

CONCERN worldwide



Building Disaster Resilience in Pakistan (BDRP) - 'Community Based Disaster Risk Management' Component PO 6883

Final Performance Evaluation – Report – Executive Summary Sept -2020



Submitted by
Dr. Chaudhry Inayatullah, Team Leader
Ace Worldwide Action for Revitalizing Sustainable Development



Foreign, Commonwealth
& Development Office



Cover Photo: Focused Group Discussion at Ghotki, Sindh

The material is financed by FCDO through Concern Worldwide. Neither FCDO nor Concern Worldwide or any Implementing Partner of the Programme necessarily share the opinions expressed in. The sole responsibility of the content belongs to the author.

Exact Citation: Inayatullah, C. 2020. Performance Evaluation of the Community Based Disaster Risk Management Component of the BDRP Phase II. Ace Worldwide Action for Revitalizing Sustainable Development, Islamabad, 87 pp.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I am highly grateful to communities and the government officials in Programme districts who candidly shared their views with the Review Team. Particularly, I am thankful to the staff of consortium partners and their downstream NGO partners for their facilitation to meet with the government officials, allowing us to meet with communities of our choice to probe about Programme activities, and for providing their invaluable insights about Programme implementation/issues encountered and how they innovatively handled complex issues.

I am indebted to Ms. Asma Asif, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Concern Worldwide for tirelessly assisting the Evaluation Team during fieldwork, for providing all the requested data and documents in time, and candidly giving her insight on Programme achievements and issues encountered. Her valuable input for the improvement of the first draft is gratefully acknowledged.

Moving on, I would like to thank Mr. Sherzada Khan, Team Leader; Mr. Naseem Ahmad Panezai, Deputy Team Leader; Mr. Ejaz Karim, CBDRM/ DRR Specialist; Mr. Sher Hassan, Infrastructure Specialist; and Mr. Hamza Abbasi, Livelihood Specialist; Ms. Nazima Shaheen, Gender Specialist; and Ms. Kanwal Manzoor, Communication Specialist for their invaluable inputs on Programme achievements and support during the finalization of the report.

I would also like to thank Ms. Siobhan Tatly, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, Programme Approach and Learning Unit, Strategy and Learning Directorate, Concern Worldwide, UK for her valuable comments to improve this research.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
ARKSP	Agha Khan Rural Support Programme
BDRP	Building Disaster Resilience in Pakistan
BHU	Basic Health Units
BISP	Benazir Income Support Programme
C&WD	Civil and Works Department
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CBDRP	Community Based Disaster Resilient Programme
CERTS	Community Emergency Response Teams
CGA	Cash Grant Assistance
CLEW	Community Livestock Extension Worker
CLTS	Community Leadership Training
CMST	Community Mobilization Skill Training
CSA	Climate Resilient Agriculture
DDMA	District Development Authorities
DIFD	Department for International Development
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FCDO	Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GLOF	Glacial Lakes Outburst Floods
GoP	Government of Pakistan
HRI	Household Resilience Index
INGO	International Non-Government Organization
IPs	Implementing Partners
IRC	International Rescue Committee
KAP	Knowledge, Aptitude and Practices
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
LMST	Leadership Management Skill Training
LSO	Local Support Organizations
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFIs	Micro-Finance Institutions
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
ODF	Open Defecation
PATS	Pakistan Total Sanitation
PDMA	Provincial Development Authority
PHED	Public Health Engineering Department
PWDs	Persons With Disabilities
RCC	Reinforced Cement Concrete

SEF	Sindh Education Foundation
SERT	School Emergency Response Team
SLTS	School Led Total Sanitation
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Trackable
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
TMA	Tehsil Municipal Administration
TORS	Terms of Reference
UC	Union Council
UCDMC	Union Council Disaster Management Committee
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VDMC	Village Disaster Management Committee
VERT	Village Emergency Response Team
VfM	Value for Money Analysis
WASH	Water Sanitation and Health
WHH	Welthungerhilfe

