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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The final evaluation of the DFID-funded project Promoting Women's Empowerment as a Pathway to Improved Household Nutrition (RAIN+) was conducted in September 2017. The aim of the assignment was to “design and conduct an endline survey and provide an evaluation of impact of the project based on the results framework and the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria”.

The RAIN+ project has been implemented from April 2015 until March 2018 in the Mumbwa district of Zambia by Concern Worldwide (CWW) and its partners Mumbwa Child Development Agency (MCDA) and Women for Change (WfC). The project also cooperated with the District Nutrition Coordinating Committee (DNCC) in Mumbwa and its members, especially the Ministry of Agriculture (MA) and the Ministry of Health (MoH).

The project aimed to “contribute to the prevention of stunting among children under 5 in rural Zambia”. This was supposed to be achieved by attaining the following outputs:

- **Output 1**: 5,910 women have increased knowledge, skills and ability to improve household nutrition security.
- **Output 2**: More equitable participation and decision-making promoted amongst men and women related to nutrition security.
- **Output 3**: 5,910 women are producing and consuming micronutrient rich foods.
- **Output 4**: Improved knowledge, attitudes and practices of 5,910 women around maternal, infant and young child feeding.
- **Output 5**: Activities that promote gender equality and women's empowerment are integrated into district planning.

Methodology

The evaluation employed the following methodology:

- **quantitative survey involving 640 of the project's female beneficiaries** selected by using multi-stage cluster sampling; out of these 307 had a child under two (resulting in data with very high levels of accuracy - the data related to female beneficiaries had a margin of error as low as 3.7 percentage points (95% C.I.) and 5.3 percentage points for data related to children under two)
- **qualitative survey of all 96 rehabilitated boreholes** and the Village Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (VWASH) committees that are responsible for their operation and maintenance
- **semi-structured interviews** with the staff of the MA, MoH and Scaling-Up Nutrition (SUN); Concern, MCDA and WfC staff; peer educator; and randomly selected VWASH committee members
- **focus group discussions** with the project’s female beneficiaries and their husbands, Smallholder Model Farmers (SMF), Community Health Volunteers (CHV), and peer educators promoting gender quality (all selected through random sampling)
- **observations** of randomly selected vegetable gardens and rehabilitated boreholes
- **reviews of secondary resources** (see the full list in Annex 7.2)

The evaluation employed a range of gender-sensitive interviewing measures and adhered to the ethical considerations described in chapter 2.10.

Findings and Conclusions

Relevance

The project’s relevance was evaluated as **HIGHLY SATISFACTORY**, primarily due to: being in line with the government's priorities and the beneficiaries' needs; focusing on the vast majority of underlying and basic causes of undernutrition; addressing nutrition insecurity from a gender perspective; actively engaging the target community members in the promotion of agronomic, health, nutrition, and gender-related behaviours among their peers. However, it relied too much on free in-kind donations and provided insufficient support to peer educators who promoted gender equality among local men.

Effectiveness

The project’s effectiveness was evaluated as **SATISFACTORY** due to: fully or largely achieving 14 out of 17 output and 4 out of 5 outcome indicators; being successful in addressing most of the underlying
causes of undernutrition; however, achieving limited outcomes regarding women’s gender-related attitudes and DNCC members’ work on promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment.

**Efficiency**
The project’s effectiveness was evaluated as SATISFACTORY due to: efficient purchases of the project inputs and the use of existing resources and expertise; however, efficiency was decreased by an unnecessary extent of free donations and the delays in the implementation of the gender activities.

**Sustainability**
The project’s sustainability is currently expected as ACCEPTABLE; however, if the project implements the sustainability-related recommendations provided in this report, it is likely to be SATISFACTORY. This conclusion is due to: the female beneficiaries wishing to continue in the production (and consumption) of nutritious crops though some women are demotivated due to pests, poor access to water, and difficulties with the sale of their produce; limited willingness among women to invest in seeds and other assets; the majority of the rehabilitated boreholes remaining operational though not always well-managed; and a relatively low number of “gender equality promoters” to ensure that the promoted gender-related attitudes and behaviours will become and remain a new social norm.

**Impact**
The project’s impact is likely to be HIGHLY SATISFACTORY due to: achieving large differences between the impact indicators’ baseline and endline values; increasing women’s self-confidence and autonomy; improving the target communities’ (i.e. not only beneficiaries) access to water and nutritious food; successfully challenging gender-related social norms (though not 100% changing); however, not being able to avoid a situation where many women rely primarily on the donated aid as opposed to their own initiative (though this can be fully confirmed only during the next growing season).

**Gender**
The quality of the project’s gender component was evaluated as ACCEPTABLE due to: the project increasing women’s autonomy and access to social capital, income, and food; however, achieving the targets of only two out of six gender-related indicators, and providing insufficient support to peer educators responsible for changing men’s gender-related attitudes and behaviours.

**Main Recommendations**
Based on the above described findings, the evaluator provides the following recommendations:

**Recommendations for maximizing RAIN+ project sustainability and impact:**
- Ensure that women are able and motivated to purchase seeds.
- Provide refresher courses on pest management.
- Strengthen women’s ability to profitably sell a part of their produce.
- Continue establishing and strengthening savings and loans groups.
- Organize refresher workshops for the existing peer educators.
- Train MA’s Camp Extension Officers (CEOs) on specific gender mainstreaming methods.
- Advocate for specific gender activities to be included in the 2018 District Nutrition Plan.
- Define / focus your RAIN+ model and promote extensively specific and easily replicable actions.
- Enable NGOs to measure the results of their women’s empowerment / gender equality work.
- Strengthen the capacity of the weakest VWASH committees.
- Ensure that CHVs are capable of effectively promoting low-cost hand washing stations.
- Contract KickStart to train local entrepreneurs on the repairs of hip pumps.
- Ensure that unused and non-functional hip pumps are used.
- Support MA and its CEOs in taking over responsibility for strengthening SMFs’ technical capacities.

**Recommendations for Concern’s future programming**
- Free donations: only once, then move to subsidized vouchers and support to commercial supply.
- Avoid donations of assets that cannot be locally repaired or re-purchased.
- Measure men’s gender attitudes as well.
- Continue to promote RAIN+ approach at the international level, incl. among Alliance2015 partners.
1. INTRODUCTION
The final evaluation of the Promoting Women’s Empowerment as a Pathway to Improved Household Nutrition in Central Province, Zambia (RAIN+) was commissioned in May 2017 by its lead implementer Concern Worldwide. It was conducted from late June to October 2017 by a team consisting of a lead evaluator, gender specialist, enumerators, supervisors, interpreters, transcribers, and data entry staff. Since many of the project indicators are prone to seasonal variations, the endline data was collected in the same season as the baseline data (after the harvest of the main staple crops). In addition to the review of secondary resources, the evaluation consisted of 1) a quantitative survey primarily collecting indicators-related data and 2) qualitative research among the project’s key stakeholders. The evaluation was an integral part of the project’s M&E system and complemented Concern’s “Stories of Change”, a longitudinal study assessing female and male beneficiaries’ opinions and experiences with regard to the project’s process, exposure, adoption and the changes it effected in intra-household dynamics, agricultural and nutritional practices.

1.1 Project Overview
Concern Worldwide has been working in Zambia since 2002 and is one of the most active nutrition actors in the country. It has been a member of a consortium responsible for the scaling up of nutrition under the Most Critical 1000 Days Programme through 1) capacity building and support to the key line Ministries, 2) nutrition planning and activities in 14 pilot Districts and 3) support for related operations and innovations research. From 2011 to 2015, Concern implemented the Realigning Agriculture to Improve Nutrition (RAIN) project that focused on reducing the prevalence of chronic undernutrition by ensuring improved nutrition during the critical first 1,000 days of life.

From the 1st April 2015 until 31st March 2018, Concern has implemented project Promoting Women’s Empowerment as a Pathway to Improved Household Nutrition in Central Province, Zambia (RAIN+) funded by the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID). Its total budget is 1.56 million GBP. The project builds on the lessons generated during the implementation of the RAIN project and its beneficiaries are members of the control group used during RAIN’s final evaluation (that is why the name “RAIN+”). The RAIN+ project aimed to develop and disseminate a model capable of reducing maternal and child undernutrition through a multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral approach integrating agricultural, nutrition and maternal and child health interventions with women’s empowerment and the systematic promotion of gender equality. The project has been implemented in cooperation with national non-profit organizations Mumbwa Child Development Agency (MCDA), Women for Change (WfC), and key government departments at district level, including the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Community Development and Social Services.

The project’s overall objective has been to “contribute to the prevention of stunting among children under 5 in rural Zambia”. Its specific objective aims to “improve nutrition of women and children in 5,910 households in four wards of Mumbwa District, Zambia”. These results were expected to be achieved by attaining the following outputs:

- **Output 1**: 5,910 women have increased knowledge, skills and ability to improve household nutrition security.
- **Output 2**: More equitable participation and decision-making promoted amongst men and women related to nutrition security.
- **Output 3**: 5,910 women are producing and consuming micro nutrient rich foods.
- **Output 4**: Improved knowledge, attitudes and practices of 5,910 women around maternal, infant and young child feeding.
- **Output 5**: Activities that promote gender equality and women’s empowerment are integrated into district planning.

In order to achieve these outputs, the project implemented a range of activities, including the promotion of improved nutrition, health and hygiene practices; support to homestead production of nutritious vegetables and fruits; rehabilitation of boreholes; advocacy towards relevant authorities; and most importantly, a range of activities promoting greater gender equality and women’s empowerment (such as community sensitization, peer to peer counselling, and labour saving measures).
1.2 Key Terms
The most important concepts that should be explained in this introductory section include:

- **Gender** refers to the norms, beliefs and expectations that shape the social relations and roles and responsibilities of women, men, girls and boys. Because gender is learned, it can be “re-learned,” and damaging notions of masculinity and femininity can be reshaped by actively cultivating and adopting positive alternatives.

- **Gender Equality** means that women, men, boys and girls enjoy the same status in society and are afforded the same rights and opportunities, regardless of their sex.

- **Sexual and Gender-Based Violence** refers to physical, sexual, psychological and economic acts of violence that are committed against a person because of his or her gender.

- **Women’s Empowerment** refers to women’s capacity to control their lives, developing self-reliance also through the acquisition of new skill-sets.

- **Women’s Autonomy** means the possibility for women to self-govern and self-direct the course of their lives, acting on motives and values that are their own.

- **Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture** is an approach focusing on maximizing the nutritional benefits of agricultural production. It recognizes that higher yields do not automatically translate into improved nutrition, and prioritizes strategies that directly contribute to reducing acute and chronic malnutrition.

- **Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Programming** recognizes that undernutrition is caused by several factors across different sectors (including agriculture, WASH, nutrition, health, education, and gender) and its reduction can therefore be achieved only through multi-sectoral programming that effectively engages stakeholders across different sectors.

- **Maternal, Infant and Young Child Feeding (MIYCF)** is a set of optimal maternal, infant and child feeding practices that are proven to effectively prevent and reduce maternal and child undernutrition. Their main focus is on the first 1,000 days of life, starting from the first day of pregnancy until 2 years of age.

- **Minimum Acceptable Diet (MAD)** is achieved when the child’s diet during the previous day and night consisted of a minimum number of food groups and was provided at a minimum number of meals, as appropriate for various age groups.
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation Objectives
The general objective of the assignment as specified in its Terms of Reference (ToR) is to design and conduct the project's impact evaluation based on the results framework and the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria.

The specific objectives, as specified in the ToR, include:
- based on the project documents, review the existing baseline survey and tools and midterm review and modify, if any additional information is required for use in impact evaluation
- to develop a paper-based questionnaire and data entry/analysis system
- to train a team of enumerators to conduct the survey
- to clean and analyse data from the survey
- to conduct an impact evaluation of the project based on the results framework and DAC criteria

2.2 Evaluation Questions
The evaluation focused on answering the following questions that reflect the five main DAC criteria. The evaluator also included the additional criterion of gender.

Relevance
- To what extent are the project objectives and its strategy in line with the problems, real needs and priorities of its beneficiaries?
- To what extent is the project consistent with and complementary to the policies, needs and priorities of the Zambian government?
- To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- To what extent did the project address the barriers to practicing the promoted behaviours?

Effectiveness
- To what extent were the planned activities, outputs, and objectives delivered and achieved / are likely to be achieved?
- What are the likely reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of objectives?
- To what extent can identified changes be attributed to the intervention?
- Which activities and their components should be strengthened in similar future interventions and which on the contrary should be limited?
- Which promoted behaviours were easier / more difficult for the beneficiaries to adopt and why?

Efficiency
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- What was the value for money the project delivered?

Sustainability
- What are the main pre-conditions needed in order for the project's main outcomes to be sustained?
- To what extent were these pre-conditions addressed?
- To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue even after its completion?
- What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the project’s sustainability?
- How might Concern do things better in the future? Which findings may have relevance for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?
Impact

- What are the likely impacts at the end of the project?
- What do beneficiaries and other stakeholders affected by the project perceive to be the effects of the intervention on their lives?
- Are there any signs of the project’s unplanned or unforeseen positive and negative impacts?

Gender

- Does the project generate any evidence to link increases in gender equality/women’s empowerment to nutrition outcomes?
- To what extent has the project contributed to ensuring greater gender equality and women’s empowerment, especially when it comes to 1) women’s access to resources; 2) their influence in decision-making; 3) workload distribution among household members; 4) gender relations within the target households; and 5) women and men’s perceptions of “normal” (acceptable) gender roles?

2.3 Evaluation Team

The evaluation team consisted of the following members:

- lead evaluator – Petr Schmied (see details in the Technical Proposal), lead the evaluation process
- gender specialist – Cecilia Ragazzi (see details in the Technical Proposal), assisted with ensuring maximum gender sensitivity throughout the evaluation process
- 19 female enumerators working in 3 teams were responsible for quantitative data collection from the project’s female beneficiaries
- 3 supervisors (one per team of enumerators) were responsible for supporting the enumerators in ensuring maximum quality of collected data (by using a provided observation checklist)
- 2 interpreters (1 female, 1 male) translated the content of the focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews (qualitative data collection)
- 2 transcribers transcribed and translated the content of the focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews
- 4 data entry staff entered the data from the completed questionnaires to an Excel system developed by the lead evaluator

2.4 Training of the Evaluation Team Members

The lead evaluator provided the evaluation team members with the following trainings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training of enumerators</td>
<td>see details provided in Annex 7.3</td>
<td>3 days (including role plays + field practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of supervisors</td>
<td>supervisors participated in the same training as enumerators; in addition to this they received 1 hour training on supervising enumerators and were coached for one day at the beginning of their fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of data entry staff</td>
<td>introduction to the data entry system; standard data entry procedure; data back-up</td>
<td>1 hour + follow-up supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of transcribers</td>
<td>introduction to the transcription system; data back-up</td>
<td>20min + follow-up supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of interpreters</td>
<td>introduction to the project; review of the questions for FGDs and SSI</td>
<td>30min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of CDFs</td>
<td>administration of borehole survey questionnaire</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Sampling Methodology

Quantitative Survey

The quantitative survey was tasked to collect data that is representative of the following groups:

- the project’s female beneficiaries
- the youngest children of the female beneficiaries aged 0-23 months

At the beginning of the project, all female beneficiaries were either pregnant or had a child under two. However, by the time of the project’s endline survey, children had grown and only some of the beneficiaries had a child under two. The evaluator therefore proposed in the Inception Report that Concern/MCDA’s field staff prepares lists of 1) households with children younger than two years and 2) households with children older than two years living in the pre-selected clusters. These lists would then be used for preparing two samples of randomly selected respondents. Despite Concern and MCDA staffs’ efforts, the lists were not provided to the required quality, and the evaluator therefore proposed and agreed with Concern on the following, alternative sampling methodology:

1) the evaluator used the project’s database of RAIN+ beneficiaries to create 200 clusters, each representing one “farmers’ group” recorded in the database
2) the evaluator then used Excel’s RANDBETWEEN function to randomly select 40 clusters
3) to gain the required number of respondents (including non-response rate – see 2.6), the evaluator then randomly selected from the list of beneficiaries living in the 40 clusters the required number of respondents

Each of the three teams of enumerators was then provided with a list of the selected respondents. In order to minimize the non-response rate, MCDA Community Development Facilitators were tasked to inform the respondents about the planned interviews and request them to be at home at the given time, if possible. In the case that a respondent was not at home, the enumerators were instructed to ask other family members or neighbours when the respondent was likely to return and reschedule the interview accordingly.

