



An income generation opportunity beneficiary in MMC. Hassan Isaac 2018

JUNE 2018

**TARGETED PROTECTION AND LIVELIHOODS
SUPPORT TO MOST VULNERABLE IDP AND HOST
COMMUNITIES PROJECT IN BORNO STATE OF
NIGERIA
Final Evaluation Report**

Disclaimer

Prepared for

This evaluation was prepared by Regional Development Consultants (RDC) for Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Nigeria.



Email: info@rdc.co.ke

Disclaimer: The opinions expressed in this publication are those of Regional Development Consultants (RDC) and do not necessarily reflect those of Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) or Danish Refugee Council (DRC) || **June, 2018**

Dr. Brian Kiswii PhD, Team Leader

Hassan Issack, Associate

Final Evaluation Report, SDC | June 2018
© Norwegian Refugee Council
Contact: Regional Development Consultants
Info@rdc.co.ke

Table of Contents

1	List of abbreviations and acronyms	4
2	Executive Summary	5
2.1	Key findings	5
2.2	Key conclusion	6
2.3	Evaluation recommendations	6
3	Introduction	8
3.1	The project under assessment	8
3.2	The Overall Project objective	9
3.2.1	The general objective of the project	9
3.2.2	The specific project objectives	9
3.3	Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation	9
3.4	Expectations and usage of the evaluation	10
3.4.1	Expectations of the evaluation	10
3.4.2	Usage of the evaluation findings	10
4	Methodology	11
4.1	Research methods	11
4.2	Sampling	11
4.3	Training, data collection and quality control	12
4.4	Data processing and analysis	12
4.5	Limitations	13
5	Findings	14
5.1	Evaluation Question 1:	14
5.1.1	Evaluation question 1.1	14
5.1.1.1	Finding	14
5.1.2	Evaluation question 1.2	15
5.1.2.1	Finding	15
5.1.3	Evaluation question 1.3	16
5.1.3.1	Finding	16
	The general objective of the project	16
5.1.4	Evaluation question 1.4	17
5.1.4.1	Finding	17
5.1.5	Evaluation question 1.5	21
5.1.5.1	Finding	21
5.2	Evaluation Question 2	21
5.2.1	Evaluation question 2.1	21
5.2.1.1	Finding	21
5.2.2	Evaluation question 2.2	23
5.2.2.1	Finding	23
5.3	Evaluation Question 3	23
5.3.1	Evaluation question 3.1	23
5.3.1.1	Finding	23
5.3.2	Evaluation question 3.2	26
5.3.2.1	Finding	26
5.3.3	Evaluation question 3.3	27
5.3.3.1	Finding	27
5.3.4	Evaluation question 3.4	27
5.3.4.1	Finding	27
6	Annexes	29

1 List of abbreviations and acronyms

DRC	Danish Refugee Council
EVI	Extremely Vulnerable Individual
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HC	Host Community
HDD	Household Dietary Diversity
HH	Household
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGA	Local Government Area
MMC	Maiduguri Metropolitan Council
M/F	Male or Female
NEMA	National Emergency Management Agency
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
ODK	Open Data Kit
RDC	Regional Development Consultants
SDC	Swiss Development Corporation
SEMA	State Emergency Management Agency
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
ToR	Terms of Reference
WFP	World Food Programme

2 Executive Summary

This is an external final evaluation of the Swiss Development Corporation (SDC) funded Livelihoods and Protection Project implemented in a Consortium by Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) in partnership with Danish Refugee Council (DRC) in Borno State of Nigeria. The project targeted the most vulnerable Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and host communities. The livelihoods component focused on improving community resilience and socio-economic recovery for targeted beneficiaries to meet their basic needs and cope with future shocks. The protection component focused on enhancing protection of conflict-affected communities and capacity of duty bearers to address better protection issues affecting IDPs and host communities. The project was implemented in a consortium led by NRC in partnership with DRC. The project was implemented in Borno state of Northern Nigeria with activities in Maiduguri Metropolitan (MMC), Jere and Kaga Local Government Authorities (LGAs). The project has come to an end and this final evaluation undertaken by Regional Development Consultants (RDC). The evaluation objectives, scope and use are outlined in section 3 of this report.

The project evaluation sought to ascertain if assistance **reached the target people in a timely manner** and measure the **achievement of the specific objectives** of the project for both the Livelihoods and Protection components. The evaluation employed a mixed methods approach. Qualitative data collected through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) while quantitative data was collected through a household survey. Further to this two approaches, a review of existing project reports was done with an aim to follow through the project progress from inception to closure.

2.1 Key findings

The evaluation made the following key findings which are explained in detailed in section 5 of this report:

- ✓ *The evaluation observed a distinct difference between protection and livelihoods beneficiaries. This was a shift from the project design which had anticipated deliberate layering of both intervention at the same beneficiary. The intervention had positive impact across the two set of beneficiaries as discussed under the indicators achievement section.*
- ✓ *The strategic engagement with Kaga LGA to provide farming land to the targeted IDPs reduced the need and burden of IDPs to pay for the land as was the case in most areas of the MMC LGA.*
- ✓ *The two project specific objectives were found valid. They matched with the key priorities of the beneficiaries.*
- ✓ *The project design as per the project documents were clearly spelt out with clear linkages of activities, outputs, outcomes and the general objective of the project.*
- ✓ *The project had reached more direct beneficiaries than originally intended. From the cost effective features mapped through this evaluation, we observe that that the action had value for money. In section 5.1.1 and 5.1.4 of the report, we present the causal factors including the project's adoption of cheaper inputs including trainings and financial service providers in addition to leaving out interventions including Psycho Social Services (PSS) and Village Savings and Loans Association to scale up other activities. In addition, DRC had included low cost protection awareness creation as an activity contributing to a larger number of beneficiaries reached (5 times the originally planned PSS activity).*
- ✓ *The project activities were largely appropriate to the needs of the target beneficiaries. This illustrates that the project activities were significantly informed by the needs of the target beneficiaries. This was made possible due to the needs and market assessments undertaken both by DRC and NRC prior to the project implementation.*
- ✓ *The project targeted more IDPs (83%) than host community members (17%) as originally designed. Based on KIIs with project teams, this played a significant role in increasing harmonious co-existence between the host community who have poor and vulnerable individuals and the IDPs who are largely targeted by none-governmental organizations.*

- ✓ The evaluation recorded mixed results on the performance of the consortium. The roles of the partners were clearly defined in the project proposal. The consortium was found to have worked more closely towards the end of the project. This was attributed to the delayed start in some of the activities and staff turnover experienced by the two consortium partners.
- ✓ *The evaluation observed management level engagement between the two partners. However, this was not cascaded downwards to the implementation team leading to teams working in silos hence missing on opportunities to learn from each other.*
- ✓ *The project outcome indicators were found to have achieved the set target of 60% except for outcome indicator 1 that scored 54%. The evaluation observes that outcome indicator 1 could have scored higher had the project reached the same beneficiaries with both protection and livelihoods activities.*
- ✓ *The project logframe lacked target values for the outcome indicators making it difficult to measure achievement of the project objectives.*

2.2 Key conclusion

The evaluation made the following key conclusions. These are described in detail under section 5 of this report.