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Poverty in Pakistan is concentrated in rural areas where 70% of the population lives. The BDRP programme area is classified as rural. Based on World Bank's poverty headcount analysis, at US\$ 1.25/day income definition, about 21% of Pakistan's population is below the poverty line. If the line is set at US\$ 2/day, then 60% of the population is below the poverty line. In 2019, the inflation rate was 10.58%, which has been increasing annually since 2015 when it was 2.53%¹. The GDP fell from 5.55% in 2018 to 2.29% in 2019 and 1.55% in 2020². It is feared that with the recent devaluation of the currency, decline in exports and price hikes, and with impacts of COVID-19 on reducing job opportunities, poverty has increased considerably. The COVID-19 pandemic has been a big blow to the already fragile economy and responsible for the reduced tax collection. This is evidenced in the form of budget cuts on development projects and a reduction in staff salaries in the public sector. Besides economic parameters, gender empowerment is rather a low priority in the country. In 2019, Pakistan ranked 3rd to the last, 151 out of 153 countries on Global Gender Gap Index, highlighting the urgent need to promote the social, economic, and political empowerment of women.

The impacts of climate change are also fast unfolding in Pakistan, which is evidenced in the form of increased intensity and frequency of extreme events. Based on the cumulative Global Climate Risk Index from 1999-2018, the German Watch Group (2020 Report) ranked Pakistan at 5th position on the Global Climate Risk Index- a case of downgraded rank from 8th position (Cumulative Index 1998-2017). The group estimated that the country has faced 152 extreme weather events from 1999 to 2018 and lost 9,989 lives and suffered economic losses worth of US\$ 3.8 billion³.

Besides inherent climatic factors and poor resources at the government and community level, the technical capacity of the Government of Pakistan (GoP) line departments and that of communities is extremely low. It could be gauged from the fact that for example, with a population of 447,362 according to census 2017, Chitral district, with an area of 14,850 sq km and an altitude ranging from 1,094 m at Arandu to 7,726 m in Tirichmir, has limited access to valleys.. The main economic activity in Chitral is livestock husbandry. There are only seven veterinarians and 30 animal husbandry technicians in the entire Chitral (both upper and lower). Although the district has been split into two districts in 2020, viz., Lower and Upper Chitral, but no additional staff positions have been created to manage the vast area. Due to limited number of veterinarians/technicians and animal clinics in the district, the mortality rate of animals is high, which is a direct loss to the poor communities whose livelihood is based on raising livestock. In this situation, the CBDRM intervention to provide training in animal husbandry and prevention of animal diseases yielded dividends and a new business trade in this regard is emerging in the district..

Under the above scenario, the programme was formulated in full consultation with the government, UN Agencies, and Implementing Partners (IPs). The selection of programme interventions was at the advice of UN specialized agency, i.e., FAO, and the selection of villages was made in full consultation with the government departments, keeping in view the vulnerability to hazards and income poverty of the selected communities. The programme aimed to serve 625,023 vulnerable households (323,295 male-headed and 301,728 female-headed households) in nine districts, viz., Chitral, D. I. Khan, Jhang, Muzaffargarh, Rajanpur, Kashmore, Ghotki, Dadu, and Tharparkar. The programme period was 24 months with a total budget of UK £ 16.9 million. The programme applied a consortium approach. The activities were implemented by ACTED in Chitral and Kashmore; WHH in Muzaffargarh and Rajanpur, Concern Worldwide in Jhang, D. I. Khan and Tharparkar; and by IRC in Ghotki and Dadu. WHH further sub-contracted activities to two local NGOs, namely Doaba Foundation and Farmers Development Organization, while Concern Worldwide sub-contracted activities to Veer Development Foundation in D. I. Khan, Lodhran Pilot Project in Jhang, and Rural Development Foundation in Tharparkar.

The final performance evaluation (PE) was commissioned by Concern Worldwide in the last week of August 2020. Four teams were composed who initiated fieldwork simultaneously where each team covered two districts, except for Team 4 (comprising of three professionals, which covered three districts. A three-prong

¹<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/FP.CPI.TOTL.ZG?locations=PK>

²<https://www.statista.com/statistics/383729/gross-domestic-product-gdp-growth-rate-in-pakistan/>

³https://germanwatch.org/sites/germanwatch.org/files/20-2-01e%20Global%20Climate%20Risk%20Index%202020_14.pdf

approach was applied to collect data. Firstly, all the documents related to the programme were reviewed, secondly, the baseline and end-line data on the Household Resilience Index was analysed, and thirdly, consultations were held with beneficiaries' communities, and the staff of relevant government officials in each district. The PE team sampled 50 villages in the programme districts and organized Focus Group Discussions (FGD) in each village. The total number of participants in the FGDs was 891 (484 males, 407 females, 139 Persons with Disabilities (PWDs), and 47 elderly (age 60+ years). The government officials interviewed in all the districts were 90.