Aside from the questionnaire survey, the evaluation also involved a quantitative survey on the functionality of all the 96 rehabilitated boreholes and operation of relevant WASH committees. The data was collected by MCDA staff and its accuracy was crosschecked during spot checks conducted by the lead evaluator. Further quantitative data was gained from the review of the project’s secondary data (see Annex 7.2).

Qualitative Survey

For the independent primary qualitative data collection, the evaluator and two interpreters:

- conducted focus group discussions (FGDs) with the following stakeholders:
  - four FGDs with the female beneficiaries selected through multi-stage sampling: in the first stage, four target female farmers’ groups were randomly selected; in the second, every second member of the group was selected (the starting point was determined randomly)
  - two FGDs with the female beneficiaries’ husbands (following the same sampling methodology described in the point above)
  - two FGDs with the male peer educators operating in the areas where the above mentioned farmers’ group members live
  - two FGDs with the Community Health Volunteers (CHV) operating in the target communities, selected for FGDs with female beneficiaries and in up to three neighbouring target communities
  - two FGDs with the Small Model Farmers, following the same methodology described in the point above

---

1 The quantitative baseline survey for RAIN+ project collected data from women only. Since the endline sampling has to mirror the baseline methodology, it used the same approach. However, the evaluator would like to note that such a methodology does not provide quantitative data on men’s gender-related attitudes.

2 RAIN+ project has worked with 290 groups of female beneficiaries. However, due to various factors (e.g. different groups having the same names, errors made when developing the database of the project beneficiaries, etc.), it frequently happened that several groups in the project’s database merged, appearing as one group only. Despite this inaccuracy, the 200 groups included all the project’s beneficiaries and no exclusion error took place. Considering that the project’s beneficiaries live very thinly spread over a very large geographical area, it was not feasible to select the survey’s respondents randomly from the total list of the project beneficiaries and a cluster approach was required.
• conducted **semi-structured interviews** (SSI) with the following stakeholders:
  - one male peer educator (selected through multi-stage sampling)
  - representatives of five WASH committees (selected through the same methodology as the one described for boreholes below)
  - CWZ Country Director
  - CWZ District Programme Coordinator
  - MCDA Project Coordinator and Technical Officer
  - MCDA Community Development Facilitators (conducted a group interview involving all seven available Facilitators)
  - WfC M&E Officer
  - SUN Coordinator in Mumbwa District
  - MA representative at the district level
  - District Nutrition Officer (MoH)

• conducted **structured observations** of:
  - 3 model farms of the SMFs participating in the FGDs above (the evaluator visited farms of SMFs in the villages where FGDs with the SMFs took place; the villages were selected by using simple random sampling – see above)
  - 2 vegetable gardens of female beneficiaries participating in the FGDs (selected randomly from two groups of FGD participants)
  - operation and maintenance of 5 rehabilitated boreholes’ (the evaluator visited boreholes in or near the randomly selected villages where FGDs with female beneficiaries took place)

The observations used standardized checklists listing the main criteria.

• reviewed the **IEC materials’** quality and appropriateness (see more in Annex 7.6)

• conducted a detailed **review of the documents** listed in Annex 7.2

### 2.6 Sample Size

The revised register of the project beneficiaries included 6,192 women out of which – at the time of the project’s mid-term review – 3,982 (64.3%) had a child under two (RAIN Mid-Term Review). At the time of the project’s endline, there was no up-to-date information on the number of women with a child under two and the evaluator therefore used a more conservative estimate of 50% (3,096 women).

Based on the following formula, the minimum sizes of the two required samples was calculated as 1) **353 female beneficiaries** and 2) **353 children under two**.

\[
ss = \frac{Z^2 \times (p) \times (1-p)}{c^2}
\]

Corrected for finite population:

\[
\text{corrected } ss = \frac{ss}{1 + \frac{ss-1}{\text{pop}}}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z value</td>
<td>1.96  for a 95% confidence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>percentage picking a choice or response</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>confidence interval (margin of error)</td>
<td>± 5 percentage points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>survey’s target population</td>
<td>pop = 1) 6,192 women; 2) 3,096 children under 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As was explained in chapter 2.5, despite the project implementers’ efforts, by the time of the endline survey there was no reliable list available of women with children under two. In order to ensure a sufficient number of respondents, the evaluator:

1) used the estimated percentage of women with children under two (50%) to determine the required number of randomly selected respondents (resulting in 706 women – as 706 minus 50% equals to 353, which was the minimum sample size for children under two)

2) increased this number by an estimated non-response rate of approx. 16% (1 out of 6 persons), resulting in **844 women being randomly selected** for their participation in the survey (see section 2.5).

Given the lack of data on which women have a child under two (with no time left for generating such lists), this approach was the only feasible and methodologically correct option. By the end of the survey, in total **640 female beneficiaries**, out of which **307** had a child under two, **were interviewed** (the remaining were absent). Despite the need to collect data from a larger number of respondents, this approach managed to provide representative data with high levels of accuracy (margin of error as low as 3.7 percentage points for data related to female beneficiaries; and 5.3 percentage points for data related to children under two).

### 2.7 Data Collection

The data was collected by a team of **19 female enumerators and 3 supervisors**. The enumerators were divided into three teams according to which of the local languages they were most fluent in. The supervisors were in charge of coordinating the enumerators’ work, monitoring the quality of their work and providing them with relevant recommendations. This was done by using the **Checklist for Supervising Quantitative Data Collection** that was developed by the lead evaluator who also trained all supervisors in its use (see Annex 7.7). Both the supervisors and enumerators were instructed on how to deal with situations when the respondent was absent or refused to participate.

The interviews were conducted using a paper-based questionnaire developed by the lead evaluator. Prior to and in the course of the interviews, enumerators were responsible for ensuring that the interviews were conducted in privacy, enabling the respondents to feel more at ease when responding to more sensitive questions. Specific guidance to sensitive questions were provided during the initial training for enumerators. At the same time, all respondents were informed about the purpose of the interview, the option to opt-out at any moment, the data usage (including confidentiality), and were asked for their agreement to participate in the interview.

At the end of each day, the lead evaluator reviewed the content of all questionnaires, highlighted identified mistakes, and the following morning provided all enumerators and supervisors with individual feedback and recommendations on what they needed to be careful about. While this procedure took time, it maximized the quality of the collected data. Dietary diversity data were categorised based on the standards set in FAO’s guidelines for assessing dietary diversity (see here and here).
2.8 Data Entry and Analysis
The collected data was entered to an Excel data entry system developed by the lead evaluator. The data entry was ensured by two teams, each consisting of one “Recorder” and one “Reader”. In order to minimize any data entry errors, they were instructed to use the following procedure:

1) first, the Reader said the number of the question, such as “question 1.5”
2) the Reader then said the code of the provided answer, such as “answer 4” (the code was included in the questionnaire)
3) the Recorder then located this answer in the data entry system and read out the associated words/phrase, such as “doesn’t have soap”
4) the Reader then confirmed whether the Recorder had identified the correct answer in the system
5) the Recorder then recorded that the given answer was provided

Since this procedure worked both with the code and the name of the provided answer, it minimized any data entry errors. The accuracy of the data entry was regularly monitoring by using random checks.

The data was analysed by the lead evaluator using Excel data analysis functions. To avoid any data analysis errors, each data calculation was performed twice. Where relevant, the data was disaggregated by sex, age and wealth. For selected variables, the margin of error of the provided data (indicating precision) was calculated using 95% confidence intervals.

2.9 Gender Mainstreaming Measures
The evaluation team took the following gender mainstreaming measures:

- all enumerators participating in the quantitative survey were women, increasing the likelihood that female respondents would feel at ease when responding to sensitive questions (such as gender-related opinions or regarding the relationship with their husband)
- qualitative survey engaged a female interpreter for FGDs and interviews with women and a male interpreter for FGD and interviews with men
- the quantitative endline survey as well as the qualitative evaluation focused on all of the following aspects of gender equality and women’s empowerment:
  - gender division of labour
  - women’s access to resources
  - women’s influence in decision-making
  - gender relations within the target households
  - women and men’s perceptions of “normal” (acceptable) gender roles
- while the project’s main beneficiaries were women, a considerable part of the qualitative survey was spent on also assessing men’s attitudes and practices
- quantitative data related to children under two are gender disaggregated
- all enumerators were trained on the principles and practices of gender-sensitive interviewing
- supervisors’ checklists included several points monitoring the use of gender-sensitive interviewing methods
- meetings were in places and at times that are deemed safe and convenient for the respondents
- each respondent was informed about the option to opt out at any point (e.g. when not feeling comfortable about the discussed topic)
- all enumerators were provided with contact details of a Mumbwa-based “One Stop Centre” providing assistance to women affected by gender-based violence and were encouraged to share it whenever they sensed that the respondent might be affected by gender-based violence
2.10 Ethical Considerations
In addition to the measures described above, the evaluation process also involved the following ethical considerations and measures:

- the purpose of the data collection and the use of the collected data was explained to all interviewees / FGD participants in an easy to understand and objective way; each participant was given the option to opt out at any point (see Consent Form in FGD Guides and SSI questionnaires)
- all interviewees were informed that the survey would have no impact on the extent of support they receive (so as to avoid raising false expectations) from Concern or other organizations
- oral consent was requested from all participants by following the consent form included in the FGD Guides, SSI questionnaires and observation checklists
- photos / audio recordings were taken only after receiving a relevant person’s consent (the consent form was included in the FGD Guides and SSI questionnaires)
- the data was collected in a safe environment where no other people could listen to what the respondent(s) said
- paper questionnaires, entered data, transcripts, etc. were provided to CWZ – its staff was expected to be responsible for ensuring the data safety
- with the exception of the local authorities, Concern, WfC and MCDA staff, respondents’ names were not recorded (ensuring greater data confidentiality)
- the survey avoided using jargon and leading questions
- the interviews and FGDs' length was kept to a minimum, to avoid exhausting the respondents by asking too many questions

2.11 Limitations
The lead evaluator identified the following limitations of the conducted survey. None of these were likely to have a significant impact on the evaluation’s outcomes:

- in order to ensure that the baseline and endline is collected in the same season, the evaluation had to be conducted 7 months prior to the completion of the project’s activities
- the database of the project beneficiaries has not been updated at a frequency that would ensure that it includes all the people who joined the project at a later stage and excludes people who stopped participating at an early stage of the project – however, according to CWZ’s Programme Area Coordinator, such “inclusion” or “exclusion” errors should be minimal
- the respondents might not have always correctly recalled or estimated the required information (such as the time required to collect water or the types of trainings they attended)
- respondents’ expectations and other factors might have affected the objectivity of received data (despite the fact that they were informed that their answers will not impact on the assistance they receive)
- despite the feedback provided to the transcribers, the quality of transcripts of FDGs and SSIs was often limited, which might have resulted in a minor part of the information being lost
3. FINDINGS

3.1 Relevance

Based on the evaluation's findings, the evaluator provides answers to the main relevance-related questions included in the ToR provided by Concern:

**To what extent are the project objectives and its strategy in line with the problems, real needs and priorities of its beneficiaries?**

Zambia has 40% prevalence of chronic undernutrition among children under five years and Mumbwa district is no exception. Children and women consume a fairly monotonous diet (caused by, amongst other things, agricultural production oriented towards growing cotton and maize) and have inadequate access to water and sanitation. Gender inequality and the perception of women as something that men own is a further contributor to high undernutrition levels. As a response to this situation, the RAIN+ project provided a range of multi-sectoral assistance. **Amongst the most relevant types of support were:**

- **promoting a change from within**, through engaging community members (such as SMFs, CHVs, peer educators and “early adopters”) in motivating and enabling women and men to practice a range of food production, health, hygiene, and gender-related practices
- **addressing many frequently “hidden barriers”** by looking at food and nutrition insecurity from the **gender point of view** (see more on the following pages)
- **introducing** (although not originally planned) saving and loan groups that **enable women to access money** (up to several hundred Kw per person) when needed and contribute to their empowerment (constant financial dependency on their spouses was one of the main disempowering factors)
- **providing quality seeds** from crops that are rich in nutrients + had a good germination rate
- **developing and providing SMFs with very practical Agricultural Manuals**
- **introducing organic farming practices** in an area that is traditionally heavily reliant on costly chemical inputs (due to the prevalence of cotton production); natural fertilizers and pesticides saved households' money, reduced dependency on purchasing chemical inputs, and decreased the risk of poor chemical management and the implications for children’s health and development
- **providing frequent agronomic trainings to SMFs**, with their timing aligned to the seasonal requirements
- **providing hip pumps reducing women’s workload** and metal solar driers enabling women to preserve the produced vegetables and fruits
- **cancelling the provision of fuel-efficient stoves** that were of a limited quality and could not be replaced once they stopped working
- **promoting largely replicable and culturally acceptable recipes** for complementary feeding

**The following types of support had a more limited relevance:**

- **providing all seeds as free donations** instead of providing only an initial amount of seeds for free and then switching to subsidized vouchers and later purely commercial supply
- **providing peer educators** with **two day gender trainings only** with no follow-up and expecting them to be able not only to change their peers’ gender-related attitudes and behaviours but also to train other peer educators
- **not including men’s gender-related attitudes and behaviours** in the project’s **baseline survey**
- **creating / not preventing an initial impression among men that “the project is for women”** resulting in their disinterest in its activities and/or suspicion about the project’s intentions and benefits – according to the 2017 Stories of Change report, “Some men felt that they were being left out of the process and women were getting far more attention. Other men initially resisted the gender activities and women’s groups, but on seeing the benefits (and that the activities are meant to help men too) became supportive, even encouraging their wives to attend meetings.”
- **providing an insufficient number of hip pumps** (1 pump for up to 25 women – realistically, 1 pump cannot be used by more than 3-4 women)

---

3 Data source: http://scalingupnutrition.org/sun-countries/zambia/
- expecting that after a training from Kick Start, women will be able to repair damaged hip pumps
- providing groundnut seeds too late to be planted and harvested with good results
- (this is not entirely the project’s weakness as the IEC materials were designed by NFNC) – using IEC materials that have too much content in one picture and its messages are therefore relatively difficult to comprehend (especially when used in a small A4/A3 format for a larger group of women)

### To what extent is the project consistent with and complementary to the policies, needs and priorities of the Zambian government?