- ✓ As a result of the different targeting of protection and livelihoods component of the project, beneficiaries were denied the opportunity to benefit concurrently from both livelihoods and protection interventions. This also denied the project the opportunity to achieve better results that would have been brought about by targeting the same group of beneficiaries.
- ✓ There was a missing element in the project where the evaluation team found out that the project was not implemented fully as designed, this is in relation to the integrated delivery of the two project components.
- ✓ The benefits of working with the local government were identified through DRC's partnership with the Kaga LGA who provided farming land to the target beneficiaries without a cost.
- ✓ The evaluation found out that the needs and markets assessments undertaken by both NRC and DRC played a critical role in making the interventions appropriate to the needs of the target beneficiaries.
- ✓ The evaluation found that there were both benefits and drawbacks of working as a consortium, with the key emergence being that there is a need to have more investment in the consortium coordination to enhance the partners working together in a more efficient manner.
- ✓ The project has made tremendous benefits amongst the beneficiaries through the attainment of the outcome indicators, this needs to be built upon by future projects targeting the same groups of beneficiaries in order to build on the gains made by the current project.

2.3 Evaluation recommendations

From the evaluation features mapped above, the evaluators make the following recommendation that have both design and operational implications:

For Program Management:

- ❖ *It is recommended that the project in future needs to adopt an integrated delivery approach through layering livelihoods and protection components through targeting the same groups of beneficiaries in order to better meet the specific objectives of the project as defined in the project design. This will also contribute to better achievement of outcome indicators.*
- ❖ *It is recommended that the project needs to work closely with both the local government and other key stakeholders for greater benefits to be achieved for the beneficiaries*
- ❖ *The evaluation recommends for detailed project inception/grant kickoff that links the project results framework as described in the logframe with the project implementation plan as described in the technical design description of the proposal. This information also needs to be shared in detail with the project implementation team*

For Program Development Team:

- ❖ *The evaluation recommends on building on the benefits accrued from this project in the design of future projects targeting the same beneficiaries and locations*

For Monitoring and Evaluation:

- ❖ *It is recommended that the project teams in future continue to rely on needs assessments to inform project design so as to make sure the project responds to actual felt needs as illustrated in this project*
- ❖ *Based on the evaluation findings, it is important for the project in future to look at the distinct differences between the distinct beneficiary groups to tailor their support in a manner that will enhance maximum benefits*
- ❖ *The evaluation recommends for future efforts to be made in ensuring the project is implemented in such a manner that will enhance the achievement of the target outcome indicators as described in the project design.*
- ❖ *The evaluation recommends that future logframes need clearly defined outcome indicators target values that will help in determining whether the project achieved its objectives or not*

For the Consortium Management:

- ❖ *It is recommended that the consortium in future invests in consortium coordination unit that would engage closely with both consortium partners and ensure the project is implemented efficiently and coherently. The coordination unit will also be responsible for monitoring and learning.*
- ❖ *It is recommended that the project management need to cascade the project design and implementation details to the implementation team in order to have the project implemented as outlined in the project proposal*

For Communication team:

- ❖ *The evaluation recommends that the project in future invests in communication and documentation of such change stories both in writing and audio-visual recordings*

3 Introduction

3.1 The project under assessment

Although Nigeria is today one of the richest and fastest growing economies in Africa, the north eastern part of the country has historically faced marginalisation and chronic under-development, with rates of poverty, illiteracy, and youth unemployment higher than in the rest of the country.

The lack of investment in addressing the various inequalities has contributed to the cycle of violence and conflict in this region which, since 2009, has resulted in a humanitarian emergency with large-scale internal and cross-border displacement.

This project was funded by the Swiss Development Corporation (SDC) and jointly implemented by NRC and DRC. The duration of the project was 15 months (December 2016 to February 2018). Implemented in Maiduguri and Jere LGA, the project had two components – livelihoods and protection. The livelihoods component was implemented by NRC while DRC implemented the protection element. The project targeted both vulnerable IDPs living in host communities and host community households. There are three categories of IDP households living in host communities: 1) IDPs having income and renting houses/apartments; 2) IDPs hosted by relatives or friends; and 3) IDPs settling on unoccupied land plots in their self-made temporary shelters. Priority was given to the last category, followed by the second and first categories. IDPs in host communities without any form of assistance to date, as well as Extremely Vulnerable Individuals (EVIs) facing exposure to negative coping strategies and associated protection risks, were prioritised.

Women and children represent 65% of IDPs in Borno State and have specific needs. The project therefore had a specific focus on female-headed HHs, divorced, single, and widows, women in polygamous marriages, as well as children orphaned or without any means of income. The beneficiaries for this intervention were selected using the beneficiary selection criteria.

The target location for the project Maiduguri, the capital of Borno State, has seen its population doubling (from 1.2M in 2009) as a result of the influx of displaced people from other areas of the state. Maiduguri Metropolis hosts a camp-based population that IOM estimates at 111,000 in some 30 different locations. There are currently 16 official camps in Maiduguri with an ongoing relocation of IDPs from informal camps (schools and institutions) into formal camps, which is leading to overcrowding. The camp population receives in-kind food assistance through the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) and National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA). Food is provided as a wet ratio, and most households eat twice a day in the geographical locations targeted by NRC while dry food was provided to the protection beneficiaries in the DRC covered geographical areas. The dire lack of access to basic services by both IDPs and host communities in Borno State is further compounded by significant protection challenges experienced by these communities.

The widespread displacement has resulted in significant increase in risk vulnerabilities for various groups including women, children, and persons with specific needs. There has been an increase in protection incidents affecting civilians including Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), child protection issues, secondary and forced relocations of IDPs, and limitations to IDP enjoyment of basic rights and freedoms. Overall, it is estimated that 5.5 million people are in need of protection assistance in the State, while 63% of IDPs reported the need for protection assistance in an intention survey conducted in 2017. Due to the limited humanitarian presence and limitations in resources for protection interventions, most of the above challenges have gone largely unaddressed with existing interventions falling short of analysis and coordination.

The current humanitarian scenario remains critical in Maiduguri Metropolis and peri-urban areas: most of the existing gaps in service delivery have not been met by humanitarian actors, especially for IDPs in

host communities. In terms of priority needs, food security and access to enhanced, safe and reliable livelihood opportunities are named as the main priority among the affected population in the area.