The programme accomplished its target of enhancing the resilience of communities to cope with disasters. Based on the cumulative data (flood- plus drought-affected households), at the end line survey time, 39%, 35%, and 26% of households were found in low, medium, and high Household Resilience Index (HRI) categories, respectively. In contrast with 80%, 15%, and 5% found in low, medium and high HRI categories, respectively at baseline. At endline, a net of 392,221 households were in low HRI category, in contrast to 797,775 at baseline. The corresponding figures for the medium HRI were 345,554 at endline vs 148,889 at baseline; and 262,221 vs 53,333 (endline vs baseline). **This means that 41% of the programme targeted population improved their HRI and shifted from low to higher categories of HRI.** Of this, 49% of households moved into the medium and 51% moved into the high resilient category. Furthermore, the analysis indicated that in both the flood and drought-prone areas, the trend of improvement in resilience was the same. Likewise, male and female headed households almost equally improved their resilience (52% male-headed households and 48% female-headed households). This endorses the effectiveness of programme interventions and gender strategies. The programme has visibly seven impacts, namely, (i) increased household income; (ii) trained volunteer force available for support to the GoP during disasters; (iii) well-informed communities about DRR; (iv) improved knowledge and practices about WASH; (v) self-confidence of communities; (vi) UC level infrastructure which provided evacuation routes as well easy access to cities and markets; and (vii) registration of PWDs with the Social Welfare Department. By having registration with the government, PWDs have become entitled to special benefits from various government schemes, such as health care, cash grants, and exemption from some taxes. In most of the cases, the programme surpassed the planned targets, **therefore, the programme efficiency, effectiveness and overall achievements of objectives is assigned rating 4- Outstanding Performance.**

A separate study is needed to calculate the monetary gains at the household and community level. However, this report cites many examples where individual households were able to increase their income by several folds due to vocational skill training and provision of tool kits, high-quality seed of various crops, seeds of vegetables and fertilizers, among other things, which also changed their lives. The support provided to community structures, advocacy material prepared by the programme, and the complaint response system practised were highly effective. The infrastructure provided at household level (hand pumps, shelter rooms, etc.) and community level (roads, bridges, culverts, irrigation channels, drinking water supply schemes, etc.) improved the living standards of people and their access to markets and service providers.

Adapting to the COVID-19 pandemic, the programme extensively launched campaigns to sanitize villages, towns and schools, promoted frequent hand washing, and provided soap bars and sanitizers to communities as well as to district authorities. This promoted safe WASH practices to a great extent, which is likely to positively impact food absorption and savings on health expenditures. Furthermore, the programme provided cash grants to the poor households left out by the GoP schemes to survive during the lockdown. This practice greatly saved the poor from becoming more destitute.

Programme Shortcomings and Challenges

The performance evaluation team observed that Concern employed well-thought process that includes but was not limited to, research, consultations, initial design, testing and redesigning of the programme that contributed well to disaster resilience across the three provinces:

1. The programme hosted a series of achievement sharing workshops in the nine targeted districts to review and evaluate the programme successes, learnings and challenges to guide respective communities and stakeholders in future planning and implementation of similar programmes. These workshops provided concrete recommendations for the continuity of the resilience building efforts and laid out steps on how the various players in the district can continue to improve coping capacities of the communities, government and local civil society organisations in-line with national and global frameworks. The workshops

also provided an avenue for the stakeholders to draw recommendations in light of the good practices and challenges on the way forward. All of the communities and government officials interviewed through the programme evaluation strongly endorsed the fact that the programme has been highly relevant to the needs of local communities as a whole.