Based on the review of relevant policies and interviews with the district SUN Coordinator, MoH’s District Nutrition Officer and MA’s Acting Senior Agriculture Officer, the evaluator has not identified any discrepancies between the Government’s plans and RAIN+ project’s approach and content. The project’s work has been positively appraised by all interviewed officials. When it comes to the government’s needs, one is the continuous development of the service delivery capacities of its extension staff – CHVs in the health sector and Camp Extension Officers (CEOs) in the agricultural sector. These stakeholders are the main “agents of change” at the community level as (aside from NGOs, etc.) they are the main stakeholders responsible for motivating and supporting people to adopt and follow the promoted health, nutrition, hygiene, and agronomic practices. While the project worked on strengthening the capacities of CHVs, its support to CEOs has been limited. The service delivery capacities of CEOs are essential for ensuring the sustainability of SMFs’ role and competencies; furthermore, the CEOs are the main actors capable of ensuring that gender is effectively mainstreamed in the agronomic trainings (RAIN+ indicator 5.3).

### To what extent did the project address the barriers to practicing the promoted behaviours?

The project has promoted dozens of different behaviours and it wasn’t within the scope of this evaluation to assess to what extent the barriers to practicing all these behaviours were addressed. The Table 2 therefore focuses on the behaviours that were analysed as a part of the RAIN Barrier Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>BARRIERS (NOT) ADDRESSED BY THE PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive Breastfeeding</td>
<td>• the project enabled lactating women to consume more nutritious foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the project promoted the benefits of EB (improved nutrition, lower risk of diarrhoea) and explained why providing breastmilk alone is sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary diversity in complementary feeding + during pregnancy</td>
<td>• the project enabled women to grow more nutritious food and earn more money, both required for providing a more varied diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwashing</td>
<td>• the project improved women’s access to water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the project did not implement any activities on increasing the accessibility and availability of soap (except through income generation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Photo: One of 22,000 people benefiting from the 96 boreholes rehabilitated in the course of the project.](image)
Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts?

The project aimed to contribute to the prevention and reduction of chronic undernutrition. According to UNICEF’s conceptual framework of malnutrition (see below), the key underlying causes of undernutrition include household food insecurity, inadequate feeding and child care practices, poor sanitation environment, hygiene conditions and inadequate access to quality health services. Among the basic causes of undernutrition are inadequate access to services, inadequate financial and human resources, and social-cultural, economic and political context.

The project’s food production, Maternal, Infant and Young Child Feeding (MIYCF), WASH, gender and policy components addressed most of the underlying and basic causes of undernutrition. Considering the existing evidence around the impact of environmental enteropathy on the prevalence of chronic undernutrition, the project could have put a stronger emphasis on low-cost hygiene practices, such as the hand washing after critical moments (including ownership and use of a handwashing station with water and soap). Furthermore, considering that addressing chronic undernutrition requires a more long-term process, a 3-year long project duration is likely to be too short.

Especially worth highlighting has been the project’s gender component. While gender is frequently hidden under “sociocultural context” (and given limited attention), looking at nutrition from the “gender point of view” shows that positive and lasting nutrition outcomes are unlikely to be achieved without addressing gender equality and women empowerment. For example, children and women are unlikely to be well-nourished if:

- women’s workload is so high that it does not allow them to ensure the required child care and to get the rest their bodies need
- women have limited say in what foods will be grown (and what they will be used for) or purchased
- women have limited access to income (and the power money gives) and/or influence over how family income is used
- men are not supportive of their wives/family members following positive nutrition, health, and hygiene practices (such as those promoted by the health extension workers)

The inclusion of the project’s gender component at the community and policy level is therefore a welcomed and much needed approach that is highly consistent with the project’s intended impact.
3.2 Effectiveness

3.2.1 Achievement of the Project’s Objectives

The overall objective of the project has been to “contribute to the prevention of stunting among children under 5 in rural Zambia”. The achievement of this objective was measured by indicators (disaggregated by sex and wealth) presented in the following Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Endline Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of children 6-23 months fed a minimum acceptable diet the day before the interview</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>51.4% (45.6 – 57.2; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>girls</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 6.5 – 9.7 (= wealthiest households)</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.8% (50.8 – 80.8; 95% C.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 3.3 – 6.4 (= ‘middle class’ households)</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.7% (43.7 – 59.5; 95% C.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 0.7 – 3.2 (= poorest households)</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.2% (32.4 – 54.0; 95% C.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of women with minimum dietary diversity (MDD)</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52.1% (48.4 – 55.8; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 6.5 – 9.7 (= wealthiest households)</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.7% (73.6 – 53.9; 95% C.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 3.3 – 6.4 (= ‘middle class’ households)</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.7% (47.8 – 57.6; 95% C.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 0.7 – 3.2 (= poorest households)</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.2% (37.0 – 51.4; 95% C.I.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project managed to achieve a sevenfold increase in the proportion of children consuming a diet of an acceptable quality – that is being provided at the minimum required frequency and containing foods from at least four out of seven food groups. Girls’ diet was more varied than the meals consumed by boys. Children from poorer households ate a nutritionally less diverse diet than those from better-off households. While most caregivers (89%) managed to feed their children at the minimum required frequency, ensuring the micronutrient diversity of the provided meals proved to be more difficult. The fact that the project did not achieve this indicator’s target value should not be perceived as its weakness – the recorded improvement in children’s diet is very significant. The main weakness is that originally proposed target was not revised once the baseline data became available, resulting in having overly ambitious target (this applies also to the next indicator).

When it comes to the nutritional diversity of women’s diets, the proportion of women whose meals contained at least four out of nine food groups has nearly doubled. At the same time, women from poorer households consumed a less varied diet than those from better-off households. Nearly all female respondents (94%) ate three or more meals in the course of the previous day and night. The meals consumed by the surveyed women and children frequently contained the foods that women grew in their gardens. During the focus group discussions, women repeatedly mentioned that prior to the project they were not able to produce and consume such a variety of vegetables, saying that “…we just used to admire them when we went to the market.” Since the project supported women in producing foods from four different food groups (grains, legumes and nuts, vitamin A rich fruits and vegetables, and other fruits and vegetables), it is very likely that the positive changes can be attributed to the intervention.

---

4 By the existing standards, MDD-women means consuming at least 5 out of 10 defined food groups. For the endline survey’s purpose, the evaluator continued to use the baseline’s original definition of MDD as “4 out of 9 food groups”.

Page | 19
The project’s **specific objective** aimed to “improve nutrition of women and children in 5,910 households in four wards of Mumbwa District, Zambia”. The achievement of this objective was measured by a set of multi-sectoral indicators presented in the following **Table 4**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Endline Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. % target households producing micronutrient rich plant and animal foods (= vitamin A, Iron, animal source foods)</td>
<td>Vit. A: 26.3% Iron: 59.9% animal: 94.8%</td>
<td>Vit. A: 60% Iron: 95% animal: 95%</td>
<td>Vitamin A: 97.3% (93.6 - 100; 95% C.I.) Iron: 97.3% (93.6 - 100; 95% C.I.) animal: 91% (87.2 - 94.6; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. % of children 6 - 23 months of age fed minimum meal frequency the day before the interview</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>88.5% (82.7 – 94.3; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>girls</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Autonomy Index</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 6.5 – 9.7 (= wealthiest households)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 3.3 – 6.4 (= ‘middle class’ households)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Asset Index 0.7 – 3.2 (= poorest households)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % of men substantially participating in at least 3 household tasks</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>data will be collected in December 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly all surveyed households have in the past 12 months produced animal source foods and crops rich in vitamin A and Iron. While the production of animal source foods (primarily eggs and poultry meat) was common even before the project, the production of Iron and especially vitamin A rich foods showed a considerable increase. In the case of Iron-rich foods, the increase was driven primarily by the very widespread production of mbereishi beans and dark green vegetables (such as rape – see photo). Since dark green vegetables are a popular part of the Zambian cuisine and can be easily sold even in the local communities, RAIN+ beneficiaries have had a double incentive to grow them in their gardens. Dark green vegetables are also the main types or crops grown both during the rainy and dry season. Vitamin A rich foods were represented primarily by orange maize (grown by 92% of the project beneficiaries), orange fleshed sweet potatoes (66%), carrots (63%), and pumpkin (45%).

The proportion of children consuming the minimum required number of meals per day has more than doubled (from 34.7 to 88.5%). Considering that the baseline and endline data was collected at times with very similar levels of food accessibility, it is realistic to expect that a significant part of this increase was achieved thanks to the project’s IYCF awareness raising sessions.
The achievement of the project’s specific objective was also measured by using the **Women Autonomy Index**, a composite indicator considering five aspects of women’s autonomy. The results are presented in the following **Table 5**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>woman earned money in the past 12 months</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman is involved in decisions about large investments</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(score 0-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman has input into households clothes and food purchases</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife and husband talk to each other about their problems</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(score 0-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman participates in at least one community group</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Autonomy Index</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identified changes in the levels of women’s autonomy were caused by improvements in all five surveyed areas: more women were earning money, (co)deciding about large investments, having a say about purchases of clothes and food, talking with husbands about the problems they face, and participating in at least one community group. While some increases were relatively easy to achieve (e.g. participation in a group), women’s greater control over income is a very positive achievement that has the potential to sustainably improve women’s and their children’s nutritional status.

The survey did not identify any significant differences in the autonomy of women from poorer and better-of households.

---

5 As decision making indicators were only asked of married women, the women’s autonomy index was only calculated for married women (using the same approach as the baseline survey).
3.2.1 Achievement of the Project’s Outputs

OUTPUT 1: 5,910 women have increased knowledge, skills and ability to improve household nutrition security.

The project established 290 groups whose representatives - the Smallholder Model Farmers (SMFs) - were trained by WfC on leadership skills. The SMFs were regularly trained by MCDA’s Community Development Facilitators (CDFs) on a range of agronomic skills, including post-harvest handling of their produce.

One of the promoted techniques for preserving fruits and vegetables was drying. Drying was common even before the project’s support (86.6% of the baseline respondents mentioned knowing this technique; 88.6% of endline respondents mentioned using this technique). The main change enabled by the project was a (partial) switch from drying vegetables on sacks lying on the ground to the use of more efficient and hygienic metal driers. Vegetables dried by using the provided driers had reportedly better taste, contained less dust, and dried faster. At the same time, since each group (approx. 20 people) received only one drier (that is quite heavy to move), the driers were used only by a part of the project beneficiaries. Due to the very positive experience with using the driers, Concern plans to provide additional driers. At least one of the promoted techniques for safe food storage was used by 95.3% of the beneficiaries.

The proportion of women in charge of selling agricultural produce (including meat, eggs, milks and/or field crops) has doubled, from 20.7% to 41.5%. According to the qualitative survey, women not only are more frequently involved in selling agricultural produce but also (co)decide on how the generated income will be used. When the evaluator asked about who decides on how the household’s agricultural income is used, one of the most common responses was: “We will sit together as a couple and decide how the family should use the income”.

Since the project did not conduct any post-training tests assessing the proportion of women with the desired knowledge and skills, the last indicator was measured by counting the proportion of women capable of growing at least three different crops (87.6%). The beneficiaries generally did not report many problems related to growing vegetables, stating that earlier they would not believe that it is so easy to produce a variety of crops for their diet and sale. Similarly, the respondents found preserving vegetable seeds from one season to another as uncomplicated (with the exception of rape, spinach and carrots).

The main identified weaknesses in beneficiaries’ knowledge and skills were related to their ability to correctly recognize and effectively eliminate pests that were diminishing their harvest (23% of the project beneficiaries claimed to have lost the majority of their harvest due to pests). While the respondents appreciated the savings generated thanks to using natural pesticides, they also mentioned that these methods are not always effective in killing or deterring the pests. However, it was not possible to determine whether the main problem is the natural pesticides’ incorrect application or their (partial) ineffectiveness.

---

Table 6: Achievement of the Project Output 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Endline Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 # of women’s groups formed and received leadership training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290 groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 % of women with children aged &lt;2 years that are preserving fruits and vegetables by drying</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>88.6% (84.9 - 92.3; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 % of women who are storing food safely</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>95.3% (91.6 - 99; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 % of women in charge of selling agricultural produce (including meat, eggs, milks and/or field crops)</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41.5% (37.8 - 45.2; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 % of women with knowledge and skills for growing micronutrient rich foods</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87.6% (83.9 - 91.3; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTPUT 2: More equitable participation and decision-making promoted amongst men and women related to nutrition security.

The community dialogues were frequently mentioned as one of the tools used for sensitizing the community members on greater gender equality and women’s empowerment. While their implementation was mentioned by different stakeholders (WfC, CZW, peer educators), based on the available data, the evaluator **could not verify the number of conducted community dialogues.**

Concern’s partner organization WfC initially trained 60 male peer educators as the main promoters of gender equality among male and female members of the target communities. According to the educators, the training helped them to gain more confidence and skills required for raising gender issues among their peers and motivating them to change their existing attitudes and behaviours. Each of the 60 initially trained promoters received two days training after which he was expected to identify in/near his community another three educators and provide them with gender training. While this process would increase the number of educators to 240 men (60 educators plus 60 x 3 educators) and the indicator would be formally met, most of these “additional” educators would have a very limited qualification. In the coming weeks, WfC will therefore train 60 more educators directly.

Among the **main gender-related changes** reported by the peer educators, female beneficiaries, their husbands, CHVs and other stakeholders in the course of the qualitative survey were:

- men increasingly helping with household chores (according to one respondent: “Earlier, men were just waiting for the woman to come back home from her work and start cooking, washing…”)
- greater sharing of responsibilities for various tasks; women and men reported rejecting the traditional division of “men’s tasks” and “women’s tasks” (it is worth mentioning that through the study it emerged that women were also co-operating in male domains, such as animal husbandry, charcoal-making and moulding bricks)
- women less frequently treated as something that men own (because “they paid for them”)
- men supporting women and children with accessing health care
- women being more aware of (and demanding) their rights
- men being more willing to make decision jointly with their spouses

Despite the qualitative survey bringing out a range of positive findings, the quantitative **Gender Attitudes Scales Index** recorded more moderate changes in women’s attitudes (changes in men’s attitudes could not be measured since their assessment was not included in the baseline survey).