Currently, over five million Nigerians are 'food insecure' of these, 1.8 million are 'severely food insecure' (Crisis Phase 3) and have limited or no access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food. The number of 'severely food insecure' HHs is about half a million (Crisis Phase 4). Approximately 54,242 HHs are facing famine.

3.2 The Overall Project objective

3.2.1 The general objective of the project

- ✓ To ensure that men, women, boys, and girls affected by conflict and displacement in Borno State benefit from an improved protective environment and have access to enhanced, safe and reliable livelihoods

3.2.2 The specific project objectives

- ✓ Improved community resilience and enabled socio-economic recovery through the provision of support to IDPs and host communities to better meet their basic needs and cope with future shocks.
- ✓ Enhance protection of conflict-affected communities and capacity of duty bearers to address better protection issues affecting IDPs and host communities.

3.3 Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The **general objective** of this evaluation is:

- ✓ To ascertain if assistance **reached the target people in a timely manner** and measure the **achievement of the specific objectives** of the project for both the Livelihoods and Protection components.

The **specific objectives** of this evaluation are to assess SDC Consortium from the following perspectives:

- ✓ To ascertain the **relevance** and **appropriateness** of the project to the priorities of the target populations;
- ✓ To determine if the end results (**outcomes**) of the projects was **achieved** and if the modalities were **appropriate** for the intervention;
- ✓ To find out if there are advantages of working in a **consortium** model to improve future programming;
- ✓ To examine **contextual changes** and challenges that impacted project implementation and identify lessons learnt for future programming.

Using the above stated OECD DAC criteria, the following questions were to be answered by the evaluation: Evaluation Questions:

1. **How can we ensure that we do the right things?**
 - ✓ To what extent has the project taken into account people's different needs according to age, gender, and ethnicity? How has the project adapted to meet those differing needs?
 - ✓ Did the intervention reach the people it was designed to reach in the right proportion and at the right time and were the modalities appropriate?
 - ✓ Are there any differences within sub-groups (e.g. M/F, Internally displaced persons (IDPs), or host community (HC).
2. **What were the benefits and drawbacks of working as a consortium?**
 - ✓ Is there any evidence that working as a consortium contributed to greater impact than working as individual agencies?

- ✓ How effective was the level of cooperation amongst partners?

- 3. **To what extent were outcomes achieved (including the improvement in household income and improved access to services and response to their primary protection concerns) achieved?**
- ✓ To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- ✓ What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- ✓ Were objectives achieved on time?
- ✓ What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?

3.4 Expectations and usage of the evaluation

3.4.1 Expectations of the evaluation

Based on the results of these findings and a lessons learnt review process with key management and programme staff of NRC and DRC Nigeria, it is expected that the evaluator provides concrete, actionable recommendations for future strategic and operational development.

3.4.2 Usage of the evaluation findings

To ensure that the report of the evaluation is maximally used to inform programme implementation, the following will be carried out:

- ✓ Publishing the evaluation report – Findings will be published on NRC’s website and also shared with other relevant actors in the humanitarian sector.
- ✓ Completing a management response – A management response will be documented and finalized within one month of receiving a final evaluation report. This is to be led by the manager on the SC who is responsible for the work under review.
- ✓ Communication and dissemination of findings

4 Methodology

The final evaluation methodology was designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation objectives. A combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques was employed, with emphasis placed on participatory data collection approaches. The mixed methods approach employed has the potential for a well-grounded output with quantitative observations from the evaluation augmented with qualitative data from beneficiaries and other key stakeholders.

4.1 Research methods

The evaluation adopted a mixed methods approach with quantitative primary data being collected through household surveys and qualitative data collected through both focus group discussions and key informant interviews. It was used to triangulate the findings and grounding evidence alongside the DAC criteria.

Five methods of data collection were used namely; desk review, Key Informant Interviews (KII), In-depth Interviews /household interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). These methods are elaborated further in the data collection section below.

The evaluation team used a variety of instruments targeting different cohorts of the evaluation respondents. The secondary and primary data was gathered from four sources:

- i) **Desk review:** A desk review was undertaken for the project documents including the proposal, logframe, budget, beneficiary numbers breakdown and project progress reports.
- ii) **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** A total of 8 key informant interviews were conducted targeting the project management, monitoring and implementation staff both in NRC and DRC, beneficiaries who were considered to have achieved significant changes as a result of the project and the Borno State Ministry of Agriculture staff who trained beneficiaries on backyard gardening and also provided farming technical extension services.
- iii) **Household Survey:** A total of sample of 399 was selected from the total direct beneficiaries 8,528. The sample was derived to provide a representativeness at 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error. 209 of the sampled beneficiaries were from NRC implementation area while 190 were selected from DRC implementation area. 278 of the sample were livelihoods activities beneficiaries while 121 were selected from protection activities beneficiaries. A coded questionnaire with a consent form (first page) was used to collect primary data at household level. Respondents were explained on the objective of the evaluation to ensure that honest discussions occurred. To protect beneficiaries under the protection component, the evaluators tell the most significant changes observed from this component in generic manner.
- iv) **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** A total of 6 Focused Group Discussions (FGD) were conducted targeting both beneficiaries and non-beneficiary community members and local leaders. The FGD participants were drawn from the livelihoods and protection beneficiaries, community members residing in the areas where both livelihoods and protection activities were implemented but not directly supported by the project, and local community leaders who are directly engaged in protection activities through the project.

4.2 Sampling

The study adopted both probability and non-probability sampling techniques. The non-probability sampling was adopted for the Key Informant Interviews and Focused Group Discussions where the evaluation purposively identified eight key informants and six FGDs. The key informants included project staff from both DRC and NRC, Borno state department of agriculture staff and beneficiaries who were identified during FGDs as being exemplary. Participants in the FGDs were entirely selected from beneficiary groups - four from livelihoods and two from the protection component. In the FGD, the evaluation selected 3 of the FGD specifically to target female beneficiary respondents to provide a gendered perspective of the evaluation.

The probability sampling technique was adopted for the household survey where a total of 399 beneficiaries were randomly sampled from the total direct beneficiaries. The sample size was calculated using the Fischer's model as shown below. The sampling provided an opportunity to bring to the fore gender variances where the evaluation selected 66% of the respondents as being female and the rest 34% were male. The Fischer's (1998) Model standard formula was applied to determine a representative sample for the end line evaluation:

$$n = \frac{Z^2 pq D}{d^2}$$

Where:

n = required sample size (for population >10,000) assuming the population for each area is >10,000.

