the project manager with many responsibilities. In addition, an external evaluation is recommended to safeguard the independence of the assessment of the measures and results of the evaluation.
- **Ordering and procurement procedure:** Specific tendering procedures should be developed and applied in accordance with the implementation context: long and short duration, urgent and less urgent activities, exclusive licence for a product or a service, etc. Compliance with fair competition rules, equity of the bidders and transparency should be the only considerations when developing these procedures.
  - **Project Duration:** A food security project dealing with household farming generally requires at least three years. The first year is to construct production infrastructure and begin the development (accessibility and availability), the second year is for intensifying the development (accessibility, availability and use), and the third year is for post-harvest activities (accessibility, availability, use and sustainability or stability). If the resources of a donor do not permit, partnerships should be established to guarantee sustainability of the results. A period of four to five years is however optimal and highly recommended.

## Chapter 7. Conclusion

FIHAVOTSE is a project whose objective is to contribute to the improvement of the level of food security in poor households in Amboasary Atsimo District of the Anosy Region in Madagascar. The project started in March 2015 for a period of two years and was extended for 5 months. The project's baseline study identified two communes for the intervention, namely, Marotsiraka and Tranomaro, and 7,721 direct beneficiaries who met the selection criteria developed by the Red Cross and the local public authorities. The total amount allocated for project was € 500,000 to carry out a series of activities to increase and diversify food in the target households, improve nutritional practices, access to clean water and promote hygiene, improve income and institutional development of the regional branch of the Red Cross. In November 2016, a mid-term review took place to revise the interventions of the project. There were recommendations and lessons learnt. This final evaluation, jointly conducted by an independent national consultant and three members of staff from the PMER Department of IFRC, was carried out from 9 to 21 July 2017 to measure the following aspects: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, early signs of impact and sustainability, coordination with other development players, and project coverage, while verifying the implementation of the recommendations made during the mid-term review.

The evaluation concluded that the FIHAVOTSE Project was implemented in accordance with the mandate of the Red Cross as an auxiliary of the public authorities and in line with the 7 principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The results obtained by the project in the two communes varied insofar as it was relevant, effective, efficient and showed early signs of impacts and sustainability in the target communities in the Marotsiraka Commune, while the same cannot be said for the Tranomaro Commune where the project was seen to be less effective and efficient. However, the project remains relevant in Tranomaro and has shown potential for improvement in respect of activities done within the context of the project, namely market-gardening, reversing the acute malnutrition curve among children and promoting hygiene. The development of small scale livestock rearing was identified as an activity to be supported, but the project missed out on this learning and experimentation opportunity.

The institutional development of the Malagasy Red Cross also did not achieve tangible results due to the fact that re-energisation of local volunteers and facilitators was done in the last months of the project's implementation. The Regional Coordinator was not able to play a major role in monitoring and supporting the project team and also had difficulties keeping up with the pace of activity.

Coordination with local development players, like public authorities, national and international NGOs and associations, and UN agencies, also enabled the Red Cross Society to optimise the allocation of its limited resources and incorporate activities necessary to achieve the objectives of the FIHAVOTSE Project.

In conclusion, FIHAVOTSE developed good practices and interesting lessons for the implementation of a food security project targeting poor populations. This type of project should be replicated in areas in a similar situation or scaled up for the benefit of the neighbouring communities.