**Table 7: Achievement of the Project Output 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Endline Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 # of community dialogues held</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 network of male peer educators established and trained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>60 educators / 300 educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 average score on the Gender Attitudes Scale (GAS)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8: Sub-components of the Gender Attitudes Scale Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-components of the Gender Attitudes Scale Index</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attitudes toward girl children index</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes toward violence against women index</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes toward social and sexual relations at home index</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composite Gender Attitudes Scales Index</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Photo: FGD with RAIN+ peer educators in Chiwena village.*
The following overview provides a more detailed insight into women’s gender-related attitudes:

The Gender Attitudes Scale Index showed improvements across all types of gender-related attitudes. Considering the absence of other “agents of change”, it is very likely that these positive changes can be attributed to the project. At the same time, the detailed analysis shows that violence against women remains a relatively accepted practice – 65% of women said that it is justified to beat women if they neglect their children and nearly half agreed that it is justified to beat women when they go out without telling her husband. At the same time, nearly two thirds of respondents (62%) did not think that a woman should tolerate violence in order to keep her family together.

About a third of the respondents believed that it is more important to give birth to a boy than a girl and to spend money primarily on sons. When it comes to the perception of women’s responsibilities, 84% of the female respondents believed that it is a woman’s job to take care of young children; two thirds of them thought that it is a woman’s responsibility to avoid getting pregnant.

Despite the fact that 66% of women believed that men should have the final word about decisions in the home, the qualitative survey identified a range of “positive deviants” – both female and male – who preferred to make decisions together and listed a range of benefits such joint decision-making brings, such as greater “harmony” at home and more effective use of the family income. According to a male respondent: “Before the training we … did not believe in women making decisions. That was because of the old tradition that when a woman makes decision, people would say you are bewitched. But now we have understood.”

As the data on the left shows, there were not significant differences in the attitudes of women from poorer and better-off households.

### Table 9: GAS data disaggregated by wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Asset Index</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.7 – 3.2 (= wealthiest households)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 – 6.4 (= ‘middle class’ households)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 – 9.7 (= poorest households)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Women’s Attitudes Towards Domestic Violence, Girls and Relationships at Home

- A woman should tolerate violence in order to keep her family together. 16% strongly agree, 23% agree, 27% disagree, 35% strongly disagree.
- A man should have the final word about decisions in his home. 28% strongly agree, 38% agree, 24% disagree, 10% strongly disagree.
- It is a woman’s responsibility to avoid getting pregnant. 25% strongly agree, 40% agree, 22% disagree, 13% strongly disagree.
- Changing diapers, or cloths, giving kids a bath, and feeding kids are a woman’s responsibility. 44% strongly agree, 40% agree, 11% disagree, 5% strongly disagree.
- A woman’s most important role is to take care of her family. 43% strongly agree, 43% agree, 9% disagree, 5% strongly disagree.
- Beating a woman is justified if she refuses to have sex with her husband. 18% strongly agree, 20% agree, 34% disagree, 28% strongly disagree.
- Beating a woman is justified if she argues with her husband. 8% strongly agree, 27% agree, 38% disagree, 27% strongly disagree.
- Beating a woman is justified if she neglects her children. 32% strongly agree, 33% agree, 24% disagree, 11% strongly disagree.
- Beating a woman is justified if she goes out without telling her husband. 22% strongly agree, 27% agree, 30% disagree, 21% strongly disagree.
- It is more important for a woman to give birth to a boy than a girl. 11% strongly agree, 20% agree, 36% disagree, 31% strongly disagree.
- If there is limited amount of money, it should be spent on sons first. 11% strongly agree, 24% agree, 36% disagree, 29% strongly disagree.
OUTPUT 3: 5,910 women are producing and consuming micro nutrient rich foods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Achievement of the Project Output 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 % of women who are producing diverse and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>micronutrient rich foods based on seed pack and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revised SMF Agriculture Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 # of women who have completed the training course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on agriculture in line with the revised manual and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 # of boreholes with functional WASH committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehabilitated and beneficiaries accessing clean water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the rehabilitated boreholes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant increase in the volume and diversity of vegetables grown and other crops was among the most commonly stated benefits of the RAIN+ project. The Figure 2 below compares the proportion of women growing selected types of vegetables and fruits 1) before the project and 2) in the past 12 months:

The data shows a considerable increase in the proportion of women growing different types of vegetables and fruits, especially when it comes to the production of tomato, eggplant (see photos) and okra. At the same time, there is a gap between the proportion of women who should have received the seeds of these crops (100%) and the proportion of women who grew them. This difference can be caused by several factors, including:

- some of the project beneficiaries (for some reason) did not plant (a portion of) the provided seeds
- the beneficiaries did not report to the enumerators those crops which they planted but could not harvest (e.g. due to pests)

While the vast majority (87.6%) of the beneficiaries grew at least three types of vegetables and fruits, it is apparent that only a few of them benefited from the full variety of the provided seeds.
As the following comparison shows, the production of vegetables was prone to seasonal differences caused primarily by significant water shortages. **35.2% of the project beneficiaries grew vegetables only during the rainy season**, primarily due to the lack of water required for irrigating even smaller quantities of crops during the dry season.

The female beneficiaries were trained on agronomic knowledge and skills by their peers, the community-based Smallholder Model Farmers (SMFs). Once every 1-2 months, the SMFs received training from MCDA’s Community Development Facilitators and were then expected to replicate the training to the women’s group members. The trainings were provided in line with the seasonal requirements (e.g. at the beginning of the season, the training covered soil preparation). In total **87% of the female beneficiaries (5,406 women) reported receiving at least one type of training and growing at least one crop**. The following overview shows the training topics the female respondents were able to recall.6

![Figure 3: Seasonal Differences in Vegetable Production](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training topic</th>
<th>% of beneficiaries reporting to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>land preparation</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil fertility</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursery management</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crop management</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pest management</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seed preservation</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project beneficiaries found the **trainings provided by SMFs useful and fairly easy-to-follow**. Since most women live relatively near each other and many have gardens located in close proximity, they could also observe and learn from their peers’ practices.

---

6 Many respondents found it difficult to recall all the trainings they participated in. The provided data therefore provides only an approximate overview.
The last component of the project’s third output was the rehabilitation of boreholes and support to the VWASH committees responsible for their maintenance. In the course of the project, in total **96 boreholes were rehabilitated, providing water to 3,035 households** (approx. 22,000 people). One borehole is used on average by 34 households. The number of users per household ranges from 7 to approx. 200 households.

**The vast majority of the boreholes were in good condition; the only exceptions were:**

- 4 out of 96 boreholes had their pump or inner pipes broken and were not functional
- 17 out of 96 boreholes had a partially damaged water pump though they remained functioning
- in the case of 11 boreholes, it took a long time (and considerable physical effort) for the water to start flowing

The survey also identified the following **technical weaknesses** that the RAIN+ project’s strategy did not plan to address; however, these still have an impact on the water quality and the boreholes’ performance:

- 47 out of 95 boreholes had either cracked, or had partially or fully missing concrete stands, increasing the risk of water seepages (see photo on the right below)
- the fencing of 73 out of 93 boreholes was not sufficiently dense, allowing domestic animals to come in (and potentially defecate / urinate near the water pump); boreholes with adequate protection were therefore rather an exception (see photo on the left below)

When it comes to the **performance of the VWASH committees**, the survey identified that:

- 75 out of 94 boreholes (80%) were supervised by an existing VWASH committee
- 74 boreholes were supervised by an existing VWASH committee and were functional
- VWASH committees have on average 7 members; 42% of the members are women
- 70% of the interviewed VWASH committee members reported receiving training on borehole management
- 53% of the VWASH committees hold regular meetings (usually once per month)
- 50% of the VWASH committees regularly collect users fees from the boreholes for borehole maintenance (some monthly, most once per year); in the remaining cases people pay only once the borehole is broken
- the monthly fees range from 2 to 20 Kwacha
- 78% of the VWASH committees keep records of their income and expenditures related to the borehole maintenance
- 92% of the interviewed VWASH committee members knew whom to contact in case their borehole needed a repair which they were not able to deal with on their own
OUTPUT 4: Improved knowledge, attitudes and practices of 5,910 women around maternal, infant and young child feeding.

Table 12: Achievement of the Project Output 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Endline Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  # of women's groups trained and counselled on MIYCF by the CHVs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290 groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  % of children exclusively breastfed the day before the interview, children &lt; 6 months of age</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90.9% (76.9 - 100; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  % of mothers / caretakers of children &lt;24 months of age that can identify at least 3 critical times for handwashing with soap</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83.1% (79.4 - 86.8; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  average individual diet diversity score of mothers</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project worked with a network of Community Health Volunteers who regularly (1-2 times per month) met with the female beneficiaries from 290 target groups and trained them on using promoted MIYCF practices. Additionally, they also promoted improved hygiene practices. Their work recorded positive results across all monitored indicators:

1) Exclusive Breastfeeding
The proportion of babies who during the previous day and night consumed only breast milk and no other fluids or meals increased from 82.2% to 90.9%. At the same time, women and CHVs perceived exclusive breastfeeding as one of the most difficult behaviours. As it is fairly time consuming, women found it challenging to combine it with the range of other responsibilities they had (including going to the markets / field / and other places where they could not always take their babies with them).

2) Handwashing with Soap
The proportion of women aware of at least three critical moments for handwashing with soap has increased from 54.6% to 83.1%. At the same time, the proportion of households with a handwashing facility (including water and soap) was very low – only 11%. Only 24% of respondents had soap at home (i.e. anywhere in the household – not necessarily just in hand washing locations). This disparity shows that improved awareness might not necessarily translate into improved behaviours. At the same time, the fact that some beneficiaries are already using low-cost handwashing stations gives Concern and MCDA a good opportunity to engage these “positive deviants” in influencing the hygiene practices of their community members.

3) Mothers’ Dietary Diversity
At the time of the project’s baseline survey, the meals consumed by mothers had a very low dietary diversity of 2.55 out of 9 food groups. Two years later, their diet became more diverse and included on average 3.7 out of 9 food groups. Over half of the survey respondents (50.5%) ate foods from four or more food groups during the previous day and night. Women who during the last season (dry season) grew at least 5 types of vegetables had a slightly higher dietary diversity (3.94) than women who grew four or less crops (3.65).

Other important health and hygiene findings are included in Table 13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>average number of antenatal visits</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>4.05 visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of women whose last baby was delivered at a health facility</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>81.5% (77.7 – 85.3; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of women taking iron/ folic acid tablets during the last pregnancy</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>98.2% (94.4 – 100; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of women who during their last pregnancy received counselling about breastfeeding</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>91.6% (87.8 – 95.4; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households using improved sanitation facility</td>
<td>2.3% (1.0 – 5.3; 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>20.2% (16.5 – 23.9; 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTPUT 5: Activities that promote gender equality and women’s empowerment are integrated into district planning.

Table 14: Achievement of the Project Output 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Endline Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 activities to promote gender equality included in the District Nutrition Plan 2017</td>
<td>no activities</td>
<td>at least 3 activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DNCC discuss and agree on actions to address gender issues in their regular meetings</td>
<td>no actions</td>
<td>5 meetings are discussing</td>
<td>more than 5 meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 actions taken</td>
<td>2 actions taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MA staff at district level mainstreamed gender in their agricultural training</td>
<td>no measures</td>
<td>3 measures</td>
<td>2 measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The achievement of the project’s policy-related output was measured through three main means:

1) Inclusion of activities promoting gender equality in the 2017 District Nutrition Plan
The 2017 Plan included a very large number of multi-sectoral activities. The only gender-related activity has been “Gender and capacity building programmes/trainings at district (DNCC) and community (WNCCs & ZNCCs) levels”. This activity is expected to take place in the last quarter of 2017. No other gender-related activities were included (however, the project still has an opportunity to influence the 2018 District Nutrition Plan).

2) DNCC discuss and agree on actions to address gender issues in their regular meetings
According to the DNCC members, during the DNCC monthly meetings, gender issues were frequently discussed (particularly thanks to the initiative of Concern representatives). These discussions led to two specific actions taken: 1) the preparation of a policy paper on the coordination of multi-sectoral nutrition activities; and 2) organization of the above mentioned “gender and capacity building training”. In addition to these activities, the DNCC members did not recall any other actions taken to address gender issues.

3) MA staff at district level mainstreamed gender in their agricultural training
The Ministry of Agriculture representatives at the district level have a high awareness of the importance of improving gender equality and promoting women’s empowerment. At the same time, it was difficult for them to recall a large number of specific gender mainstreaming measures in their agricultural trainings. The two measures they could list were 1) ensuring that at least 30-40% of the training participants are women; and 2) inviting men to cooking demonstrations.

3.3 Efficiency
Based on the evaluation’s findings, the evaluator provides answers to the main efficiency-related questions included in the ToR provided by Concern:

Were objectives achieved on time?
The final evaluation was conducted seven months prior to the project’s completion. At that time, the project managed to (nearly) achieve most of its food security / nutrition-related indicators. The fulfilment of gender and policy-related indicators is likely to require more time (also due to the delays in the implementation of WfC’s gender component) but can be largely achieved within the remaining project duration. At the time of the evaluation, the project did not face any serious delays.
What was the value for money the project delivered? Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

The project’s value for money was assessed from the four key perspectives of “4E” (Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Equity) as follows:

**ECONOMY:** Were the purchased inputs of the appropriate quality and at the right price?

- The purchase of all material inputs was compliant to Concern’s Procurement Guidelines that requires any purchase above 1,000 EUR to be based on the best of at least 3 quotations (stricter rules apply to purchases above 10,000 EUR).
- VAT exempt status reduced the costs of purchased inputs.
- The project spending was regularly monitored and the budget was updated when required (e.g. by increasing or decreasing some types of support as required). Only in one instance did an incorrect overview of the budget spending influence the management’s ability to ensure well-planned spending.
- The office costs of Concern, MCDA and WfC were largely shared between several projects.
- The project used the largely existing expertise within Concern and its partners, which was gained during the implementation of similar interventions (such as the RAIN project), reducing the need for spending time and money on acquiring the required know-how. The same applied in the use of existing IEC materials, manuals, etc.

**EFFICIENCY:** How well were the inputs converted into outputs?

- The project activities managed to largely or fully achieve 15 out of 18 output indicators.
- The project engaged a wide network of over 500 volunteers – SMFs, CHVs, and peer educators who promoted a range of agronomic, health, hygiene and gender-related practices at minimum costs.
- The project provided a large amount of seeds of good quality; part of which were provided at a time when market-based (instead of donations-based) types of support would be more relevant (and less expensive).
- Concern’s internal auditor visited the project several times and randomly verified whether the beneficiaries received the assets they were supposed to receive.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** How well did the project’s outputs achieve the desired outcome?

- The project outputs managed to fully or largely achieve 4 out of 5 assessed outcome and impact indicators.
- The project avoided duplication of its efforts with the work done by other actors.
- The project’s approach has good potential for replication; Concern has promoted the approach among multiple actors and plans to consolidate and disseminate learnings from this intervention.
- The existing sustainability strategy has been partially effective (see next page); however, the project still has the time to strengthen the sustainability of its key outcomes (see recommendations).