Z = the standard normal deviate at the required confidence level, (set at 1.96 corresponding to 95%, confidence level adopted for this study).

p = on the chance that somebody gives a certain answer or 0.5 is used).

q = 1-p

d = desired precision (set at 0.05 for +/-5%).

D = the design effect.

4.3 Training, data collection and quality control

The final evaluation relied on the 8 enumerators working over 6 days to complete the household survey data collection, while the consultant worked closely with 4 project implementation staff and 1 monitoring and evaluation staff to undertake the KIIs and FGDs.

The 8 enumerators were trained on Saturday 19th May 2018, allowing them to interact with the data collection tools on the Open Data Kit (ODK). The enumerator training was facilitated by the consultant with each question explained and local language terminologies derived for key concepts that risked being comprehended differently.

To enhance data quality and for triangulation of the information collected, the evaluation team used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative. The household survey tool was designed with a skip logic, ensuring that enumerators do not skip required questions. In addition, the consultant and project implementation and monitoring and evaluation staff oversaw the household survey data collection as well as the KIIs and FGDs were done as planned.

4.4 Data processing and analysis

The household survey data was analysed using the SPSS while the qualitative data from the desk review, key informant interviews and focused group discussions were analysed through determination of trends. The qualitative data was used to inform and further ground the findings from the household survey. In scenarios where beneficiary voices have been used directly, these are captured as anonymous respondents (respondent 1,2,3..n) further deepening the ethical considerations made.

4.5 Limitations

The major data collection challenge was the limited access to Kaga Local Government Authority (LGA) given security concerns. This limitation was identified once the consultant arrived in Maiduguri, where in all prior communication this never came up, based on discussions with DRC and NRC, it was agreed the consultant sample beneficiaries from Jere and Maiduguri Metropolitan Council (MMC) LGAs. This limited the data collection to Maiduguri Metropolitan City (MMC) and Jere LGAs. The data collection period coincided with the Muslim Holy month of Ramadan where Muslims were fasting and mostly inaccessible in the afternoons. To mitigate the effects of the challenges mentioned above, the evaluation deliberately engaged with beneficiaries across all activities implemented in MMC with project teams providing information about Kaga LGA. This was in addition to ensuring that all data collection activities happened in the first half of the day with no activities planned for in the afternoons.

5 Findings

5.1 Evaluation Question 1:

How can we ensure that we do the right things?

The aforementioned question was broken down into four different parts as listed below:

5.1.1 Evaluation question 1.1

To what extent has the project taken into account people's different needs according to age, gender, and ethnicity? How has the project adapted to meet those differing needs?

5.1.1.1 Finding

This question was responded through data gathered using key informant interviews with the project staff and desk review.

The project under evaluation intended to reach both internally displaced persons (IDPs) and host communities in Maiduguri Metropolitan City (MMC) and Jere Local Government Authorities (LGAs) of Borno state. This was redesigned during the project implementation period to focus on MMC and Kaga LGA of Borno state. The project design intended to deliver an integrated program with beneficiaries supported by both protection and livelihoods sector interventions. Both NRC and DRC undertook beneficiary needs assessments as well as market assessments. The needs and markets assessment played a role in targeting and selection of beneficiaries as well as in the design of interventions which proved relevant in terms of linking to the priorities of beneficiaries as reported in sub section 5.1.2 below.

From the final evaluation findings, the project reached a total of 8,528 direct beneficiaries, of which 5,233 benefitted from livelihoods interventions with an additional 3,295 direct beneficiaries reached through protection specific interventions, none of the beneficiaries benefitted from both protection and livelihoods. As explained in section 5.1.4 below, this was possible as a result of the project adopting cheaper alternatives such as trainings and financial service providers as well as dropping some activities such as Psycho Social Services (PSS) and Village Savings and Loans Association in order to reach more beneficiaries through the other activities, in addition, DRC included protection awareness creation as an activity which contributed to a larger number of beneficiaries reached (5 more times than the originally planned PSS activity) given the intervention being a low cost activity. The project reached the two groups of beneficiaries differently, with all located in different geographical locations.

Information obtained through key informant interviews show that, Danish Refugee Council (DRC) opted to implement the backyard home garden activities in Kaga LGA instead of Jere LGA as a result of limited farming land and water availability in Jere LGA as originally planned. Kaga LGA, which is a rural farming area with a considerable number of IDPs, offered the opportunity of farming land provided by the local government to the IDPs, hence the transfer of the activity. During a key informant interview with, a backyard home garden beneficiary in Faria, MMC LGA, the respondent observed:

"I would like to expand the land under cultivation, but currently I am limited by the high cost of renting land. For this piece of land (the evaluation team estimated the land to be approximately 0.5 acres), I pay 20,000 Naira every 3 months to be allowed to use it" (respondent 1).

The project had a clearly defined beneficiary targeting and selection criteria that as informed by the needs and market assessments conducted both by NRC and DRC. This was used in the selection of target beneficiaries. The evaluation observed that the individual protection assistance beneficiaries, who are considered as extremely vulnerable individuals, had their information protected. This level of confidentiality was instituted as a beneficiary protective measure also well as an accountability

requirement to the implementing partners. In addition, this was clarified as being an obligation for DRC to protect sensitive beneficiaries' data..

The evaluation finds the project as having taken into consideration the different needs of the target population, but at the same time, the needs were not fully met, especially the livelihood needs of the protection beneficiaries. This is informed by the key informant interviews of the protection staff, where there were reported cases when protection beneficiaries needed livelihood support in terms of income generating opportunities, but this could not be achieved given the different geographical targeting adopted by the livelihoods and protection components of the project. This limited possibilities of having the two groups of beneficiaries receiving both protection and livelihoods support at the same time.

Conclusions

- ✓ *The evaluation observed a distinct difference between protection and livelihoods beneficiaries this was a shift from the project design which had anticipated deliberate layering of both intervention at the same beneficiary. The intervention had positive impact across the two set of beneficiaries as discussed under the indicators achievement section*
- ✓ *The strategic engagement with Kaga LGA to provide farming land to the targeted IDPs reduced the need and burden of IDPs to pay for the land as was the case in most areas of the MMC LGA.*

Recommendations

- ✓ *It is recommended that the project in future needs to adopt an integrated delivery approach through layering livelihoods and protection components through targeting the same groups of beneficiaries in order to better meet the specific objectives of the project as defined in the project design.*
- ✓ *It is recommended that the project needs to work closely with both the local government and other key stakeholders for greater benefits to be achieved for the beneficiaries.*

5.1.2 Evaluation question 1.2

To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?

5.1.2.1 Finding

This question was responded to from information gathered from the beneficiaries through the household survey and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) as well as from the project team through the Key Informant Interviews (KIIs).