## Annexes

### Annex 1: Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

#### Madagascar Food Security Project Final Evaluation

##### 1. Summary:

- 1.1. Purpose:** The overall purpose of this evaluation is to measure the outcomes of programme to find out if there have been any positive or negative changes to the lives and livelihoods of the affected communities and to learn how we can in the future, deliver appropriate food security programmes to the most vulnerable populations.
- 1.2. Audience:** The results will be used by Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC) senior management to foster internal learning to feed into future food security programming, and to share good practices with local, national and international actors in food security and resilience programming.
- 1.3. Commissioners:** This internal review and lessons learnt is being commissioned by IFRC and MRCS in compliance with its Evaluation framework.
- 1.4. Duration:** The evaluation exercise will take 12 days including field travel to the project in South – East Madagascar.
- 1.5. Timeframe:** 9<sup>th</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> July 2017
- 1.6. Methodology summary:** It is expected that the team will use a mixed methods approach which will include: Desk reviews, individual interviews (Key Informant Interviews), Household survey and focus group discussions.
- 1.7. Location:** The Final Evaluation will be conducted in both Antananarivo and visit to project sites in Amboasary district in South- East Madagascar
- 1.8. Requirements:** The team should be well versed with the OECD-DAC criteria for evaluation and must have strong writing skills in English.

##### 2. Background

Madagascar has a population of over 23 million people and in recent years has experienced increasing vulnerability, food insecurity and malnutrition. A combination of factors contributes to this worsening situation and these include frequent drought and cyclones, poor agricultural practices, high levels of environmental degradation, declining soil quality, lack of improved seed and other agricultural inputs, amongst others.

The country is ranked 154<sup>th</sup> out of 187 countries in the 2015 Human Development Index, chronic malnutrition is widespread (about half of children under five years are chronically malnourished) and over 30% of the population lacks adequate food at any time of the year, and is highly exposed to climatic hazards including cyclones, drought, floods and locust invasion, affecting the lives of more than half the population.

Since 2013 Madagascar has experienced prolonged and deepening drought in the south leaving over 1 million people without enough food to eat. The southern part of the country has the highest poverty levels with 90% of the populations earning less than \$2 per day. Due to the semi-arid climate, the southern region is highly vulnerable as most of the population depends on rain fed agriculture and livestock.

It is with this background that Malagasy Red Cross Society (MRCS) selected Amboasary District in Anosy Region to implement a two-year food security project with funding from the Spanish government. The project aims to increase food and nutrition security for poor households in two poor communes (Tranomara and Marotsiraka) of Amboasary district, Anosy Region, South East Madagascar.

**Project Overall Objective:** To increase food and nutrition security of chronically food insecure poor households in Amboasary District, Anosy Region, south east Madagascar.

**Specific Objective:** 3000 poor small-scale farming households in 10 communities (Fokontany) in Amboasary district have improved food and nutrition security.

**Expected Results:**

Result 1: Target households increase and diversify their agricultural (crop and livestock) production for food, nutrition and incomes

Result 2: Target households have increased access to improved water sources for domestic use, irrigation, and for livestock

Result 3: Target households adopt improved nutritional practices for child carers (mothers and fathers) and their children

Result 4: Target households have increased and diversified income generation capacity

### 3. Evaluation purpose & scope

#### 4. 3.1 Purpose

Through this final evaluation, the IFRC & MRCS will analyse the successes and challenges of the Food security project and identify key lessons learnt. The emphasis is on learning to feed into future food security and resilience programming. A baseline assessment was conducted in 2015 followed with a mid-term review in November 2016 and these, in combination with project reports will constitute key documents for the evaluation

#### 3.2 Scope

The Evaluation will be conducted in the two target communes (Marotsiraka and Tranomaro) in Amboasary district. Visits will be made to all the 10 target communities to ensure sufficient understanding of the successes and challenges the project faced.

### 5. Evaluation Criteria – Objectives - Questions

The objectives of the evaluation will be:

1. To measure the appropriateness/relevance of the objectives and strategy
2. To assess the effectiveness and coverage of program implementation (programme quality)
3. To highlight good practice, lessons learnt and areas of improvement to inform future programming.
4. To assess the extent to which programme objectives ensured programme benefits continue beyond donor support

#### 4.2 Evaluation criteria and Questions

The exercise should be carried out in accordance with the IFRC ethics and legality standards ([refer to the IFRC Evaluations Framework / 4.3](#)), and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement's *Fundamental Principles*.

**Relevance and appropriateness:** The extent to which the interventions suited the priorities of the affected population, if other interventions would have been more suitable; how they were revised based on the needs assessments carried out.