2. Phase 1 of the programme centred on flood and targeted flood-related hazards districts, two in Punjab (Rajanpur and Muzaffargarh) and two in Sindh (Ghotki and Kashmore). Phase 2 was expanded to include drought and earthquake-prone districts as well and also included Chitral and Dera Ismail Khan (DI Khan) in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Tharparkar in Sindh. In other words, BDRP has increased the scope of the programme from flood prone disasters only to both drought and multi-hazards (flood, earthquake, glacial lake outburst flood, and avalanches). The programme targeted 630 villages of 63 Union Councils (UC) in the nine selected districts. The marginalized groups such as women, children, persons with disabilities (PWDs) and older people (OP) were the primary focus of all BDRP programme interventions. BDRP interventions followed an integrated approach for resilience building measures in CBDRM, shelter, WASH, infrastructure, on-farm livelihoods and off-farm livelihoods. The objective of the programme was to assist village communities in disaster prone districts to mitigate and prepare for disasters through improved early warning systems, risk information, community level response mechanisms, and improved linkages with disaster management authorities. This performance evaluation revealed that the delivery of CBDRM has greatly assisted targeted communities to mitigate and prepare for disasters through improved early warning systems, risk information, community-level response mechanisms and improved linkages with disaster management authorities. In addition, community-based DRR and climate change adaptation measures were also realized for improving the resilience of local communities.
3. Capacity building through training is a major component within the BDRP approach at both Institutional Strengthening Component (ISC) and Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) levels. The evaluation shows that these trainings responded to the resilience needs of target groups and were generally well-designed for their audiences. Delivery and content were felt by participants to be, in most cases, good or at least adequate, and overall targeting was generally observed to be appropriate. Nonetheless, there were issues related to some specific training courses for V/UDMCs and government officials at the district level. The main issue was the overwhelming number of trainings scheduled in a limited time, without keeping in view the cropping/livestock management seasonal calendar. The adoption of a range of different training techniques and approaches brought a generally positive response, although inconsistent provision of training materials and kit across a range of courses was regularly highlighted as a problem. This was due to implementation of activities by different implementing partners. There were signs that capacity building activities were contributing to the strengthening of community resilience. For example, Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) training suggested positive evidence of 'trickle down' of learning and good practice within and between villages.
4. In response to dynamic disaster conditions as related to the COVID-19 pandemic in Pakistan, and its impact on CBDRM-BDRP programme districts and village communities, Concern and its consortium members were very swiftly able to integrate some COVID-19 related response and support activities and interventions for, and in the programme target communities. The integration of COVID-19 within the original programme design is evidence that the programme followed a flexible approach to delivery. In this regard, the programme pivoted to include 24 new activities (18 by the Institutional Strengthening consortium in 3 districts – Jhang, Ghotki and Dera Ismail Khan – and 6 by the CBDRM consortium in all BDRP districts) supporting COVID-19 affected communities. Around 7,403,968 beneficiaries were reached through COVID-19 response activities. **As per third party monitoring (TPM) reports, 61% expressed their confidence that BDRP activities have helped them cope with the COVID-19 pandemic.** Vocational skills training and capacity building of V/UDMC members were considered to be the most likely activities to help strengthen beneficiary resilience.
5. The construction of disaster resilient model household shelters followed by mason trainings was highly beneficial for local masons. The masons were identified from local villages. The training contents were contextualised regarding the utilisation of local material and they covered aspects of disaster resilience. These trained masons were employed for construction of disaster resilient shelters. The value of trained masons has increased with respect to improved technical knowledge and wages. The BDRP team has developed a contact directory of these trained masons and shared it with relevant stakeholders like UDCMC,

DDMAs, Construction and Works Department and Irrigation Department. As per the PIU M&E, shelter replication impact assessment study conducted in five programme districts (DI Khan, Ghotki, Dadu, Muzaffargarh and Rajanpur), 84% community members partially replicated the BDRP model shelter while 16% people constructed their homes in the same vicinity with full replication of the BDRP model shelter.

The evaluation team found VfM analysis a very good approach to calculate economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity in financial terms. The VfM approach employed was purely in line with the FCDOs “Four E’s” approach and focused on concepts from economic evaluation to respond to FCDO requirements for accountability and good resource allocation, as well as to support reflection, learning, and adaptive management. A mix of evidence (numbers and stories) gives a better understanding of whether the interventions of BDRP programme are really changing lives. Clear attempts have been made by the programme to deliver VfM at multiple levels. The programme performed well on economy, efficiency and equity.