The need for food, especially amongst the IDP population remains a key priority. Respondents in FGDs identified **food as their first priority ahead of livelihoods and protection related priorities**. This priority in the project is captured as part of the specific objective 1 as outlined in the project specific objectives in section 3.2.2 above.

During FGDs with livelihoods component beneficiaries, respondents observed that through the food assistance played a safety role hence the success of the income generating opportunities and the backyard home vegetable gardens. From the household survey, 66% of the beneficiaries received food assistance in the months of the project implementation from other sources, with the majority (78%) receiving from either Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) or the World Food Program (WFP). This highlights the importance for social protection through food assistance in increasing the potential success of achieving the livelihoods related specific objective 3.2.1.

The need to integrate protection support with livelihoods support such as income generating activities and food distribution emerged as a key second priority amongst the protection beneficiaries. This priority fits very well with the general project objective as outlined in section 3.2.1 above, although this was not achieved during the implementation.

Protection as a priority by itself did not emerge from any of the livelihoods beneficiaries. This could be attributed to the finding that none of the livelihoods beneficiaries received any protection related information as described in other sections of this report.

The project team on the other hand, highlighted the important role the protection component played in the project, as it enabled to bring out cases of hidden vulnerabilities especially amongst the IDPs that would otherwise have gone unnoticed. This was achieved through the regular protection information monitoring and creating protection awareness amongst the community leaders.

With the project features mapped above, the evaluation finds the project objectives as being valid.

Conclusions

- ✓ *The two project specific objectives were found valid. They matched with the key priorities of the beneficiaries.*

Recommendations

- ✓ *It is recommended that the project in future needs to adopt an integrated delivery approach through layering livelihoods and protection components through targeting the same groups of beneficiaries in order to better meet the specific objectives of the project as defined in the project design*

5.1.3 Evaluation question 1.3

Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall objective and the attainment of the same?

5.1.3.1 Finding

This question has been responded using information gathered through literature review and KIIs with the project team.

The overall objective of the project states “Men, women, boys and girls affected by conflict and displacement in Borno state benefit from an improved protective environment and have access to enhanced, safe and reliable livelihoods”.

The overall objective was broken down in specific objectives as outlined in section 3.2.2 of the report and listed below, with these further broken down into specific activities as reported under section 5.1.4.

The general objective of the project

- ✓ To ensure that men, women, boys, and girls affected by conflict and displacement in Borno State benefit from an improved protective environment and have access to enhanced, safe and reliable livelihoods

The specific project objectives

- ✓ Improved community resilience and enabled socio-economic recovery through the provision of support to IDPs and host communities to better meet their basic needs and cope with future shocks.
- ✓ Enhance protection of conflict-affected communities and capacity of duty bearers to address better protection issues affecting IDPs and host communities

The activities as listed in section 5.1.4 and provided in the table below are consistent with the specific objectives listed in section 3.2.2 which in turn are consistent with the general objective. If implemented as described in the project design, then the activities and outputs of the project are very consistent with the general objective given the roles they play. The livelihood components activities of multi-purpose unconditional cash grants, income generating opportunities and backyard home gardening beneficiaries reported seeing benefits in terms of increased food availability at the household as well as increase in income and social benefit brought about by the interactions. The backyard gardens and income

generating opportunities beneficiaries, through the focused group discussions and observations, were still active five to six months after conclusion of the project, this point to the sustainability of these interventions. The protection beneficiaries reported an increased awareness of protection related issues at the household and community level as reported under section 5.3.1.

Table 1 Project Activity Planned Versus Reached

Activity	NRC - Planned	NRC Actual	DRC – Planned	DRC Actual	Total reached
Multi-purpose unconditional cash grants	0	0	200	389	389
Income Generating Opportunities	1,500	1,910	200	444	2,354
Backyard Home Gardens	1,300	2,290	100	200	2,490
Village Loans and Savings Association (VSLA)	0	0	50	0	0
Individual Protection Assistance	0	0	225	703	703
Dignity Kits Distribution	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000
None Food Items (NFI) distribution	0	0	1,000	0	0
PSS sessions and PSS community support	0	0	300	0	0
Protection Awareness creation	0	0	0	1,592	1,592
Totals	2,800	4,200	3,075	4,328	8,528

The final evaluation found that the activities and outputs were consistent with the overall objective, but these were not fully attained as described in section 5.3.1.1 of this report. This can be attributed to the challenges in implementation which lacked layering of the protection and livelihoods components of the project in a manner that would result in the attainment of the project outcome indicators.

Conclusions

- ✓ *The project design as per the project documents were clearly spelt out with clear linkages of activities, outputs, outcomes and the general objective of the project.*

Recommendations

- ✓ *Based on the findings of this research question, the evaluation team recommends that in future, there is a need for a detailed project inception/grant kickoff that links the project results framework as described in the logframe with the project implementation plan as described in the technical design description of the proposal. This information also needs to be shared in detail with the project implementation team*

5.1.4 Evaluation question 1.4

Did the intervention reach the people it was designed to reach in the right proportion and at the right time and were the modalities appropriate?

5.1.4.1 Finding

This question was responded through data obtained through review of project reports and proposal; key informant interviews with project staff; focus group discussions with the project beneficiary groups as well as the household survey.

The project reached more than the original intended direct beneficiaries, surpassing the original target of 5,875 direct beneficiaries by 45% to reach a total of 8,528 direct beneficiaries. This was possible as a result of the project adopting cheaper alternatives such as trainings and financial service providers as well as dropping some activities such as Psycho Social Services (PSS) and Village Savings and Loans Association in order to reach more beneficiaries through the other activities, in addition, DRC included protection awareness creation as an activity which contributed to a larger number of beneficiaries

reached (5 more times than the originally planned PSS activity) given the intervention being a low cost activity. The beneficiary breakdown by activity and by partner is provided in the table 1 below.