**Efficiency:** The extent to which the project was managed in an organised and competent way; if the allocation was adequate to deliver the expected outputs / activities; if the funds were used in the appropriate way; if costs could have been reduced or most cost-effective approaches taken.

**Effectiveness:** The extent to which the project met its intended objectives and outputs ....

**Coverage:** The extent to which the project reached the populations/areas most at risk by the crisis; how the criteria for this was identified/implemented.

**Coordination:** The extent to which coordination occurred with the key stakeholders during the project implementation.

**Sustainability & connectedness:** The extent to which the outcomes of the project will be sustained (where relevant); particularly in relation to capacity and learning gained through the interventions (National Society capacity); and how they can be integrated within MRCS long term food security and resilience programming.

**Accountability:** The IFRC is bound by enabling action 3 of strategy 2020 to commit to a culture of transparent accountability to our stakeholders. Thus, the IFRC/MRCS evaluation team will be guided but not limited by the following question in measuring our accountability:

- To what extent were beneficiaries involved in the planning, design and implementation of the project?
- To what extent was there meaningful participation of project beneficiaries?
- What mechanism was used for community feedback during the project implementation?

**Lessons learnt:** The IFRC/MRCS evaluation team should consider the following areas to measure whether the issues listed were effective and discuss what worked well, what didn't work well, and what could be done to improve in the future.

- i. Operational decision making, communication and coordination among internal and external District and national actors.
- ii. Needs Assessment
- iii. Advocacy and communication
- iv. Logistics (warehousing, transportation and supply chain) and procurement
- v. Implementation reporting

## 6. Evaluation Methodology

The methodology for this evaluation will be developed by the IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team including the sampling techniques to be used. The evaluation team at a minimum is expected to conduct:

- Desk review of all the Madagascar Food Security Project documents reports including the proposal, baseline report, quarterly reports, mid-term report.
- Conduct a household survey (this will not use mobile data collection) for selected project beneficiaries (. This should be complemented with success stories on each of the project interventions (food security, nutrition education, water and income generation).
- Using a standardised tool, conduct Focus Group Discussions with beneficiaries who were part of the project interventions, MRCS staff at Headquarters and field levels, as well as volunteers involved in the project.
- Conduct Stakeholder interviews: MRCS and IFRC staff from relevant technical areas (including former project staff who are willing to participate), PNSs, Government and UN/NGO representatives in Amboasary District.

The evaluation team should ensure data is well triangulated to obtain objective feedback.

## 7. Deliverables (or Outputs)

- **Debriefings:** The IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team will present initial findings in a debrief meeting with MRCS, PNSs and IFRC key personnel in Antananarivo.
- **Report:** The National Consultant will produce a draft evaluation report within 5 days after the field exercise. The IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team members will review and work with the consultant to finalise the report within 10 days after receiving the draft.
- **Any additional deliverables.** In case of any other outputs identified from the evaluation, they shall be documented as case studies, photographic records or presentations for conferences, success stories (from beneficiaries) etc.

The final report shall adopt the headings below:

1. Executive summary
2. Abbreviations/acronyms
3. Introduction
4. Review aims and objectives
5. Methodology
6. Findings (sub headings to include but not limited to appropriateness, efficiency and effectiveness, impact)
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons learnt
9. Conclusion
10. Appendices

## 8. Proposed Timeline (or Schedule)

Date	Event
10 July 2017	Meeting with MRCS and PNSs in Antananarivo, to jointly discuss the evaluation. Interviews in Antananarivo
11 July 2017	Travel to Amboasary Meeting with Project
12– 18 July 2017	Field work
19 July 2017	Travel to Antananarivo
20 July 2017	Final consultations in Antananarivo Debriefing with MRCS, and PNS
21 July 2017	Departure

### Team Composition:

- Team leader is IFRC Africa PMER officer responsible for Evaluations, with the support of RRCS PMER Coordinator, and a national consultant hired by MRCS. The Project Manager and Food Security officer have been retained to support closeout activities, including the final evaluation. The team leader is responsible for managing the review in-country, including the preparation of the report with inputs from interviews, focus group discussions and the survey.
- MRCS and IFRC staff in Antananarivo will be focal points for the evaluation responsible for communicating with NS leadership on plans for evaluation, and to support preparation and provision of relevant documentation, planning and liaison with key informants, organising logistics for the team, as well as analysis and finalisation of review findings and recommendations (including facilitating inputs/feedback from MRCS management).