Evaluating Ratings

The ratings are assigned as per the Concern Worldwide Guidance for Evaluation⁴. These are explained in the footnote.

Measure	Performance Evaluation Rating	Summary of Description
Relevance	Relevant Rating 4	The effects of climate change are fast unfolding in Pakistan which is evidenced in the form of an increase in frequency and intensity of extreme events. The GoP departments lack the financial, logistical, and technical capacity to cater to the needs of people. The programme districts are highly prone to disasters, and the communities are generally resource poor and lack knowledge and awareness. The economic slowdown and devaluation have further affected the financial allocations of GoP for development projects. Under such circumstances, the programme was highly relevant to the needs of the communities and the GoP, therefore rating 4 has been assigned.
Progress towards results	Objective. Poor people in Pakistan (especially women) are more resilient to natural disasters. Achievement Rating: 4- Outstanding Performance	The programme accomplished its target of enhancing the resilience of communities to cope with disasters. Based on the cumulative data (flood- plus drought-affected households), at the end line survey time, 39%, 35%, and 26% of households were found in low, medium, and high Household Resilience Index (HRI) categories, respectively. In contrast with 80%, 15%, and 5% found in low, medium and high HRI categories, respectively at the time of baseline study. At end line, a net of 392,221 households were in low HRI category, in contrast to 797,775 at baseline. The corresponding figures for the medium HRI were 345,554 at end line vs 148,889 at baseline; and 262,221 vs 53,333 (endline vs baseline). This means that 41% of the programme targeted population improved their HRI and shifted from low to higher categories of HRI. Of this, 49% households moved into the medium and 51% households moved into the high resilient category. This proves that the programme was instrumental in building community resilience. Furthermore, the analysis indicated that in both the flood and drought-prone areas the trend of improvement in resilience was the same. Likewise, male- and female-headed households almost equally improved their resilience (52% male-headed and 48% female-headed), however, there were differences across the districts. This endorses the effectiveness of programme resilience and gender strategies. The programme has visibly seven impacts, namely, (i) increased household income; (ii) trained volunteer force available for support to the GoP during disasters, (iii) well-informed communities about DRR; (iv) improved knowledge and practices about WASH; (v) self-confidence of

⁴Rating scales: 0, totally unacceptable performance or insufficient data to make an assessment; 1, barely acceptable performance with some major shortcomings and reservations; 2, generally acceptable performance but with some clear, and documented, shortcomings; 3, performance in line with what would be expected of a well-functioning organisation; 4, outstanding performance.