Table 2 Project Beneficiary Breakdown by Activity

Activity	NRC - Planned	NRC Actual	DRC – Planned	DRC Actual	Total planned	Total reached	% of reached against planned
Multi-purpose unconditional cash grants	0	0	200	389	200	389	195%
Income Generating Opportunities	1,500	1,910	200	444	1,700	2,354	138%
Backyard Home Gardens	1,300	2,290	100	200	1,400	2,490	178%
Village Loans and Savings Association (VSLA)	0	0	50	0	50	0	0%
Individual Protection Assistance	0	0	225	703	225	703	312%
Dignity Kits Distribution	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	100%
None Food Items (NFI) distribution	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	0%
PSS sessions and PSS community support	0	0	300	0	300	0	0%
Protection Awareness creation	0	0	0	1,592	0	1,592	
Totals	2,800	4,200	3,075	4,328	5875	8,528	

The project reached more beneficiaries in some activities such as multi-purpose unconditional cash grants (195% of originally planned), income generating opportunities (138%), backyard home gardens (178%) and, individual protection assistance (312%). These proved cheaper than originally planned. The activities were cheaper due to benefits accrued from cheaper financial service provider costs as a result of adopting value for money in the selection of such providers by DRC. The cheaper cost of using community based organizations by both DRC and NRC and basing the start-up grant value on the specific business idea selected by different beneficiaries for the income generating opportunities. The cheaper cost of seeds provided for the backyard gardens beneficiaries as well as the manageable cost of using Borno department of agriculture for technical extension service provision led to both partners reaching more beneficiaries than planned. Given the personalized nature of the individual needs assistance, DRC were able to reach three times more beneficiaries using the same resources as originally planned. The dignity kits provision activity reached the same number of beneficiaries as originally planned. Some of the activities such as village loans and savings association (VSLA), none food items distribution and psychosocial support services were not implemented by DRC based on findings from the needs assessment that informed the need to undertake a new activity of protection awareness creation.

The **livelihoods** component of the project to a large extent retained the intended timelines with initial start delays. The **protection** components of the project largely delayed in implementation. The delay in implementation of the protection component of the project is as a result of changes in protection staffing at the Danish Refugee Council.

The modalities of the project were **appropriate** as per the project design when looked at as individual activities, but given that this was designed as an integrated project, the modality in implementation was not fully achieved given that both protection and livelihoods targeted different groups of beneficiaries in different locations. A community leader that had participated in the protection awareness training observed:

"...lack of food and sources of income assistance worsened the protection situation. As much as we got protection awareness, sometimes lack of food or appropriate sources of income prompted my community members, who are all IDPs, to venture into insecure areas to look for income. This exposed them to insecurity" (respondent 2).

This was also articulated by the protection project team, who indicated that at times, the extremely vulnerable individuals (EVIs) needed livelihoods support, but could not acquire this, given that the livelihoods and protection components of the project targeted different geographical locations from the beginning. This denied the protection beneficiaries opportunities to be referred for livelihoods support.

The multi-purpose unconditional cash grants was designed to be delivered over a period of six months with monthly cash grants. This was not accomplished as per the project design, with the target beneficiaries receiving a one off payment of 50,000 Naira. The change in the modality was attributed to delayed process in the acquisition of cash transfer service providers as well as the contracting process. The delay occasioned the need to make the payments in one month instead of the envisioned 6 months.

From the household survey findings, none of the livelihoods beneficiaries received any protection related information, this is despite the project design articulating the need to layer both livelihoods and protection activities.

The household survey also followed up with the sampled beneficiaries on whether they felt the activities were appropriate to their needs. The beneficiary responses are presented in table 2 below.

Table 3 Beneficiary Assessment of Project Activities Appropriateness

Activity	Percentage of respondents who felt it was appropriate to their needs	Percentage of respondents who felt it was NOT appropriate to their needs
Income Generating Opportunities	97%	3%
Dignity Kits Distribution	96%	4%
Protection Awareness creation	96%	4%
Multi-purpose unconditional cash grants	81%	19%
Backyard Home Gardens	74%	26%
Individual Protection Assistance	<i>Not sampled due to beneficiary information confidentiality restriction which denied the evaluation team the opportunity to identify and interact with them</i>	<i>Not sampled due to beneficiary information confidentiality restriction which denied the evaluation team the opportunity to identify and interact with them</i>

The 26% of respondents who felt that backyard home gardens were not appropriate to their needs cited the time it takes for the farm produce to be harvested (approximately 100 days) as too long waiting for such produce. This is an indicator of beneficiaries need for immediate food assistance. Project team members from NRC, explained that all the vegetable home garden beneficiaries received 4 months food distribution from other NRC implemented projects as well as from the World Food Program (WFP).

For the multi-purpose unconditional cash grants, beneficiaries who found that not appropriate to their needs (19%) cited the transfer value as being inadequate for them to meet their needs.

The final evaluation found that the project surpassed its original number of targeted beneficiaries and also from the response of appropriateness, reached its intended beneficiaries.

Conclusions

- ✓ *The project had reached more direct beneficiaries than originally intended. From the cost effective features mapped through this evaluation, we observe that that the action had value for money. In section 5.1.1 and 5.1.4 of the report, we present the causal factors including the project’s adoption cheaper inputs including trainings and financial service providers in addition to leaving out interventions including Psycho Social Services (PSS) and Village Savings and Loans Association to scale up other activities. In addition, DRC had included low cost protection awareness creation as an activity contributing to a larger number of beneficiaries reached (5 times the originally planned PSS activity).*
- ✓ *The project activities were largely appropriate to the needs of the target beneficiaries. This illustrates that the project activities were significantly informed by the needs of the target beneficiaries. This was made possible due to the needs and market assessments undertaken both by DRC and NRC prior to the project implementation*

Recommendations

- ✓ *It is recommended that the project teams in future continue to rely on needs assessments to inform project design so as to make sure the project responds to actual felt needs as illustrated in this project.*

5.1.5 Evaluation question 1.5

Are there any differences within sub-groups (e.g. M/F, Internally displaced persons (IDPs), or host community (HC)?

5.1.5.1 Finding

The household survey and the focus group discussions were geared towards responding to this question.

The project had a bias towards targeting more internally displaced persons (83%) than the host community members (17%). Based on findings from the evaluation, the host target beneficiaries have benefitted more from the livelihoods activities compared to the IDPs. This points to the different levels of need and capacities that exist between these two groups.

About a third (31%) of the host community reported having debts, compared to slightly over a half (53%) of the IDPs. The debt acted as a burden to the IDPs who use more money to repay their debts compared to the host community beneficiaries who are able to reinvest financial proceeds from the various support received. The host community members who have a lower debt level also have an almost similar level of access to new credit (58%) as the IDPs (61%).

All of the host community target beneficiaries supported through the backyard home vegetable gardens reported an increase in the number of months of food availability at the household compared to 91% of the IDPs. The IDPs who have stayed in these locations for more than 4 years also had a higher positive response rate than the IDPs who have stayed in the same locations for less than 2 years.

Both IDPs and host community income generating opportunities beneficiaries had identical responses regarding achieving benefits from the support. The difference lies in that more IDPs (61%) reported financial benefits while the host communities had more social benefits (52%). This points to the different viewpoints held by the two groups regarding benefits accrued from the same activity.

Based on beneficiary discussions, the two groups, host community and IDPs often tend to have separate communities within the same geographical locations. This gives the two groups different level of access to social capital.

