

Project evaluation report

Evaluation details	
Project title	Reinforcing logistics capacity for the distribution of seeds, tools and food rations to protect seeds to 25,000 displaced people in Paoua sub-prefecture, Ouham-Pendé
Organisation	Cooperazione Internazionale (COOPI)
Sector	Food security
Project duration	3 May – 3 November 2007
Project budget (ERF)	\$124,709
Place	Paoua sub prefecture, Ouham-Pendé
Dates of evaluation	30 September – 1 October 2008
Evaluation team members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nicolas Bokossy, FAO Davide Stefanini, DRC The French Cooperation had planned to participate in the evaluation but was prevented from doing so at the last minute for security reasons
Examined documents	Project file, work plan, final narrative report

Context

Briefly describe the context in which the project was implemented, including the local security and political context, the displacement situation, and the assessed needs of the people in the area.

During the first half of 2007, people north of Paoua, on the road from Bétoko to Békaye axis, suffered from violence due to clashes between the APRD militant group and government forces, causing 25,000 of them to flee their villages into the bush. In response to this situation, COOPI, with the support of FAO and WFP, started this project to provide assistance to vulnerable people in need.

Results

Compare the results (outcomes and impact) on the ground with the 'expected outcomes' and indicators in the project sheet and work plan. If possible, add summaries.

The project's main goal was to build the logistics capacity of COOPI's sub-office in Paoua, to facilitate distributions of food, seeds and tools for 5,000 families affected by violence. The project document and work plan summarise the project objectives.

Increase logistics capacity and facilitate the distribution of agricultural kits and food to people struck by conflict and displacement

COOPI hired a technical team to implement the project, rented trucks and purchased fuel to transport and distribute food provided by WFP, and seeds and tools from FAO. As the distributions were carried out successfully, this objective has been achieved.

Distribute 5,000 FAO agricultural kits to 5,000 homes

The initial project document foresaw the distribution of 5,000 farming kits to 5,000 families. Agricultural kits included 10kg of maize, 2kg of sorghum, a hoe and a machete. A later detailed identification of

families in need at the beginning of the rainy season, however, showed that there were 6,632 families. As the rainy season was setting in, it was too late for the cultivation of maize and sorghum. The 5,000 families all received the kits so that the objective was achieved at 100%. With regard to the real needs of 6,632 families, however, 1,632 families did not receive farming kits due to the advanced agricultural season.

Distribute food provided by WFP to the same families who had received agricultural kits

The distribution of WFP-food rations aimed at providing nutritional assistance to avoid the consumption of seeds. According to the distribution report, 6,632 families have received food rations composed of maize flour, beans, CSB (corn-soya blend), cooking oil, sugar and salt. Compared to the number of families in need, the objective was achieved at 100%.

Constraints

What constraints were faced during the implementation of the project, including security and logistical constraints or constraints internal to the organisation (lack of staff, etc.)? Was the project duration extended as result? If yes, was it justified?

The difficulties faced by COOPI during the implementation of this project were related to security, accessibility and monitoring. As a consequence of insecurity due to clashes between the APRD militant group and the government army in the Paoua area, transporters had significantly reduced their activities in this zone. This caused delays in the transport of agricultural kits and food to Paoua. This delay in turn forced families to consume an estimated 30% of the distributed seeds. Discussions with field staff in Paoua revealed that monitoring was difficult not only because of the large number of families in many locations who received seeds, tools and food, but also because of a lack of logistics support for staff to access remote areas. For this reason monitoring was concentrated on 30 sample fields, so-called 'school farms', in areas close to Paoua with an average 0.7ha cultivated per family. The project duration was extended to finish the distribution of food to the 1,632 additional families.

The impact of ERF funding

What impact did ERF funding have on the overall programme activities of the organisation? Were ERF-funded activities compatible to activities of other organisations in the same area? Were these well coordinated?

In April 2007, in addition to the ICRC and two international NGOs – MSF-France and Première Urgence – COOPI launched life-saving activities for people affected by conflict in the area north of Paoua. The funding had not only enabled the reinforcement of logistics capacities for the distribution of agricultural kits and food provided by FAO and WFP. The programme was also a pilot phase during which the needs in several sectors were assessed, to inform follow-on activities. This needs assessment paved the way for a new project, funded by ECHO. Generally, activities carried out by the different humanitarian organisations are well coordinated to avoid duplication, and information is exchanged regularly.

Conclusion

What is the evaluation team's overall conclusion? Was ERF funding helpful? Was the project implemented according to the plan? Did it have an impact on the ground? What are the lessons learnt?

The project covered the emergency needs of people affected by conflict north of Paoua. The distribution of agricultural kits and food contributed to mitigating food insecurity and rebuilding agricultural production. During visits to villages such as Béokara and Bétokomia on the road from

Paoua to Bétoko, villagers testified to the positive impact of the project on improving their living conditions. The project's monitoring and evaluation mechanism should be improved and better coordinated. For instance, no data was available on the surface cultivated with the distributed seeds. While it may have been difficult to develop such a monitoring mechanism during the emergency phase of the project this should be envisaged in the longer term.