Measure	Performance Evaluation Rating	Summary of Description
		communities; (vi) UC level infrastructure which provided evacuation routes as well as easy access to cities and markets; and (vii) registration of PWDs with the Social Welfare Department which gave them a ray of hope in the state of despair to avail government grants under various schemes. As the programme has fully achieved its target, rating 4 (outstanding performance) has been assigned.
	<p>Output 1. Target communities have resilience-building measures in place (disaggregated by community structures, households)</p> <p>Achievement Rating: 4- Outstanding Performance</p>	<p>As per plan, VDMCs and UCDMCs were formed in all the villages and UCs, and these are functioning to a variable degree at different places. The ODF component surpassed its target (663,361 vs 546,000). Likewise, the drinking water supply component surpassed its target (81,490 vs 79,618). Some 282,130 persons are benefitting from the communal infrastructures and the target was overachieved. The programme target was to build 500 model resilient household shelters, whereas 508 shelters were constructed, benefitting to 3,441 persons (males 1,794, females 1,647, PWDs 90, and 171 elderly. All the targets set for this output have been fully achieved, therefore rating 4 (outstanding performance) has been assigned.</p>
	<p>Output 2. Target stakeholders have improved skills and systems to develop, plan, and apply DRM and DRR strategies and SOPs.</p> <p>Achievement Rating 3 Performance in line with what would be expected of a well-functioning organisation</p>	<p>Indicator 2.1. and 2.4 were the domain of FAO. For the remaining two indicators, the programme assisted all the programme UCs (total 63 UCs- 7 per district) to prepare well-informed disaster preparedness and management plans, which could be implemented by the local governments and other donors/NGOs. The plans are available in the offices of the UCDMCs and the local government. All VDMCs and UCDMCs members have been fully trained and in community management and new DRR resilient techniques. The tool kits have been provided to all the UCDMCs. Since the programme has fully achieved its targets under the Output 2, a rating 4 has been assigned.</p>
	<p>Output 3. Target communities are introduced to sustainable livelihoods and environmental management practices for resilience building: Target communities are introduced to sustainable livelihoods and environmental management practices for resilience building</p> <p>Achievement Rating: 4- Outstanding Performance</p>	<p>Over 13,000 people have been trained in CSA against a target of 1,275. Around 3,608 vegetable seeds packets have been delivered against the target of 2,556 packets. The programme has trained 401 CLEWs to enhance the animal vaccination capacity of the communities and to provide a business opportunity to the vaccinators. The programme trained 3,408 persons (against a target of 3,288 in various income generating activities). Since the programme surpassed the target, a rating 4 (outstanding performance) has been assigned.</p>
<p>Programme Effectiveness</p>	<p>Rating: 4- Outstanding Performance</p>	<p>The programme accomplished its target of enhancing the resilience of communities to cope with disasters. Based on the cumulative data (flood- plus drought-affected households), at the end line survey time, 39%, 35%, and 26% households were found in low, medium, and high Household Resilience Index (HRI) categories, respectively. In contrast with 80%, 15%, and 5% found in low, medium and high HRI categories, respectively at the time of baseline study. At end line, a net of 392,221 households were in low HRI category, in contrast to 797,775 at baseline. The corresponding figures for the medium HRI were 345,554 at end line vs 148,889 at baseline; and 262,221 vs 53,333 (endline vs baseline). This means that 41% of the programme targeted population improved their HRI and shifted from low to higher categories of HRI. Of this, 49% households moved into the medium and 51% of the households moved into the high resilient category. This proves that program was instrumental in building community resilience. Furthermore, the analysis indicated that in both the flood- and drought-prone areas the trend of improvement in resilience was the same. Likewise, male- and female-headed households almost equally improved their resilience (52% male-headed and 48% female-headed), however, the differences were observed across the districts. This</p>

Measure	Performance Evaluation Rating	Summary of Description
		endorses the effectiveness of Programme strategy, therefore, rating 4 (outstanding performance) has been assigned to effectiveness.
Programme Efficiency	Rating: 4- Outstanding Performance	The cumulative achievement of programme against the targets indicated that the programme surpassed several indicator targets, such as the number of VDMCs and UCDMCs organized (Joint Logframe Indicator 1.1). The programme followed an inclusive approach to include males, females, PWDs, and the elderly (age above 60 years). The number of persons who have benefitted from the disaster-resilient infrastructure (output Indicator 1.3), also surpassed the target, achievement 282,130 vs. target of 100,800. This intervention equally benefited the male and female population. However, the PWDs benefited were 7,409, and the elderly 18,799. The number of people who benefited from the livelihood activities also surpassed the target. The programme also provided 508 disaster resilient shelters (one room with sturdy disaster-resilient structure and windows for ventilation, etc.) 3,441 vs target of 2,576. The number of persons who were trained in new Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) techniques at the UC level was 1,669 against a target of 1,170, while at the village level these were 10,041 vs 8,775. Though some activity targets were missed due to lockdown because of the COVID-19 outbreak, the programme provided excellent support to the PDMA, DDMA, and communities to cope with this outbreak which was not foreseen at the time of programme formulation. This is an excellent example of adaptive management. Therefore rating 4 has been assigned to efficiency.
Programme M&E	Achievement Rating 3 Performance in line with what would be expected of a well-functioning organization	The programme M&E system was well in place, and it fully recorded the achievements in terms of quantitative targets but reporting on quality of interventions was less adequate. Similarly, the activities had several impacts at the household level but the Programme did not document the gains in economic terms. An independent study should have been commissioned to document the economic gains at the household, community, and district levels. Therefore, rating 3 (performance in line with what would be expected of a well-functioning organization) has been assigned to Programme M&E.
Sustainability	Achievement Rating 4 Outstanding Performance	The programme has no environmental or socio-economic risks to sustainability, rather there will be an environmental enhancement in terms of land conservation, promotion of social forestry, water conservation, etc. The fact that the registration process for NGOs is not conducive in KP and Punjab has hindered the opening of bank accounts, savings and loan schemes, and receipt of funds from other donors and GoP. However, the Group Maturity Index (GMI) study indicated that 93.5% of the UC and 85% of the village level social structures ranked within the top two group maturity categories - (Category 3 Managed/Institutional Development, and Category 4 (Maturity Achieved/Institutional Independence). Further breakdown of data indicated that 41.3% of the UC level and 20% of the village level social structure reached the Institutional Independence Stage. The social mobilization process is a slow process and emergence of results takes a long time, as reported in the GMI study based on the comparison of the maturity level of the Phase 1 and 2 groups. Therefore rating 4 has been assigned to sustainability.
Programme Impact	Rating: 4- Outstanding Performance	The programme has several visible impacts, such as (i) increased household income; (ii) trained volunteer force available for support to the GoP during disasters, (iii) well-informed communities about DRR; (iv) improved knowledge and practices about WASH; (v) self-confidence of communities; (vi) UC level infrastructure which provided evacuation routes as well easy access to cities and markets; and (vii) registration of PWDs with the Social Welfare Department which gave them a ray of hope in the state of despair. However, the programme did not record impacts in terms of monetary gains.