Conclusions

- ✓ *The project targeted more IDPs (83%) than host community members (17%) as originally designed. Based on KIIs with project teams, this played a significant role in increasing harmonious co-existence between the host community who have poor and vulnerable individuals and the IDPs who are largely targeted by none-governmental organizations.*

Recommendations

- ✓ *Based on the evaluation findings, it is important for the project in future to look at the distinct differences between the distinct beneficiary groups to tailor their support in a manner that will enhance maximum benefits*

5.2 Evaluation Question 2

What were the benefits and drawbacks of working as a consortium?

5.2.1 Evaluation question 2.1

Is there any evidence that working as a consortium contributed to greater impact than working as individual agencies?

5.2.1.1 Finding

This question was responded through the key informant interviews with the project team.

The project adopted a consortium approach, where NRC, being the lead agency was responsible for overall management, implementation of livelihoods activities as well as macro-level (state wide) protection information. On the other hand, DRC, was responsible for implementation of protection activities, micro-level (beneficiary linked) protection information as well as some of the livelihoods activities.

During the evaluation, it was noted that some aspects of the consortium had worked well with other not having worked well. The consortium worked in terms of activity implementation, whose status is outlined in other sections of this report.

Consortium working well

The consortium had a clearly defined role for each of the two partners, with NRC leading in livelihoods and macro-level protection implementation, while DRC led in implementation of protection activities at community levels as well as livelihood activities. There were deliberate attempts at various stages of the project implementation to create interactions between the two partners, but from the KIIs, this was largely as a result of individual staff efforts at different times.

Taking the livelihoods sector income generating opportunity activity, which were implemented by both partners, there were uniformity in terms of the approach taken. This was a result of regular meeting between the 2 partners' livelihoods managers. The outcome from these meetings were however not well cascaded downwards to the implementing teams of the 2 partners.

NRC produced 3 macro-level protection reports that informed the protection sector in Borno state and involved a wider range of stakeholders, while DRC produced monthly protection monitoring reports that highlighted the protection needs of the target beneficiaries. This was implemented as originally envisioned in the project design. The main limitation was that the protection needs of the livelihoods beneficiaries in both NRC and DRC areas of implementation were not captured in the monthly protection monitoring reports.

There were significant efforts made towards the end of the project to streamline protection information sharing between the two partners. This is largely attributed to increased interactions between the two partners' protection teams and deliberate efforts to share the protection monitoring reports as well as macro-level protection coordination.

Consortium not working well

The 2 consortium partners developed separate baselines for the project. Given that this was one project being implemented by 2 partners, the baseline could have been uniformly approached using similar methodologies but still giving emphasis on the different information needs of each partner.

The 2 partners had separate agreements with the Borno State Agricultural Development Program (BOSADP) to provide technical agricultural extension services. The two partners both implemented the backyard home vegetable garden intervention, albeit in two different LGAs, but given this was based on a common project, it would have been beneficial to have a common agreement with BOSADP regarding the provision of technical extension services.

KIIs with protection teams, revealed of referral of protection beneficiaries to other projects and or other agencies to access livelihoods support. This is despite the project under evaluation having both protection and livelihoods components. This is attributed to the implementation phase where protection and livelihoods components targeted separate geographical locations and separate groups of beneficiaries. This was not rectified by the consortium during the project implementation period.

The evaluation observed that working as a consortium had both benefits and drawbacks to the project as described above. The project needs to improve on the consortium coordination as well as partner roles follow up in future.

Conclusions

- ✓ The evaluation recorded mixed results on the performance of the consortium. The roles of the partners were clearly defined in the project proposal. The consortium was found to have worked more closely towards the end of the project. This was attributed to the delayed start in some of the activities and staff turnover experienced by the two consortium partners..
- ✓ *The evaluation observed management level engagement between the two partners. However, this was not cascaded downwards to the implementation team leading to teams working in silos hence missing on opportunities to learn from each other.*

Recommendations

- ✓ *It is recommended that the consortium in future invests in consortium coordination unit that would engage closely with both consortium partners and ensure the project is implemented efficiently and coherently. The coordination unit will also be responsible for monitoring and learning.*
- ✓ *It is recommended that the project management need to cascade the project design and implementation details to the implementation team in order to have the project implemented as outlined in the project proposal.*

5.2.2 Evaluation question 2.2

How effective was the level of cooperation amongst partners?

5.2.2.1 Finding

This question was responded to through the key informant interviews with the project team as well as desk review.

The consortium's level of partnership based on KII with the project team can be seen at two different times of the project. The first half of the project did not see an effective partnership right from the delay in contract signing between the two partners, while the second half of the project partnership saw a smoothly functioning consortium once each partner had identified their actual budget items and also established closer working relationships between the various managers involved in the project.

The evaluation found that the cooperation amongst partners evolved during the project implementation period for the better. This was a result of more engagement by staff from the two organizations in relation to the project as well as more stability in terms of low levels of turnover by staff, especially at DRC. This points out to the need for clear partnership coordination for successful partnerships right from the start of the project.

5.3 Evaluation Question 3

To what extent were outcomes achieved (including the improvement in household income and improved access to services and response to their primary protection concerns) achieved?

5.3.1 Evaluation question 3.1

To what extent were the objectives achieved?

5.3.1.1 Finding

This question was responded primarily through the household survey with some of the information obtained through the focus group discussions with beneficiaries as well as literature review. The evaluation team identified that the project logframe lacked target values for the outcome indicators, this makes it impossible to determine whether the project achieved its outcome objectives. Following the

initial findings dissemination, it was agreed that the evaluation will use target values of 60% to measure the outcome indicators.

Table 3 below shows the objectives, outcome indicators as well as output indicators and the status from the evaluation findings. It is important to note that, as stated in the first question (5.1) the project implementation saw different beneficiary groups and geographical regions targeted separately for the livelihoods and protection activities.