**EQUITY:** To what extent were the results of the intervention equitably distributed?

- The project’s monitoring system and in-depth studies (Stories of Change, evaluations) sought opinions from a wide range of stakeholders, including female beneficiaries, their husbands, service providers, etc.
- The dietary diversity data was disaggregated by sex and wealth.
- The project’s trainings worked through a “cascade system” where the project implementers trained a limited number of community members (SMFs, CHVs, peer educators) who were then expected to train others. While this approach reduced the costs, the project had only limited possibility to monitor the extent to which the know-how reaches different members of the target groups. Similarly, since some assets were provided in smaller quantities (solar driers, hip pumps), only some of the beneficiaries could use them. During the qualitative survey, these assets were usually kept by women with a higher social/economic standing, such as SMFs or women from better-off households (though they were usually used by several more women).
### 3.4 Sustainability

Based on the evaluation’s findings, the evaluator provides answers to the main sustainability-related questions included in the ToR provided by Concern:

**What are the main pre-conditions for the project’s main outcomes to be sustained? To what extent were these pre-conditions addressed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE-CONDITIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY</th>
<th>EXTENT TO WHICH THE PRE-CONDITIONS WERE ADDRESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTCOME:</strong> access to a variety of nutritious fruits, vegetables and other crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| the target household members are motivated to keep producing vegetables | - both women and men value the dietary and economic benefits of the diversified agricultural produce  
- difficulties with selling produce (due to distant market + low prices versus the invested effort) are discouraging some of the women from producing a variety of vegetables (as the dietary benefits alone do not seem to be “good enough” if no additional income is generated) |
| men approve of (and ideally also support) women growing vegetables | - While many men were originally sceptical about women growing vegetables, the positive yields (and generated income) made them encourage and to a certain extent also assist women in growing vegetables. For instance, according to Stories of Change findings, many male respondents acknowledged the value of women’s gardens and noted that while they perceived the gardens as of little importance in the past, they now play an important part in family well-being. Gardening and agricultural activities generally seem to be done together far more frequently than in the past. Increased fluidity in gendered tasks is evident from men helping women in the groundnut fields – previously an apparently exclusively female domain. Reasons given for helping wives more include greater recognition of the wife as a partner, awareness of women’s workload, the resultant improved efficiency in getting tasks done and better outcomes in terms of food-security and financial security (Stories of Change 2017). |
| the household members are able to access seeds and other resources | - none of the interviewed women reported any difficulties with preserving vegetable seeds  
- 47.3% of women knew where to purchase the seeds of rape, spinach and carrots (i.e. seeds that cannot be easily extracted and kept from one season to another); 21.8% claimed to know where to purchase the seeds of orange maize  
- however, many women claimed that they do not have money for purchasing seeds and hoped the project would keep providing seeds (despite a situation where they earn some 300-800 Kw per season from their gardens and the most essential seeds – carrot, rape, spinach - only costs 28 Kw)  
- orange maize has a high content of vitamin A, but only when seeds are purchased for every season (are not re-used from the previous one); many women might not be willing to make such an investment  
- interviewed women had very limited willingness to invest their time and money in ensuring the repair of broken hip pumps |
| the household members are able to prevent / kill pests that reduce the vegetable yields | - 59.5% of women had a third or more of their harvest affected by pests  
- while many women were positive about the use of natural pesticides (also due to costs savings), others claimed that they were not able to sufficiently protect their crops |
| the household members have sufficient access to | - 35.2% of women could not grow vegetables during the dry season, primarily due to a lack of water |
| water for year-round production | during the qualitative survey, improving access to water for producing vegetables in the dry season as well, was one of the most commonly raised requests of the project beneficiaries |
| the household members can access production-related advice | all female beneficiaries can ask their SMF or other women for production-related advice
at the same time, SMFs’ know-how has its limits and currently they only have limited communication with the government’s extension workers |

**OUTCOME: improved maternal and child care practices (incl. hygiene)**

| women believe that the practices are effective | the interviewed women were positive about the promoted practices and did not label any as ineffective or culturally inappropriate |
| women have the means required for following the promoted practices | except in the lean season around January and February, most women should have an acceptable access to foods (especially those who can grow vegetables during the rainy as well as dry season)
lack of money or husbands’ support might be hindering the use of some practices (such as prioritising the purchase of soap when shopping) |
| women’s husbands support them with following the promoted practices | husbands who participated in the CHVs’ sessions appeared positive and supportive of the promoted practice; more problematic are the attitudes and support of men who were not reached by CHVs, especially when it comes to practices requiring more time or money |

**CHVs continue in their work to ensure that the promoted behaviours are ingrained in women’s everyday practices**

| CHVs are likely to continue with systematic awareness raising activities only if they are supervised and supported even after the project’s completion
at the time of the evaluation, MoH’s Nutrition Officer claimed that MoH is willing to take on this role; however, no handover / follow-up plan was agreed between Concern and MoH |

**OUTCOME: access to water from rehabilitated boreholes**

| VWASH committees are functioning | 80% of the rehabilitated boreholes had an existing VWASH committee
53% of the VWASH committees were meeting regularly |
| VWASH committees know whom to contact for repairs | 92% of the interviewed VWASH committee members knew whom to contact in the case that their borehole needed a repair which they are not able to ensure on their own |
| VWASH committees have money for borehole repairs | 50% of the VWASH committees regularly collect fees for using the borehole; the others collect money from the borehole users only when the borehole breaks down |

**OUTCOME: changes in gender equality / women’s empowerment**

| the promoted practices are followed by a large number of people and become a widely accepted social norm | based on the available quantitative and qualitative data, the promoted behaviours are definitely practiced by a number of “early adopters”; however, it is not possible to say that they would already become a widespread social norm – for this to happen, the gender sensitization needs to continue for a longer period of time and be driven by a larger number of well-qualified male and female promoters |
| women retain / expand their access to key resources | most women are likely to continue in vegetable production (even though the number might decrease due to demotivation arising from no free distributions, poor access to water, and marketing difficulties)
social and saving groups offer a good opportunity for sustaining the existence of “women groups” even after the SMFs’ trainings and various project activities are over
those couples who mutually experience tangible benefits from joint planning and decision-making (e.g. over the use of the generated income) are likely to continue in their existing practices |
3.5 Impact

Based on the evaluation’s findings, the evaluator provides answers to the main impact-related questions included in the ToR provided by Concern:

What are the likely impacts at the end of the project?

The project’s main impacts include:

- a portion of the project’s female beneficiaries are more self-confident due to a higher awareness of their rights, ability to earn money for their family and ensure better child care, and lower dependency on their spouses
- positive changes in the traditional social norms regarding women’s decision-making power and workload distribution that sees increased collaboration between men and women (contributing to, amongst other, decreased workload of some of the female beneficiaries)
- greater diversity and volume of agricultural produce, especially nutritious vegetables and fruits
- improved dietary diversity of the target families’ diet (women, men, boys and girls)
- greater commercial availability of nutritious crops for sale in the target areas (as the project beneficiaries sell part of their local produce)
- an estimated 1,000 people (approx. 3 per “women’s group”) started growing vegetables on their own, without any external support
- female beneficiaries and CHVs reported a lower prevalence of acute malnutrition (though this could not be verified due to a very weak screening and reporting system)
- women/their families having higher purchasing power which positively impact on children’s access to education and family members’ access to health care
- greater awareness and use of natural pesticides and fertilizers (Mumbwa is traditionally a cotton growing region with a very high reliance on the use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides)
- families saving money due to reduced need to purchase vegetables, chemical fertilizers and seeds

What do beneficiaries and other stakeholders affected by the project perceive to be the effects of the intervention on themselves?

The single most frequently stated benefit of the project was the increased and more diverse production of nutritious vegetables, including all newly acquired agronomic know-how and the benefits such produce provides – improved diets, higher income, and a reduced need to purchase food in the markets.

Are there any signs of the project’s negative impacts?

At the start of the project, most beneficiaries produced a very limited quantity and diversity of fruits and vegetables. Many of them lacked the knowledge, skills, self-confidence, and money required for diversifying their production. Furthermore, since they had no previous experience with Concern, some of them (especially men) were not sure of the project’s intentions and were not completely convinced that participating in the project (i.e. attending meetings, trainings, surveys …) was worth their time. It was therefore fully justifiable that the project initially provided a range of free inputs, such as quantities of seed packages, solar driers, hip pumps, bicycles, and other assets. At the same time, the continued provision of inputs (e.g. seeds) led people to believe that Concern would keep providing further assets for several more years and gave them limited incentive to be more pro-active. For example, when a group of women was asked where they would get the seeds for the next season, they replied that “we will come and get from you [the project], since it’s you who usually help us”. Very few respondents said that they would go and spend their money on purchasing new seeds (this will possibly happen but the primary expectation is different). This happened despite the project staff in 2016 reportedly informing women that this would be the last year when they would be provided with free seeds. Similarly, none of the hip pumps that were broken were taken by the beneficiaries for repair. In one case, a group was given a hip pump (worth some 700 Kwacha) with a hose that wasn’t long enough to reach the nearby river and instead of investing a few dozen Kwacha into buying additional hose, they left the pump unused. Such “donation syndrome” nourishes passivity among people and reduces a sense of their own initiative and responsibility. At the same time, it must be emphasized that such a mind-set isn’t entirely the project’s fault and was not present among all the project beneficiaries.
3.6 Gender

**Does the project generate any evidence to link increases in gender equality/women’s empowerment to nutrition outcomes?**

To examine the link between increases in gender equality / women’s empowerment and the quality of women and children’s diet, the evaluator conducted the following comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16: Link Between Women Autonomy and Dietary Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children aged 6-23 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17: Link Between Gender Attitudes Score and Dietary Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children aged 6-23 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these findings, most women gained improved access to nutritious food and a portion of them also improved their access to income, both important pre-conditions for improving the nutrition of their family members.

To what extent has the project contributed to ensuring greater gender equality and women’s empowerment, especially when it comes to 1) women’s access to resources; 2) their influence in decision-making; 3) workload distribution among household members; 4) gender relations within the target households; and 5) women and men’s perceptions of “normal” gender roles?

**WOMEN’S ACCESS TO RESOURCES**

The project improved women’s access to several key resources:

1) **Access to social capital**: Prior to the project, only 23% of the female beneficiaries were members of a community group. According to the FGDs with women and men, men frequently did not support (or even allow) women to participate in community groups as they perceived them as a waste of time which their spouses could use for more productive purposes. This happened especially when a woman went to a meeting or training and returned “empty-handed”. The main change in their opinion came when women who managed to join the project’s “women groups” started showing and talking about the benefits they are gaining, such as free seeds, improved yields, savings on food purchases, income, etc. By the time of the project evaluation, 90.6% of the survey respondents reported to be a part of at least one community group (such as agricultural or savings group, etc.). This trend enabled women to access new knowledge, skills, assets, and support from their peers.
2) Access to income: The female respondents of the qualitative survey reported earning 300-800 Kwacha per season from their vegetable gardens. The decision on how this income would be spent was reportedly done jointly with their husbands. The money was most commonly used for buying household equipment, paying school expenses, purchasing food (oil, sugar), small investments (into animals, petty trade), and for covering health care costs. An even more important financial asset is likely to be loans provided by the recently established saving and loans groups, as the availability of this money will be less dependent on the seasonal agricultural harvest. The third source of money comes from husbands who started engaging women in the decisions on how the household income (e.g. from selling staple crops) would be used. Since money was frequently used by men to reaffirm their power (as many women had to ask whenever they needed even a small amount of money), greater financial independence has been an important part of women's empowerment. However, in the absence of more detailed quantitative data in the baseline survey, it was not possible to determine the exact proportion of women with a meaningful increase in their access to and control over income.

3) Access to food: Changes in women's ability to produce food were described in chapter 3.2. The decision on which vegetables (incl. legumes) and fruits would be grown was largely a woman's decision. There was contradicting information on whether women were given the same quality foods as men; unequal access to quality food (e.g. meat) is likely to affect a few women only.

WOMEN’S INFLUENCE IN DECISION-MAKING

According to the quantitative survey, 66% of women believed that men should have the final word about decisions in the home (the baseline report does not provide the exact values of this sub-indicator). At the same time, the vast majority of FGD participants reported that women are increasingly involved in planning and decision-making regarding family matters, such as the use of generated income. One area where women had little control was the use of longer-term contraception, such as pills, intrauterine devices or injections. According to men, such behaviour “encourages promiscuity” as women “get power to start sleeping around with other men”. Women therefore either cannot use longer-term contraception (having lower control over family planning) or use it without their husband's knowledge.

WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION, GENDER RELATIONS, AND PERCEPTION OF GENDER ROLES

The data on which tasks are done primarily by women / men will be collected in December 2017 as a part of the project's regular M&E surveys and are likely to provide very useful and accurate insights into the changes in women's workloads. For now, the only available data comes from the qualitative survey’s findings. During the FGDs, both women and men reported that men are now increasingly helping with what was previously perceived as “women’s tasks”: “Before the project it was perceived that certain jobs are for women alone and others for men and now we know that no work is meant for a woman or man only, so we work together”. Men are reportedly taking more care of children (when their wives are not at home), collecting water, accompanying pregnant women for ANCs, and to a limited extent helping with vegetable gardens. This change has not been easy as, according to a male respondent: “In the past, if a man helped a woman in the house he was considered weak and bewitched.” According to Concern’s Program Area Coordinator, “Earlier people were laughing when men did feminine tasks, so we wanted to show that you still remain a man when you do some tasks.” It seems that the project managed to successfully challenge the traditional social norms. A male FGD participant explained that now “No one can laugh at you when you do “women’s tasks” because everyone has been taught [that this is something men should be doing].” The Stories of Change findings reinforce this perception: those men who describe openly helping their wives seem unperturbed at being laughed at or being told that they are victims of ‘love potion’ (providing a form of magical female control over their husbands) as they feel convinced of the ‘rightness’ of their actions. According to a male respondent: “We have to be helping each other, I can carry firewood and I will not change and become a woman but I will still be a man”.

At the same time, the existing data does not make it possible to determine how prevalent such changes in men’s attitudes and behaviours are. One certain thing is that most men started changing their behaviours because they 1) saw their peers behaving in a different way (i.e. slowly changing the social norms); and 2) saw or experienced the benefits such change brings to their families (such as greater harmony and well-being). The combination of experiencing different social norms (respectively, copying the behaviour or early adopters) and gaining clear benefits proved to be the key motivator.
4. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are based on the findings presented in the previous chapter and respond to the questions included in the ToR provided by Concern. For any justifications based on what grounds the conclusions were made, please refer to the information provided therein.