Measure	Performance Evaluation Rating	Summary of Description
		The evaluation team has recorded several such striking examples, which had given an impact at the individual household level. However, the study of the cumulative effect of all the interventions at the district and programme level should have been included in the programme design. Keeping in view all the achievements against various targets (mostly surpassed the targets), and gathering of community perceptions and quantitative data during the FGDs, rating 4 has been assigned to impacts.

Recommendations Summary Table

Keeping in view the above issues and challenges, the following recommendations are made for the future:

S. No.	Programme Area/ Stage	Recommendations
1	Design	The programme duration of any community-based programme should be for a minimum period of 3 to 5 years. This will help in improving the maturity level of social infrastructure and sustainability. Membership fees, savings, and loans are the fundamentals of group maturity.
3	Strategy	There is a need to improve the local breed of cows and buffaloes in the programme area to increase animal productivity.
4	Strategy	Health and hygiene plays an important role in improving health, and thus food absorption and savings on health expenditures. At the village level, improved supply of drinking water and construction of toilets at the household level should continue to be high priority in future programming.
5	Strategy	The availability of high-quality seed of crops is a major issue in Pakistan. Hardly 30% of farmers have access to high-quality seed. In future programmes, the farmers should be provided high quality seed for multiplication which was an important aspect of the BDRP programme. VDMCs and UCDMCs should ensure that the farmers who have received free high-quality seed will provide the same quantity to VDMCs or UCDMCs free of cost for onward giving to other farmers.
6	Strategy	In drought-prone areas, rotational grazing and planting of crops, bushes, and trees resistant to salt and drought and drip irrigation should be promoted. Drip irrigation is the best solution for water conservation in water deficient areas. The provincial governments provide a cash grant to promote drip irrigation, which must be tapped in future programmes.
7	Strategy	The programme has successfully diversified income generation activities and demonstrated enhanced crop and livestock productivity. In future programmes, emphasis should be given on the value addition of agriculture and non-agricultural products (handicrafts, fashion designing, embroidery, etc.) to enhance household income.
8	Resource Mobilization	Community and local government share must be a pre-condition to have any agriculture demonstration plot or community infrastructure programme. This will enhance resource mobilization and government/ community ownership.
9	Economy	In future programming due attention should be paid to develop the communal infrastructure. Furthermore, communities should be engaged in the construction of infrastructure programmes instead of engaging contractors in order to save costs and to enhance community ownership.
10	Monitoring and Evaluation	A dedicated software should be developed to record expenditures being incurred and results being obtained at the village, UC, and district levels to calculate VfM at these levels. Furthermore, a web-based system should be developed to collate all the data efficiently.
11	Sustainability	In every district, one or more local NGOs or mature groups (VDMCs and UCDMCs) should be engaged to promote group marketing and marketing

S. No.	Programme Area/ Stage	Recommendations
		support to better negotiate prices for inputs and outputs. For example, in Chitral and other hilly areas, traders purchase the crop even at the time of flowering at a very low rate resulting in farmers earning a negligible profit.