## 9. Annexes

- Evaluation questions

### Annex 2: Main questions

In order to reach these objectives, this evaluation will focus on eight evaluation criteria including relevance and appropriateness, efficiency, effectiveness, coverage as well as on coordination, sustainability & connectedness and lessons learnt.

#### **Relevance/Appropriateness**

The extent to which the project objectives and activities have been suited to the priorities of the target community as well as conform to the Red Cross Movement principles and code of conduct. The IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team is expected to consider the following questions in measuring relevance/appropriateness:

- To what extent were the objectives of this programme met?
- To what extent were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- To what extent were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- To what extent were the resources or was the support provided appropriate to the beneficiaries (culture, religion)?

#### **Efficiency:**

The extent to which the project was managed in an organised and competent way; if the allocation was adequate to deliver the expected outputs / activities; if costs could have been reduced or most cost-effective approaches taken. The IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team is expected to consider the following questions in measuring effectiveness.

- To what extent was the Project was managed in an organised and competent way?
- To what extent were the activities undertaken cost effective?
- To what extent were there alternative activities that could have been done at a less cost to obtain the same result?
- To what extent were there adequate resources (financial, human, physical and informational) available and were they utilised effectively.

#### **Effectiveness**

To what extent are the interventions likely to achieve their intended results? The MRCS/ IFRC internal evaluation team is expected to consider the following questions in measuring effectiveness.

- To what extent have the program objectives been achieved?
- To what extent were objectives being achieved on time?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of these objectives?

#### **Coverage**

The extent to which the operation was able to reach the populations/areas who are most affected; how the criteria for reaching them were identified/implemented. Thus, the IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team will be guided but not limited by the following question in measuring coverage:

- To what extent were the most vulnerable identified and supported by this project?
- To what extent were there inclusion and exclusion errors?

- Are there exclusions or differential impact between groups based on their location? How could the coverage be improved?

### **Coordination**

One of the important roles of the IFRC secretariat is to coordinate the activities of Red Cross Red Crescent partners. In order to measure if this role is fully satisfied the IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team will be guided but not limited by the following questions:

- To what extent has is this role being fulfilled and is it adequate and constructive?
- How adequate is the coordination with non-Red Cross Red Crescent actors, i.e. clusters, in terms of both the information contributed and the information received through the available mechanisms?
- How adequate is the coordination within the Red Cross Movement?
- What can we learn from this experience?

### **Sustainability/connectedness**

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The IFRC/MRCS internal evaluation team is expected to consider the following question in measuring connectedness.

- What were the major factors which are influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
- Are the benefits of these interventions likely to continue once donor input has been withdrawn?
- Are the communities linked to other actors who can support them in a similar manner to what they had with the MRCS support.

### **Annex 3: Field Visit Programme**

**Duration:** 8 days including travel time from Antananarivo to Amboasary and each site of the FIHAVOTSE Project

**Start Date:** 12 July 2017

**Planned End Date:** 19 July 2017

**Local Contact:** Randriatsitohaina Jean Marcellin –FIHAVOTSE Project Leader

Activities	Day								Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Antananarivo – Taolagnaro trip									Arrival at 8h30 at Taolagnaro
Taolagnaro – Amboasary Atsimo trip									Arrival at Amboasary at 11h30
Interview of the Project Leader									14h 30 – 18 h 30
Interview of the local UNICEF Project Assistant									8h30 – 10h30
<b>Team 1-2:</b> Logistical preparation and Amboasary Atsimo – Marotsiraka - Tsivory trip									Night in Tsivory
Team 1: Focus Group Discussion (men and women)									Analamena (morning)
Team 1: Interview of community leaders (Head of <i>Fokontany</i> –CUMA women’s focal point – Community Health Worker – Chairperson of the Water Committee									
Team 1: Direct participant observation and informal discussion (visit of food stocks- collective and individual granary 6)									
Team 2: Focus Group Discussion (mixed group)									