4.1 Relevance
- the project was perceived by its main beneficiaries as highly relevant, primarily thanks to its food production component
- the project has been supporting the government's policies and effectively contributed to the fulfilment of its nutrition-related priorities
- the project addressed the vast majority of the underlying and basic causes of undernutrition
- the promotion of a “change within” – through the work of community-based SMFs, CHVs, and peer educators – has been a highly relevant approach
- instead of relying largely on donations, the project should have used more sustainable approaches, such as subsidized vouchers and private sector development assistance
- the inclusion of the gender component has been highly relevant; however, the capacity building support provided to peer educators was very limited

| as an overall conclusion, the relevance of the project has been HIGHLY SATISFACTORY |

4.2 Effectiveness
- the project managed to largely or completely fulfil 14 out of 17 output indicators and 4 out of 5 outcome indicators
- the project was successful in diversifying and increasing the production of nutritious crops, improving infant and young child feeding practices, improving people’s access to water, and increasing women’s autonomy
- on the other hand, the project achieved limited outcomes regarding women’s gender-related attitudes and DNCC members’ work on promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment
- more quantitative data will be collected in December 2017 to allow a deeper understanding of dynamics about men’s contribution in household tasks

| as an overall conclusion, the effectiveness of the project has been SATISFACTORY |

4.3 Efficiency
- the use of Concern’s 1,000 EUR procurement thresholds; VAT exempt status; and use of existing resources and expertise has positively contributed to the project’s efficiency
- on the other hand, the project’s efficiency was slightly compromised by the unnecessary extent of free donations and the delays in the implementation of the project’s gender component

| as an overall conclusion, the efficiency of the project has been SATISFACTORY |

4.4 Sustainability
- the project’s beneficiaries are very positive about the changes in the quality of their and their children’s diets and are motivated to sustain them
- the vast majority of women wish to keep producing vegetables; however, poor access to water, pests, and difficulties with marketing of their produce discourage many women
- women are largely aware of where to purchase vegetable seeds; however, they have limited willingness to invest their own money (and expect further free donations)
the sustainability of SMFs and CHVs’ work is likely only if the MA and MoH take over responsibility for supervising / supporting their work; no such plans have been formed yet

there are a number of “early adopters” following positive gender behaviours; however, more substantial change will happen (and last) only if more community members promote such changes

the vast majority of the rehabilitated boreholes are operating although many have insufficiently strong VWASH committees

as an overall conclusion, if the sustainability-related recommendations are implemented, **the project sustainability is likely to be SATISFACTORY; otherwise it will remain ACCEPTABLE**

**4.5 Impact**

although the project did not fully achieve any of the two targets of its impact indicators, the differences between their baseline and endline values show very large changes in the proportion of children and women consuming nutritious diets, and the main weakness is therefore that the overly ambitious targets were not decreased once the baseline data was available

the project contributed to increasing the self-confidence of many of its female beneficiaries, primarily through increasing their agronomic skills, access to food, and increased financial autonomy and participation

the project increased the availability of nutritious food not only for its beneficiaries but also people living in and around its target communities

CHVs and female beneficiaries reported a lower prevalence of acute malnutrition; however, due to a very weak screening and reporting system, this information could not be verified

the project enabled 22,000 people to improve their access to water from rehabilitated boreholes

the project managed to challenge the traditional social norms around gender relationships, women’s roles in decision making, and workload distribution – however, in order for these changes to be more ingrained (i.e. becoming new social norms), more work is needed

although the project helped many women to be more self-reliant, the donations-based system of assistance contributed to many relying primarily on donated aid as opposed to their own initiative

**as an overall conclusion, the impact of the project is HIGHLY SATISFACTORY**

**4.6 Gender**

the quantitative survey did not identify any links between the level of women’s autonomy and the diversity of their (and their children’s) diet

the quantitative findings also did not reveal any link between women’s attitudes and the diversity of their diet; however, there was a moderate difference in the dietary diversity of children of women with more progressive gender attitudes versus those with less progressive gender attitudes

only two out of six gender-related indicators were fulfilled – the most positive change has been improvement in women’s autonomy

the project was successful in increasing women’s access to (and to some extent also control over) social capital, income, and food

the project also recorded some positive changes in women’s decision-making power and in workload distribution between women and their husbands

gender-related policy work succeeded in increasing DNCC members’ awareness on the importance of gender equality and women’s empowerment; however, it did not lead to many specific actions

the capacity building (and any other) support provided to the main actors responsible for changing men’s gender attitudes and behaviours was very limited

**as an overall conclusion, the quality of the gender components is ACCEPTABLE**
5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above presented findings and conclusions the evaluator presents the following recommendations for maximizing the impact and sustainability of Concern and its partners’ nutrition programming. The evaluator is aware that RAIN+ project has only five more months to go and its remaining budget is limited. The provided recommendations were therefore designed to be relatively non-demanding, requiring only limited amount of money and time. Concern is encouraged to review RAIN+ project’s remaining budget and the expected workload and to **decide which of the proposed recommendations can be realistically implemented** (the evaluator is aware that Concern might have to prioritize only a limited number of recommendations).

5.1 Recommendations for the Remaining Project Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.1:</th>
<th>Ensure that women are able and motivated to purchase seeds.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Impact:</strong></td>
<td>medium/high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong></td>
<td>MCDA’s CDFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
<td>staff time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each women’s group, MCDA’s CDFs should:

1) **identify the nearest shops** that sell the seeds of carrots, rape, spinach and orange maize (this needs to be verified by personal visits to the shops)

2) **inform the shop sellers** that in their surroundings are thousands of women among whom you will be promoting the purchase of carrots, rape, spinach, and orange maize seeds at the local shops

3) **calculate the costs** of purchasing the amount of seeds that was included in the project’s “seed packs” (10g of rape, 23g of carrot, 22g of spinach, and 1kg of orange maize)

4) meet with the members of each of the 290 women groups, discuss with them how much money they can earn from selling a portion of these crops (keeping consumption needs in mind) and let them compare it with the costs of these seeds – the difference (= i.e. the profit) is likely to be quite large and will hopefully **increase women’s motivation** to purchase the seeds

5) at the same time, **re-confirm** that the project will not be providing any more seeds

6) discuss with the women the **ideal timing** for purchasing the seeds – i.e. time when they have the most money, such as after selling their cash crops or after selling a portion of their vegetables

7) since the effort and costs of going to the nearest shop with seeds is one of the barriers to their purchase, discuss with women the possibility of **purchasing seeds as a group**: one woman (e.g. the SMF) collects money, goes to purchase the seeds for everyone (large packaging = lower costs), and then divide them accordingly (i.e. 95% of the women group members do not need to make virtually any effort to get the seeds they need)

8) ensure that women are **aware of the shops’ exact locations**: consider providing them also with the sellers’ phone numbers and with a simple price list of the available seeds, so that they can **pre-order the required seeds**

**This activity requires very little time** as the preparations can be done by CDF staff within one day only and the discussion with women can take place during any of the CDF meetings with women (during this single meeting other recommendations can also be implemented, such as 1.4, 1.12, 1.13). It is important that CDFs personally facilitate such discussions and don’t just delegate the task to the SMFs. The evaluator understands that from the project’s point of view, the vegetables are grown primarily for home consumption (which is 100% correct). At the same time, in order to keep re-purchasing the required seeds, women need to earn at least some income, and therefore the understanding of the financial costs and gains of producing vegetables is essential.
**Recommendation 1.2:** Provide refresher courses on pest management.

**Expected Impact:** medium  
**Responsibility:** MCDA Technical Officer/ CDFs  
**Costs:** low/medium

The vegetable losses caused by pests have not only reduced women’s access to nutritious food and income but also lowered their motivation to keep growing vegetables. The evaluator therefore recommends that CDFs in the coming weeks (i.e. at the start of the new season) organize a practical re-fresher course on pest management for SMFs. In order to effectively tackle pests, one of the most important skills is to correctly recognize what exactly is attacking the crop, as incorrect identification is likely to lead to inappropriate treatment. It is therefore recommended that MCDA’s Technical Officer selects from the existing resources (such as Concern’s Info Cards, Agricultural Training Manual, etc.) high-quality photos of the most common pests and diseases and prints them in colour on large paper (A4 size – the small photos in the Agri Manual are not sufficient). These large-scale, clearly visible pictures should then be used during the training of SMFs and most importantly, should be given to SMFs to be used during their training of the women group members. Since training on pests, without being actually able to see the pests, is not very effective, these visual tools will increase women’s ability to correctly recognize pests. The training should also emphasize that pests and diseases are frequently the result of plant stress arising from nutritional deficiencies, water shortages (or excess), and other factors that are to a large extent under women’s control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 1.3:</th>
<th>Strengthen women’s ability to profitably sell part of their produce.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expected Impact:** | medium/high  
| **Responsibility:** | Concern / CDFs  
| **Costs:** | low/medium |

While women generally appreciate the nutritional benefits of vegetable production, most of them are not satisfied with the idea of producing vegetables for home consumption only, as generating income is an equally important priority for them. Ability to generate income is also the key motivator for women to keep maintaining (and potentially also expanding) their gardens. During the FGDs, women frequently stated that difficulties with profitably selling their produce was discouraging them from continuing with producing vegetables. For the sake of 1) the gardens’ sustainability and 2) women’s empowerment, their ability to profitably market their production does matter. The evaluator therefore proposes that Concern organizes a half day workshop involving several of the most experienced CDFs and several progressive SMFs and discusses with them the most effective ways of supporting women in the sale of their produce. Among the most feasible ideas might be:

1) **Local promotion and sales of lesser known crop varieties:** Many of the project’s beneficiaries live in fairly remote areas with underserved markets. While this brings many challenges, it also offers an opportunity to sell produced vegetables directly in and near the local communities (this practice is already common in some communities). The local population would then gain access to nutritious foods (most likely at lower costs than in the town markets) and vegetable producers would gain a local market. In order for this to happen, it is important that the project beneficiaries are able to raise the local demand – ideally also for locally less common types of crops. One way of doing so would be to encourage and support women in organizing cooking demonstrations for women and men living in the local areas, enabling them to see what crops are for sale and how they can be used. Ideally, these “promo events” should be organized at a place where there are many people, such as after a church service, during child growth monitoring events, etc.

2) **Support to “lead farmers-sellers”:** It would not be realistic to expect that all women are motivated and capable of effectively marketing their produce. The evaluator therefore proposes that the CDFs discuss with the women group members the option of the women letting one (or more) of their most progressive and experienced peers to act as the “lead farmer-seller” who is in charge of selling the crops the women group members produce. This “entrepreneur” could charge a margin on the sales while the remaining women would receive income without having to spend time and money on selling their produce. Supporting only a limited number of more experienced sellers would also be easier for the project team than supporting thousands of individual women-sellers.

While supporting these options, it is important to always emphasize that the main purpose of vegetable production needs to be ensuring family members’ access to nutritious food.
Recommendation 1.4: Continue establishing and strengthening savings and loans groups.

**Expected Impact:** High  
**Responsibility:** MCDA  
**Costs:** staff time

Participation in savings and loans groups enables women to be financially more independent, an important part of women’s empowerment. The MCDA Project Coordinator is therefore encouraged to ensure that CDFs provide women with sufficient support in establishing savings and loans groups and with resolving any difficulties. CDFs should be regularly reporting to their manager on the main issues women are facing with regards to managing the groups and helping them to quickly resolve the issues.

At the same time, CDFs are encouraged to motivate women in a productive use of the loans they take out (for example, on purchasing domestic animals or vegetable seeds, investing in petty trade, and other ways that help women to use the loans in the most effective way).

Recommendation 1.5: Organize refresher workshops for the existing peer educators.

**Expected Impact:** Medium  
**Responsibility:** Concern / WfC  
**Costs:** low/medium

Despite the peer educators having been the project’s most important “agents of change” when it comes to women and men’s gender-related attitudes, the only capacity building support they received was a two day training (with no follow-up). The evaluator therefore recommends that WfC/Concern organize one day (longer if funding allows) workshops where the peer educators will be able to discuss their experience, share what worked well (tips & tricks), what challenges they faced, etc. and to receive competent advice. Concern/WfC should invite all of the 60 originally trained educators + the most active of the 180 additionally “trained” educators. These rather informal workshops should take place at the local level in order to decrease travel distances, minimize costs, and to enable natural networking between educators living in the same areas. Each workshop should have less than 15 participants, so that all of them have sufficient space for sharing their experience and asking questions. It is also important that during these events respected and influential community leaders are invited to participate, if possible. In the case that WfC will not be able or willing to facilitate such workshops as a part of its existing contract, Concern should hire (for some 7-10 working days) a facilitator experienced in gender mainstreaming. This workshop (or any similar capacity building event) is crucial for reinforcing the positive changes that have started happening. Concern should also consider inviting DNCC members to the event, enabling them to hear first-hand how gender trainings are done and what results they can bring.

Recommendation 1.6: Train CEOs on the specific gender mainstreaming methods they should use in the course of their agricultural trainings.

**Expected Impact:** High  
**Responsibility:** Concern / WfC  
**Costs:** low/medium

Currently, despite the MA staff at the district level being aware of the importance of gender equality and women’s empowerment, MA’s agricultural trainings are taking and promoting very little gender mainstreaming activities / practices. Concern is therefore encouraged to:

1) consult WfC and its Gender Advisor on what gender mainstreaming measures can be integrated in the agricultural trainings

2) discuss these measures with the MA offices and the CEOs and agree on which will be integrated in the trainings, how, by when, and by whom

3) train CEOs on an effective use of these measures (approx. two day training should be sufficient and within Concern / MA’s financial means)

In the case that WfC is not able to deliver such training as a part of its existing contract, it is recommended that Concern hires (for a few days) an experienced WfC trainer who would deliver the training. The training should be very hands-on, free of too much theory and concepts, focusing primarily on how CEOs can effectively implement the selected gender mainstreaming measures.

Following MA / CEO / Concern / WfC’s experience with the training, Concern can advocate to the MA to replicate the training in other districts as well.
**Recommendation 1.7:** Advocate for specific gender activities to be included in the 2018 District Nutrition Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Impact</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>staff time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the 2017 District Nutrition Plan included only one gender-related activity, it is recommended that Concern discusses with the DNCC members the most important gender priorities – especially those that are likely to have a clear impact on the ground – and advocates for their inclusion in the 2018 Plan.

**Recommendation 1.8:** Define / focus your RAIN+ model and promote (extensively) specific actions the government and NGOs can replicate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Impact</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>staff time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to ensure that the government and civil society organizations are able to replicate the model promoted by the RAIN project, it is important that Concern very clearly communicates what exactly these actors should (not) be doing. It needs to expand its work from promoting a certain model (i.e. “multisectoral approach, focus on women empowerment, etc.”) to promoting specific activities and measures that 1) people can visualize and easily understand; and 2) their organizations can easily integrate into their interventions. For example, in addition to talking about the importance of gender mainstreaming in the agricultural sector, Concern should show specific examples / directions on how to do so. For example: “When designing a project aiming to enhance households’ food production for improved nutrition, address the entire process from the gender point of view, considering:

- Who has access to land? Only men or also women?
- Who in the household decides which crops will be grown?
- Do women and men have an access to agricultural extension services that is adequate to the role they play in agricultural activities?
- Who in the household decides how the harvest from the vegetable gardens and larger fields will be used?
- Who in the household decides what the generated income will be used for?
- Who in the household decides which meals will be prepared?
- Are there any differences in the quality and amount of food provided to men, women, boys, and girls?
- Etc.