Activities	Day								Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Team 2: Direct participant observation and informal discussion (visit to demonstration fields-market gardening)									Other <i>fokontany</i> (morning)
Trip to Marotsiraka									
Discussion with the communal team									Mayor's Office (15h – 16h30)
<b>Team 1-2: Marotsiraka - Tsivory trip</b>									Night in Tsivory
Travel: Tsivory – Marotsiraka									7h – 8h
Team 1-2: Focus Group Discussion (mixed group)									Marotsiraka county town (morning)
Visit to the gravity-fed water system									From the pumping station to a standpipe
<b>Team 1-2: Marotsiraka – Amboasary Atsimo trip</b>									Night in Amboasary Atsimo
<b>Team 1-2: Amboasary Atsimo – Tranomaro trip</b>									
Team 1: Focus Group Discussion (men and women)									Fokontany 1
Team 1: Visit to agricultural land parcels and collective water points									
Team 2: Focus Group Discussion (mixed group)									Fokontany 2
Team 1: Focus Group Discussion (men)									Fokontany 3
Team 2: Focus Group Discussion (men)									
Team 1-2: Visit to a collective water point and informal interview with users									
Team 1-2: Tranomaro – Amboasary Atsimo trip									
Interview with the Mayor of Tranomaro and his collaborator									
Interview with the District Chairlady (Malagasy Red Cross)									
Drafting									
Interview with a medical supervisor (Amboasary Atsimo)									
Amboasary Atsimo – Taolagnaro trip									Night in Taolagnaro
Interview with the Regional Coordinator at the Anosy Nutrition Office									
Interview with the Regional Coordinator of the MRCS branch									
Debriefing with the FIHAVOTSE Project Leader									
Drafting									
Taolagnaro-Antananarivo trip									

## IFRC Management Response to Recommendations for the Food Security Project In Madagascar

### Background information:

- **Date and duration of evaluation:** July-Sep 2017
- **Evaluator/s:** Antilahy Herimpitia Estelle Rolande (Consultant)
- **Evaluation Management Response Team members:** Malagasy Red Cross Secretary General and the Programme Manager

### Summary of Management Response:

**Follow up and necessary support will be considered and these recommendations will be taken forward in future planning and implementation**

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p><i>Describe the rationale for the Management Response decision. If the recommendation is fully accepted, this may not be necessary (as the evaluation report itself should justify its recommendations). However, if the recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, be sure to explain the reasons for this decision.</i></p>	<p><i>If the recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, specific key follow-up action/s and deliverable/s required to ensure accepted or partially accepted recommendations are followed and corrective action taken. These planned actions must be incorporated into the responsible departments or units work plans.</i></p>	<p><i>For acted upon recommendations, define the timeframe for follow-up action/s and deliverable/s.</i></p>	<p><i>Identify the department or unit responsible for implementing the follow-up action/s and deliverable/s.</i></p>

**Recommendation 1:** Procedure for ordering and acquisition: of procurement procedures specific should be developed and applied in the context of implementation: long and short duration, activities, urgent or non-urgent, exclusive license to a product or a service, etc. The respect of free competition, the fairness of the tenderers and the transparency should be the only conditions for the development of these procedures.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<i>The non-respect of the existing procedures is perceptible, and its enforcement should be strictly controlled</i>	<i>To guarantee transparency, a note has already been published concerning the participation of partners in the committee evaluation process, and sanctions will be applied in the case of non-compliance with the procedure.</i>	<i>Since August 2017</i>	<i>Logistic Department, Program Department</i>

**Recommendation 2:** Duration of the project: a project for food security involved in family agriculture usually requires three years. The first is devoted to the construction of the infrastructure for the production and the beginning of the development (Accessibility and availability), the second for the intensification of the Enhancement (accessibility, availability and use), and the third for post-harvest activities, (accessibility, availability, use and sustainability or stability). If the conditions of a donor do not permit, partnerships should be engaged to ensure the sustainability of results. A period of four to five years would however be optimal and strongly encouraged.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b>	<i>Important to be considered</i>	<i>Opportunities for earmarking should be explored with other donors and partners</i>	<i>Starting October 2017</i>	<i>MRC, IFRC, other partners</i>

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>				
--	--	--	--	--

**Comments:** *Complete per instructions above.*

The plan of operational communication, monitoring and follow-up evaluation must be formulated in the initial proposal or assigned a specific budget line to make it available as soon as the first quarter of the implementation of the action. It will also be necessary to provide for a position of responsible for communication and follow-up evaluation among the team of execution in order not to overload the tasks of the project leader. In addition, an Evaluation External resolutely is always recommended to keep the independence of the assessment of the measures and the results of the evaluation.

<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<p><i>Indicate management decision on the recommendation:</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>	<p><i>The PMER tool already exists and this is used to monitor and follow up all the indicators set in the logical framework . The position of responsible for communication already exists. However, the position of a follow up evaluation among the team will not be strictly necessary, because the project leader him/herself could do the follow up against the logical framework , with a good planning and work organization. The external evaluator is interesting and has to be considered when the resource allows</i></p>	<p><i>Clearly define the planning of activities of the responsible of communication</i></p> <p><i>Develop other tools to improve the existing one (CEA Approach)</i></p>	<p><i>Starting October 2017</i></p>	<p><i>PMER, Responsible of communication</i></p>

<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> The execution of activities of Food security will be achieved by involving several actors from different sectors of activity. The intervention logic of food security actors is increasingly oriented towards building a partnership, with a view to complementarity of actions, from the moment the project is formulated rather than delivering a package of activities per actor. In the future, CRM will be encouraged to this end either (i) by intervening or targeting municipalities where actors specialized in primary health care, access to drinking water and basic sanitation, local governance are already involved, or (i) by having a line of activities with the corresponding funds to actively seek partners during the implementation of the project.</p>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		<i>providing the package (Health, WASH, ....) services in focalized area will be the priority for future project implementation and methodology of success will be replicated in others area</i>	<i>Starting 2018</i>	<i>Program Department</i>
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> Imperative inclusion of men and women in awareness-raising campaigns is recommended to achieve better results in terms of acquiring new knowledge, changing attitudes and behaviour for the well-being of young children. In everyday life, women take care of the children but they are connected to men (their companions) when a decision of change affecting the family circle has to be made. Beyond gender issues, inclusion is strongly recommended to achieve sustainable behaviour change.</p>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		<i>Breakdown the FGD into men and women when implementing VCA, or Community Risk Assessment and Appraisal</i>  <i>Apply gender marker of at least "1" as condition for approval of new projects. Before, training to be undertaken on Gender Marker</i>	<i>Starting 2018</i>	<i>MRC, IFRC, other partners</i>
<p><b>Recommendation 5:</b> The participatory approach is recognized as a basis for the appropriation of activities and related results by the target groups. Consideration of contextual specificity and an inclusive approach are also key to success. The Commune of Tranomaro demonstrates the absence of this response to the specificities. It is important to ensure that future projects are context specific.</p>				
<b>Management Response</b>	<b>Decision Rationale</b>	<b>Action/s to be taken</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partially accepted</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rejected</b>		<i>Further deepen the analysis stage in which tools on stakeholders analysis format improved/facilitated to allow for easy application and adaptation of project</i>	<i>Starting 2018</i>	<i>Program Department</i>

© International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

P.O. Box 372

CH-1211 Geneva 19

Switzerland

Telephone: +41 22 730 4222

Telefax: +41 22 733 0395