All these gender-related factors decide whether improved agricultural production will translate into improved nutritional status of the different family members. If you are interested in reading more about making agricultural production more “gender-sensitive”, explore the following resources: [provide a list of 3-4 hands-on resources relevant to the Zambian context]. You can also contact the following organizations experienced in promoting gender equality and women empowerment in agriculture: [provide a list of organizations working in Zambia].” Such more specific guidance can be complemented by shorter examples of successful projects, enabling people to visualize what gender-sensitive nutrition programming looks like. Most importantly, Concern’s communication must provide its target audience with a satisfactory answer to a simple question of “So what exactly is my organization / government department supposed to do?”
**Recommendation 1.9:** Enhance NGOs’ capacity to measure the results of their women’s empowerment / gender equality work.

**Expected Impact:** High  
**Responsibility:** Concern / IndiKit  
**Costs:** staff time

While it is essential that NGOs and governments increasingly work on improving gender equality and women’s empowerment, it is equally important that they are able to objectively demonstrate the results of such work. Greater availability of reliable evidence helps NGOs to understand the effectiveness of their approaches and to advocate to donors and governments to invest the required resources. Currently, there is a limited amount of well-consolidated, practical guidance on which indicators development interventions can use – and how to measure changes in gender equality and women’s empowerment. Many of the existing resources are relatively long (150-200 pages long documents) and do not adequately reflect development workers’ need for more hands-on and easy-to-understand guidance.

The evaluator therefore proposes that Concern’s Gender Equality Advisor agrees with IndiKit (see below) on developing and publishing at www.indikit.net step-by-step guidance on an effective use of the most useful gender equality and women’s empowerment project indicators. This new resource could be presented by Concern during the RAIN+ advocacy event (planned for January 2018) as one of the RAIN+ advocacy outcomes (the website would fully acknowledge Concern’s work). As a result, NGOs not only in Zambia but also in other countries, would be able to include into their project designs and surveys meaningful gender indicators and to collect the required data to the best possible quality (IndiKit is used by up to 400 people per day). Such an outcome (including very good visibility for Concern) could be achieved at very low costs as IndiKit would take full responsibility for creating the content of the guidance – the only thing Concern / the Gender Equality Advisor would be expected to do is to share with IndiKit the best available resources on gender-related indicators and to supervise that the guidance drafted by IndiKit is of a maximum quality.

**Recommendation 1.10:** Strengthen the capacity of the weakest VWASH committees.

**Expected Impact:** high  
**Responsibility:** MCDA / Concern  
**Costs:** staff time

In September 2017, CDFs conducted a very detailed assessment of all the rehabilitated boreholes’ operation and of the performance of local VWASH committees. It is recommended that Concern and MCDA staff take advantage of this up-to-date understanding and organize a workshop where they review the findings and agree on what needs to be done to strengthen the capacity of the weakest VWASH committees. While doing so, they should take maximum advantage of well-performing committees, looking at why they perform so well (while others do not).
Recommendation 1.11: Ensure that CHVs are trained on home-based counselling on family planning and on the promotion of low-cost hand washing stations.

Expected Impact: medium  
Responsibility: Concern / MoH  
Costs: low/medium

It is recommended that Concern requests the MoH to train CHVs participating in the project on the promotion of two practices that have a significant impact on children’s and women’s nutritional status:

1) **Counselling on family planning:** CHVs should be encouraged (and trained in) conducting home-to-home visits focusing on promoting longer-term family planning and birth spacing methods among couples. CHVs should be trained especially in 1) addressing the widespread belief that “longer-term contraception encourages promiscuity among women”; and 2) promoting contraception among teenage girls and boys in order to reduce the prevalence of early pregnancies.

2) **Ownership and use of low-cost handwashing stations:** Despite the relatively high awareness on the critical moments for handwashing with soap, only 11% of the project beneficiaries have a hand washing station with water and soap at home. Since ownership of such a facility is strongly correlated with the actual hand washing rates, it is likely that hand washing with soap at the crucial times (the single most effective prevention of diarrhoea) is not very widespread. Concern and the MoH should therefore train CHVs in encouraging households to purchase and use a low-cost handwashing facility (e.g. tippy tap – see photo; credit: CWZ) and soap.

Recommendation 1.12: Contract KickStart to train local entrepreneurs on the repairs of hip pumps.

Expected Impact: Medium  
Responsibility: Concern / CDFs  
Costs: low

Before the project provided hip pumps to its beneficiaries, it contracted the company KickStart to train selected women on how to repair the pumps. However, the qualitative survey showed that despite receiving the training, women find repairing the pumps difficult (plus do not have access to spare parts). It is therefore recommended that:

1) MCDA’s CDFs in each of the main Ward towns of the project target areas identify existing entrepreneurs that would be willing to be trained in the repair of hip pumps and subsequently offer this service. These can be, for example, existing repairers of agricultural machinery, bicycles, and other people with some basic mechanical skills. In each town, at least two repairers should be identified to prevent a situation where a repairer, for example, moves away and the service suddenly becomes unavailable.

2) Concern subsequently requests KickStart to 1) train these entrepreneurs in the repairs of hip pumps and 2) to ensure that they are able to order spare parts from KickStart or ask its staff for advice, if required (thanks to the contact with KickStart, these repairers could also offer those people interested in buying a new pump to acquire the pump from KickStart).

3) Concern subsequently prints simple business cards with the repairers’ name, address, phone number and a picture of a hip pump, and requests CDFs to distribute them to the project beneficiaries (such cards would cost a few dozen dollars).

These three steps are a fairly easy and cheap way of ensuring that women are able to keep the pumps in operation for a maximum period of time.
Recommendation 1.13: Ensure that unused and non-functional hip pumps are used.

**Expected Impact:** Medium  
**Responsibility:** MCDA’s CDFs  
**Costs:** staff time

The hip pumps provided by the project are essential for decreasing women’s workload and making the production of vegetables easier. At the same time, the qualitative survey showed that 1) some of the pumps are broken and were not repaired; and 2) other pumps have not been used (due to being perceived as too heavy to use; or being provided in an area with no suitable water source (e.g. where there are boreholes only); or due to their hose being too short to reach the water source and women not being willing/able to purchase a longer hose). At the same time, many women groups do not have a sufficient number of hip pumps. In order to ensure that all provided hip pumps are effectively used, the evaluator recommends that MCDA’s CDFs:

1) **assess the number of pumps** that are not used due to i) being broken; ii) having been provided to an area where they cannot be used; iii) women’s lack of interest in using the pumps; iv) other reasons

2) for the pumps that are broken, **provide women with a contact for the trained repairers** (see 1.12) and inform them that if they take them to a repairer within the next one month, Concern will cover 50% of the repair costs. In the case they do not take the pumps for repair (without having any acceptable reason), Concern will take back the pump and provide it (after ensuring its repair) to another group that needs it

3) for the pumps that are not used, **assess whether women are interested in their use** and if not (or if they do not start using them), re-distribute them to other groups that need them more. In case where pumps are not used but there is an interest by the women to give it another try, support them accordingly.

These three simple steps will ensure that all of the donated pumps are used by women who actually need them, are willing to use them and are willing/able to take responsibility for their maintenance.

Recommendation 1.14: Support MA and its Camp Extension Officers (CEOs) in taking over responsibility for strengthening SMFs’ technical capacity.

**Expected Impact:** High  
**Responsibility:** Concern / MA  
**Costs:** low

For the sustainability of the female beneficiaries’ crop production it is important that they retain access to agronomic know-how. While SMFs can provide a certain amount of help, their knowledge and skills have their limits. Furthermore, if no one continues supervising and supporting SMFs, they are unlikely to share their know-how in as systematic manner as they did until now. The evaluator therefore recommends that Concern supports the district MA and its CEOs in taking over responsibility for continuous strengthening of SMFs’ technical capacity. According to the information from the Acting Senior Agriculture Officer, the MA is willing to take on this responsibility; at the same time it requires the following support:

1) developing a **clear plan of what exact support CEOs will provide to SMFs**, how often, upon what conditions, etc. with Concern (the main focus should be on training)

2) ensuring that each **CEO has the contact details of all SMFs** within his/her catchment area (and all of these SMFs are able to contact the local CEO)

3) ensuring that all **CEOs understand the main strengths, weaknesses, and needs** of SMFs and women group members living in her/his area of operation

4) providing CEOs with the **logistical means** required for visiting the project beneficiaries (since there are only 6 CEOs operating in the RAIN+ target areas, Concern should request DFID to donate the six motorbikes currently used by the RAIN+ project to the district MA for the 6 CEOs’ use)

Most important is that the plan agreed between Concern, MA (and the SMFs) is fully realistic and MA has the resources for its implementation.
5.2 Recommendations for Concern’s Future Programming

| Recommendation 2.1: | Free donations: only once, then move to subsidized vouchers and supporting commercial supply. |

With the exception of purely emergency contexts, free donations of widely available assets such as seeds are appropriate only in the initial phase of the projects when organizations need to 1) motivate people that it is worth using the assets (i.e. in the case of RAIN+, worth growing vegetables) and 2) to gain people’s trust and motivation to participate in the project (while clearly stating the limited time-frame for such free assistance). In other cases, free donations are more likely to nourish unhealthy dependency. The evaluator therefore proposes that Concern adopts – globally, in all non-emergency contexts, and where market supply allows – an approach when free donations will be used only for enabling people to initially experience the benefits of the promoted behaviours (such as growing vegetables). Once people truly appreciate their benefits (i.e. hopefully after the first free donations), Concern should switch to:

1) **Providing subsidized vouchers:** For example, a group of farmers will be entitled to purchase seeds worth 100 USD and 50% of this cost will be covered by the project (based on an agreement with pre-identified sellers). This approach will ensure that people become familiar with the local sellers, the products they offer, and the prices they charge. At the same time, the possibility to get a “50% discount” should be sufficiently attractive for people to co-finance the remaining 50%. This scheme should be introduced at a time when people have sufficient amounts of cash (e.g. after the main harvest). While this approach might experience initial challenges (e.g. people’s reluctance to invest their own money, expectations that someone else might provide things for free, etc.), it is considerably more sustainable and cost-efficient than nourishing the donations-based mind-set. At the same time, such an approach should be used only once or twice and the projects should then switch to fully commercial supply.

2) **Commercial supply:** The “normal” way of accessing most things in life is by purchasing them. Since there are several main factors that frequently hinder poor people’s ability to purchase the assets they need (such as seeds or agricultural equipment), NGOs resort to donating these assets for free or for minor co-financing. However, the most meaningful way – which the evaluator also recommends to Concern – would be to address the main reasons why people find it difficult to purchase the assets they need, such as:

- **Limited availability:** Local markets often do not supply the required assets at all, or not in the required quantity, quality or type. A range of approaches (such as Market Systems Development) are available to address such shortcomings.

- **Limited affordability:** The required assets are sometimes (perceived to be) too expensive. This can often be addressed by supporting the sale of products in smaller volumes (e.g. selling 10 gram packs of seeds as opposed to 100 grams); ensuring that people know the real costs (instead of the costs they assume); helping people access credit or savings; or supporting the supply of less expensive alternatives.

- **Limited demand:** People are sometimes not interested in purchasing certain assets due to not knowing their availability or their benefits. Often, especially when the assets are not commonly used, people are not willing to take the risks associated with being “early adopters”.

All of these factors can be addressed and a range of tools and approaches are available for doing so. The evaluator has experience with using both approaches in both fragile (South Sudan) as well as more stable (Cambodia) contexts and if required, would be happy to help Concern with expanding the use of this approach throughout its programming.
**Recommendation 2.2:** No donations without the possibility of repairs or re-purchase.

It is recommended that whenever Concern distributes a large amount of assets whose longer-term use requires them to be either repaired or re-purchased (such as hip pumps or seeds), it pilots - and if not effective, then revises - ways for enabling the beneficiaries to do so. RAIN+ project demonstrated some positive practices in this regards that can be further improved and replicated elsewhere. An example of such a solution is provided in recommendation 1.12.

**Recommendation 2.3:** Measure men’s gender attitudes.

Assessing women’s gender-related attitudes is important for understanding the extent to which they are open to practice (and require their husbands to follow) behaviours that contribute to greater gender equality and women’s empowerment. At the same time, without measuring the attitudes of their husbands (or men generally), it is difficult to understand what support or opposition women have in their daily lives. It is therefore recommended that Concern’s baseline and endline surveys measure not only women but also men’s gender-related attitudes.

**Recommendation 2.4:** Continue to promote RAIN+ approach at the international level.

Concern’s approach of addressing gender as a part of its multi-sectoral nutrition programming is definitely worth the attention of (and replication by) other development agencies and donors. Concern is encouraged to continue promoting the approach and to share its lessons learnt internationally, including amongst its Alliance2015 partners, for example, through the Technical Working Group on Food Security and Nutrition.
### 6. MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Not Accepted</th>
<th>Management Response / Planned Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REMAINING PROJECT DURATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Ensure that women are able and motivated to purchase seeds.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an integral activity in the marketing component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Provide refresher courses on pest management.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>This will be intensified through trainings conducted by CDFs with crops cards used as teaching aids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Strengthen women’s ability to profitably sell a portion of their produce.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Market linkages will be strengthened by looking at micro-financing, agro dealers and promoting local sells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Continue establishing and strengthening savings and loans groups.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>More trainings will be rolled out to the groups not yet trained through the CDFs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Organize refresher workshops for the existing peer educators.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>WFC will train MCDA staff as ToT and they will roll out training to new peer educators and follow up trainings to the existing peer educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Train CEOs on specific gender mainstreaming methods.</td>
<td>Not agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO will be invited to trainings for peer educators and the project will work with DNCC to train CEO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Advocate for specific gender activities to be included in the 2018 District Nutrition Plan.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern will submit to DNCC actions that promote gender activities in 2018 budget/plan. Also WFC will be given space during routing DNCC monthly meetings to train/orient DNCC members on gender mainstreaming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Define / focus your RAIN+ model and promote (extensively) specific actions the government and NGOs can replicate.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be covered within the learning event and through the different National and local level forums that Concern participates in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Enhance NGOs’ capacity to measure the results of their women’s empowerment / gender equality work.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be followed up through the Global Equality Advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Strengthen the capacity of the weakest VWASH committees.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training for all VWASH committees will be conduct for all 96 VWASH committees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.11 Ensure that CHVs are trained on home-based counselling on family planning and on the promotion of low-cost hand washing stations. **Not agree** CHVs are already trained in this but the project might encourage them to strengthen the messaging through the GMP activities.

1.12 Contract KickStart to train local entrepreneurs on the repairs of hip pumps. **Not agree** The project will however, use CDFs to reorient beneficiaries and might work with KickStart.

1.13 Ensure that unused and non-functional hip pumps are used. **Agree** The project will take stock on the distributed hip pumps and ensure that only beneficiaries with water source have these.

1.14 Support MA and its Camp Extension Officers in taking over responsibility for strengthening SMFs’ technical capacity. **Agree** The project will continue to engage CEO at community level, however, transport remain a challenge for this.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONCERN’S FUTURE PROGRAMMING

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Donations: only once, then move to subsidized vouchers and supporting commercial supply.</td>
<td><strong>Not possible to comment</strong> – Zambia programme will close in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>No donations without the possibility of repairs or re-purchase.</td>
<td><strong>Not possible to comment</strong> – Zambia programme will close in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Measure men’s gender attitudes.</td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong> This is the standard practice and was an error made by the consulting firm at baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Continue to promote RAIN+ approach (especially specific actions) at the international level, including among Alliance2015 partners.</td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong> Concern continues to promote RAIN+ at international and national level. Recent opportunities include; poster and handouts at the International Conference on Nutrition, two papers under peer review, abstract accepted for the Zambia National Nutrition Conference, series of 3 case studies developed for the SUN Global Gathering 2017 including one with a focus on the DNCC Mumbwa and District level coordination and alignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. ANNEXES

7.1 Terms of Reference

To access the Terms of Reference (ToR), click on the following icon:

TOR for the RAIN+ final evaluation Final.docx

7.2 List of Reviewed Project Documents

The evaluation involved a careful review of the following project-related documents:

- RAIN+ Project Proposal
- RAIN+ Operational Manual
- RAIN+ Logframe (version August 2016)
- RAIN+ Indicator Framework
- RAIN+ M&E Framework
- RAIN+ M&E Plan
- RAIN+ Baseline Report
- RAIN+ Mid-Term Review Report
- RAIN+ Budget (June 2017)
- RAIN+ Work Plan
- RAIN+ Organisation Chart
- RAIN+ Beneficiary Database
- RAIN+ Reports to DFID (2016, 2017)
- RAIN+ Stories of Change (2015, 2016)
- RAIN+ Marketing Training Manual + Marketing Strategy
- RAIN+ Gender Training Manual
- indicators-related training attendance sheets
- lists of SMFs, peer educators, and CHVs
- list of provided seed packs
- list of rehabilitated boreholes
- reports from boreholes repairers
- Concern (2016) Procurement Thresholds
- Women for Change – Concern Implementation Plan (August to October 2017)
- Crawford, B. (2016) Suggested Ideas Activities in Training Sessions To Address Gender Equality in RAIN+
- RAIN Gender Needs Assessment
- Promundo (2013) Concern Worldwide Equality Scales Project
7.3 Content of the Enumerators Training

The training focused on achieving a situation in which the enumerators and supervisors:

- are able to correctly identify the survey respondents
- fully and correctly understand the meaning of each survey question
- know how to correctly ask the survey questions and record the provided answers
- are aware of the most common mistakes occurring during similar surveys and are able to prevent them effectively
- are capable of ensuring gender, age and culturally-sensitive interviewing
- know how to reduce the risk of self-reporting biases
- (only for supervisors) are capable of effectively supervising the quality of enumerators’ work and providing them with constructive and helpful feedback

In order to achieve these goals, the lead evaluator delivered the following three-day training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>training content</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>introduction</td>
<td>30min</td>
<td>peer to peer introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIN+ project</td>
<td>15min</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why do we conduct this survey &amp; why the data quality matters</td>
<td>15min</td>
<td>discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child age identification</td>
<td>60min</td>
<td>presentation, participatory development of a Local Events Calendar, practicing its use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questionnaire administration</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>question-by-question review of the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>discussion about each question’s meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presentation, discussion and practice on which foods belong to which food groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brainstorming on what can go wrong and how to prevent it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles of gender and age sensitive interview</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>presentation, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoiding respondent biases</td>
<td>20min</td>
<td>presentation, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respondent selection</td>
<td>10min</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey planning and logistics</td>
<td>20min</td>
<td>presentation, Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions &amp; answers</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>presentation, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervision of enumerators</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>presentation, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducting interviews</td>
<td>half day</td>
<td>role plays, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questionnaires piloting</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>field practice (experience-based learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback and review session</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>discussion, Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender and age sensitive training module focused on motivating and enabling enumerators to use (and supervisors to monitor) the following practices:

- building rapport with the respondents in a short space of time to make them feel comfortable
- assuring the respondent of confidentiality
- ensuring that no one else can listen to what the respondent says
- ensuring that no one else can influence the respondent’s answers through proximity
- providing the respondent with an option to decline responding or to opt out of the interview
- approaches for asking more sensitive questions
- responding sensitively to the information the respondent provides
- referring the respondent to specialized service providers
## 7.4 List of Participating Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/9 – 8/9/2017</td>
<td>4 target Wards</td>
<td>• quantitative endline survey involving 640 respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2017</td>
<td>Shaciyle village, Nangoma Ward</td>
<td>• FGD with 7 female beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• key informant interview with 1 SMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGD with 9 peer educators (men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/2017</td>
<td>CWZ office in Mumbwa</td>
<td>• interview with CWZ’s Program Area Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/2017</td>
<td>Kachili village, Chisalu Ward</td>
<td>• FGD with 11 female beneficiaries’ husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGD with 13 female beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• observation of a female beneficiary’s garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9/2017</td>
<td>Kasalu village, Chisalu Ward</td>
<td>• boreholes observation, interview with VWASH committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ndolobaki village, Chisalu Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kakombo, Chisalu Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/2017</td>
<td>Champa village, Shimbizhi Ward</td>
<td>• FGD with 4 female beneficiaries’ husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGD with 9 female beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• observation of a SMF’s garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• observation of a female beneficiary’s garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• interview with a male peer educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/2017</td>
<td>MCDA office in Mumbwa</td>
<td>• interview with MCDA’s Technical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• interview with MCDA’s RAIN+ Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGD with 7 MCDA’s Community Development Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2017</td>
<td>Chiwena village, Nakasaka Ward</td>
<td>• FGD with 3 SMFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGD with 11 female beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGD with 5 CHVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chanshika village, Nakasaka Ward</td>
<td>• FGD with 4 male peer educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• borehole observation, interview with VWASH committee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2017</td>
<td>Kaputula village, Chisalu Ward</td>
<td>• FGD with 4 SMFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• observation of a SMF’s garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FGD with 3 CHVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• borehole observation, interview with VWASH committee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2017</td>
<td>MoH office in Mumbwa</td>
<td>• interview with district SUN Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MoH office in Mumbwa</td>
<td>• interview with District Nutrition Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA office in Mumbwa</td>
<td>• interview with Acting Senior Agriculture Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/2017</td>
<td>MIKA Centre in Lusaka</td>
<td>• interview with WfC’s M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/9/2017</td>
<td>CWZ office in Lusaka</td>
<td>• interview with CWZ’s Country Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.5 Endline Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Level</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
<th>Endline Value</th>
<th>Indicator Met?</th>
<th>Measurement Methods</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Indicator 1</td>
<td>% of children 6-23 months fed a minimum acceptable diet the day before the interview</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>PARTIALLY</td>
<td># of children 6-23 months with both minimum dietary diversity and minimum meal frequency / total # of surveyed children 6-23 months</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries with children aged 6-23 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact Indicator 2 | % of women with minimum dietary diversity (MDD) | 28.1% | 60% | 52% | LARGELY | # of women who consumed at least 4 out of 9 food groups the previous day or night / total # of interviewed women | quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries | By the existing standards (see FANTA), MDD means consuming at least 5 out of 10 defined food groups. For the endline survey's purpose, the evaluator kept using the baseline's definition of MDD as “4 out of 9 food groups”.
| Outcome Indicator 1 | % target households producing micronutrient rich plant and animal foods | Vit. A: 26.3% | Vit. A: 60% | Vit. A: 97% | YES | # of target households producing at least one source of vitamin A-rich foods / total # of interviewed women (households) | quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries | |
|                   | | Iron: 59.9% | Iron: 95% | Iron: 97% | | # of target households producing at least one source of Iron-rich foods / total # of interviewed women (households) | | |
|                   | | animal: 94.8% | animal: 95% | animal: 91% | | # of target households producing at least one source of animal foods / total # of interviewed women (households) | | |
|                   | |                      |                      |                      | | | | |

---

7 Following Concern’s instruction, all indicators are taken from the file “Concern_UKAM_Logframe_August_2016” sent by CWZ as the latest version of the logframe that should be used for the final evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicator 2</th>
<th>% of children 6-23 months of age fed minimum meal frequency the day before the interview</th>
<th>34.7%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>89%</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th># of children 6-23 months of age who receive solid, semi-solid, or soft foods the minimum number of times* / # of surveyed children 6-23 months</th>
<th>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries with children aged 6-23 months</th>
<th>2 times for breastfed infants 6-8 months</th>
<th>3 times for breastfed children 9-23 months</th>
<th>4 times for non-breastfed children 6-23 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 3</td>
<td>Women's Autonomy Index</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>following methodology described in RAIN+ baseline report, page 48 (Annex 4)</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 4</td>
<td>% of men substantially participating in at least 3 household tasks</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data will be collected in December 2017</td>
<td># of target households where men “substantially participate” in ≥3 household tasks / total # of interviewed women (with a husband / partner)</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td>A male partner can be considered “substantially participating” if the respondent stated that “the partner does everything”, “usually partner”, or responsibility for the task was “shared”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.1</td>
<td># of women's groups formed and received leadership training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of formed women groups that have received leadership training</td>
<td>interview with CWZ’s PAC, list of women groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.2 A</td>
<td>% of women with children aged &lt;2 years that are preserving fruits and vegetables by drying</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of women with children aged &lt;2 years that are preserving fruits and vegetables by drying / total # of interviewed women</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries with children &lt;2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.2 B</td>
<td>% of women who are storing food safely</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of women storing food by using a recommended practice / total number of interviewed women</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
<td>% of women in charge of selling agricultural produce (including meat, eggs, milk and/or field crops)</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>LARGELY</td>
<td># of women with children &lt; 2 years in charge of selling agricultural produce in the past year / # of interviewed women</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.3</td>
<td>% of women with knowledge and skills for growing micronutrient rich foods</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>LARGELY</td>
<td># of women (group members) who in the past season managed to plant and harvest at least 3 micronutrient rich crops / # of interviewed women</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.4</td>
<td># of community dialogues held in line with the project methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td># of community dialogues held</td>
<td>no sources of verification available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.1</td>
<td>network of male peer educators established and trained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of male peer educators trained</td>
<td>training attendance lists</td>
<td>list of trained educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.2</td>
<td>average score on the Gender Attitudes Scale (GAS)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Average of three gender scales: 1) Attitudes toward girl children 2) Attitudes toward violence against women 3) GEM scale</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.3</td>
<td>% of women who are producing diverse and micronutrient rich foods based on seed pack and</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of interviewed women who in the past 12 months produced at least two types of the crops whose seeds were provided by the project / # of interviewed women</td>
<td>quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td># of women who have completed the training course on agriculture in line with the revised manual and established gardens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5319</td>
<td>5406</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of women who have completed at least one training course on agriculture and in the past 12 months grew at least one of the promoted crops. Quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td># of boreholes with functional WASH committees rehabilitated and beneficiaries accessing clean water from the rehabilitated boreholes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of boreholes rehabilitated</td>
<td># of WASH committees functional</td>
<td># of people accessing water from (rehabilitated) boreholes</td>
<td>Quantitative endline survey of all rehabilitated boreholes and relevant WASH committees. Considering that the difference between the target and the reality is only one borehole, it was more reasonable to conclude that the indicator was met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td># of women's groups trained and counselled on MIYCF by the CHVs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of women's groups trained and counselled on MIYCF by the Community Health Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>% of children exclusively breastfed the day before the interview, children &lt; 6 months of age</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td># of children 0-5.99 months who received only breastmilk during previous day</td>
<td># of surveyed children 0-5.99 months</td>
<td>Quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries with children aged 0-5 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>% of mothers / caretakers of children &lt;24 months of age that</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>LARGELY</td>
<td># of mothers/caretakers that can identify at least 3 critical times for</td>
<td>Quantitative endline survey among female beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Activity Details</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>can identify at least 3 critical times for handwashing with soap</td>
<td>handwashing with soap / # of interviewed mothers/caretakers with children &lt;2 years</td>
<td>LARGELY</td>
<td></td>
<td>The survey used the same 9 food groups that were used for assessing women’s minimum acceptable diet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>average individual diet diversity score of mother/care giver</td>
<td>sum of all interviewed mothers’ IDDS / number of interviewed mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>activities to promote gender equality included in the District Nutrition Plan 2017</td>
<td># and types of activities promoting gender equality that are included in the District Nutrition Plan for 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>District Nutrition Plan 2017, interview with DNCC members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>DNCC discuss and agree on actions to address gender issues in their regular meetings</td>
<td># of DNCC meetings discussing inclusion of activities to promote gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>interview with DNCC members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA staff at district level mainstreamed gender in their agricultural training</td>
<td># and types of gender mainstreaming measures included in MA’s agricultural training</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARTIALLY</td>
<td>interview with MA representative at the district level and CWZ’s PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6 Inception Report

To access the Inception Report, click on the following icon:

Inception_Report_RAIN_2017-08-26.docx

7.7 Tools for Qualitative and Quantitative Data Collection

The main tools used in the course of the evaluation were:
- structured questionnaire (for quantitative data collection)
- boreholes and VWASH monitoring checklists
- facilitator guides for conducting focus group discussions
- questionnaires for semi-structured in-depth interviews
- observation checklists
- review of the project documentation

Structured Questionnaires

Based on the agreement between the evaluator and CWZ (and inputs provided by both sides), the evaluator developed, and Concern reviewed and approved, a paper-based questionnaire used for quantitative data collection (as electronic data collection could not be used due to time constraints). To access the questionnaire, click on the pdf icon below. To access a checklist used by the supervisors for supervising the quality of the data collection process, click on the Word icon below. An additional structured questionnaire was developed for assessing the performance of rehabilitated boreholes and VWASH committees. To access, click on the icon below.

RAIN+_baseline_questionaire_FINAL.pdf  RAIN+ Interviews Supervisor Checklist  Rehabilitated Boreholes + WASH i

Facilitator Guides for Conducting FGDs

For each FGD, the evaluator and gender specialist drafted a guide to help the evaluator and interpreter facilitate the discussions in the most effective manner. The guides can be accessed by clicking on the following icon:

RAIN+ FGD Guides.docx

Questionnaires for Semi-Structured Interviews

For each interview, the evaluator used a semi-structured questionnaire helping the evaluator and interpreter to guide the discussion in the most relevant and effective manner.
Structured Observations Checklists
The evaluator conducted structured observations using rapid checklists evaluating:

- model farms
- vegetable gardens of female beneficiaries participating in the FGDs and SSIs
- rehabilitated boreholes’ operation and maintenance

Structured Review of the Project’s IEC Materials
As part of assessing the project strategy’s effectiveness, the evaluator reviewed the quality and appropriateness of the project’s information, education and communication (IEC) materials. The review used Pathfinder International's “Straight to the Point” Checklist for Evaluating IEC Materials that assesses seven main features of any IEC materials. At the same time, the review focused on assessing whether the IEC materials factored in any barriers identified by the Barrier Analysis carried out during the project’s preparatory phase.