Table 4 Project Outcome Indicator Status

<i>Item</i>	<i>IDPs</i>	<i>Host</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Final Evaluation status</i>
OUTCOME (Specific Objective 1) <i>Improved community resilience and enabled socio-economic recovery through the provision of support to IDPs and host communities to better meet their basic needs and cope with future shocks</i>					
Outcome Indicators:					
1. <i>% of HHs reporting increased income sources</i>	44% of income generating opportunities beneficiaries who are IDPs	55% of income generating opportunities beneficiaries who are Host Community	51% of income generating opportunities beneficiaries who are male	58% of income generating opportunities beneficiaries who are female	54% of income generating opportunities beneficiaries
2. <i>% of beneficiaries reporting utilising distributed assets for food production</i>	100% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are IDPs	100% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are host community	100% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are male	100% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are female	100% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries
3. <i>% of households reporting increased extended months of food production</i>	92% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are IDPs	92% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are host community	98% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are male	86% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries who are female	92% of vegetable home garden beneficiaries
OUTCOME (Specific Objective 2) <i>Increased community self-protection skills and capacities of duty-bearers to better address protection issues facing IDPs</i>					

<i>and host community members affected by the conflict.</i>						
Outcome Indicators:						
1. % of beneficiaries receiving protection monitoring activities reporting increased awareness on how to address protection issues arising in their communities	Not applicable	75% of protection beneficiaries	N/A	N/A	75% of protection activities beneficiaries	
2. % of beneficiaries, referred to SEMA and the Ministry of Women Affairs, receiving timely and adequate feedback from these authorities	Not applicable	6 successful referrals out of 6 referrals	N/A	N/A	100% (Six cases successfully referred to SEMA and the Department of women affairs)	

The evaluation found that the outcome results were achieved as shown in the table above, all except for the first outcome indicator of percent *of HHs reporting increased income sources* which stood at 54% as shown in the table above. Despite the lower number of beneficiaries reporting increase sources of income, 70% of the beneficiaries reported having consumed at least two or more meals in the 24 hours prior to the household survey interview, this could have been higher given that the interview was during the holy month of Ramadhan with most beneficiaries fasting and having two meals a day.

The evaluation also found almost all beneficiaries supported by income generating opportunities and backyard vegetable gardens still undertaking their activities beyond the project period. This was reported through the FGDs as being a result of the interventions meeting the needs of the beneficiaries hence they find it appropriate to continue.

Amongst the beneficiaries in Modusulumri, especially by the IDPs, most beneficiaries reported the increased dignity that was brought about by having a reliable source of food and/or income as a result of the livelihoods support by NRC. The IDPs reported that they felt they developed a voice within the community as they no longer rely on borrowing to meet the household needs for food and other needs.

Amongst the protection beneficiaries in Farm central, the protection awareness as well as the individually tailored individual protection assistance interventions by DRC has seen the IDPs receive support in an area they felt was ignored by most agencies working in the area. In addition, DRC successfully made six referrals to government agencies as highlighted below.

- ✓ Three (3) Successful Referrals to the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) in Custom House and Farm Center

- ✓ Two (2) Successful Referrals to Women Development Centers under the Ministry of Women Affairs in Farm Center
- ✓ One (1) Successful Referral to the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) in Farm Center.

As part of the project, NRC successfully developed three macro-level protection reports and one briefing note that highlighted the plight of protection sector in Borno state and were used to influence the direction the protection sector took in Norther Nigeria. The reports titles are provided below:

- ✓ Report on scoping exercise to better understand protection concerns in Borno state, Nigeria
- ✓ Report on the conditions of living and key happenings at the transit sites in Dikwa and Shuwari transit sites
- ✓ Inception report to better understand protection concerns in Borno state, Nigeria
- ✓ NRC Briefing note: Are they ready to return, relocate and settle

<p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>The project outcome indicators were found to have achieved the set target of 60% except for outcome indicator 1 that scored 54%. The evaluation observes that outcome indicator 1 could have scored higher had the project reached the same beneficiaries with both protection and livelihoods activities.</i> <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>It is recommended that the project in future needs to adopt an integrated delivery approach through layering livelihoods and protection components through targeting the same groups of beneficiaries in order to better meet the specific objectives of the project as defined in the project design. This will also contribute to better achievement of outcome indicators.</i>
--

5.3.2 Evaluation question 3.2

What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

5.3.2.1 Finding

When looked at as distinct sectors in the same project, with the two specific objectives taken to represent separately the two sectors, then it can be said that the project achieved its indicators, with the evaluation adopting a target of 60% and above as a measure of success for the two specific objectives outcome indicators.

During the evaluation, it emerged that the project logframe lacked target values of all the outcome indicators. This makes it impossible to measure whether the project achieved its target or not for the two specific objectives.

The evaluation found that lack of an integrated program delivery in terms of layering activities of the project with the same group of beneficiaries played a key role in the underachievement of the project outcome indicators of the specific objectives. The delayed implementation timelines of the project also a role in the achievement of the same as the evaluation was undertaken close to the closure of implementation.

<p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <i>The project logframe lacked target values for the outcome indicators making it difficult to measure achievement of the project objectives.</i> <p>Recommendations</p>

- ✓ *The evaluation recommends for future efforts to be made in ensuring the project is implemented in such a manner that will enhance the achievement of the target outcome indicators as described in the project design.*
- ✓ *The evaluation recommends that future logframes need clearly defined outcome indicators target values that will help in determining whether the project achieved its objectives or not*

5.3.3 Evaluation question 3.3

Were objectives achieved on time?

5.3.3.1 Finding

This question was responded to through information gathered through the KIIs with the project team as well as literature review.

The 2 partners of the project had different timelines in terms of implementation, while the 2 components of the project were implemented at different times as well.

The livelihoods component of the project to a large extent was achieved on time given the outcome indicators of this specific component. The protection component of the project on the other hand achieved its objectives when looked at independently, but the implementation period had significant delays resulting from staff turnover within DRC's protection team.

The evaluation found that, there were delays in implementation of the project, but still the two components made significant achievements in their objectives when looked at in isolation. The difference between the protection and livelihood component timelines also played a role in denying the project an opportunity at integrated program delivery.

5.3.4 Evaluation question 3.4

What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?

5.3.4.1 Finding

This question was responded to through the household survey, focus group discussions, key informant interviews with project beneficiaries and observations made during the data collection.

The question will be responded to by sector:

1. Livelihoods sector

All the income opportunity generation beneficiaries sampled during the evaluation reported that they benefitted from the activity. Most of these (60%) beneficiaries reported financial benefits, 22% reported social while 18% reported other benefits including increased dignity and reduced reliance on borrowing money for household needs.

From focus group discussions and key informant interviews of selected project beneficiaries, the activity has increased the sources of income, for example for Sadia Abubakar¹ who currently has 3 different sources of income which include "sale of bedsheets, sale of homemade spaghetti and sale of homemade bean cake". The increase in number of sources of income was reported by 43% of the income generating opportunities beneficiaries while 59% of the same beneficiaries reported increased household income.

The vegetable backyard home garden beneficiaries reported an increased household food production (74%) while almost all (92%) reported an increase in household food availability by at least 2 months.

¹ Not her real name

During the data collection in Faria, almost all the households supported by the project to undertake vegetable backyard home gardens were preparing their farm lands in readiness of the rainy season expected to start in June 2018. All these beneficiaries have bought seeds for their farms.

About three quarters (73%) of the livelihoods activities beneficiaries reported having consumed at least 2 meals in the 24 hours prior to the interview. During the FGDs, the IDPs supported through the livelihoods activities pointed out that before the interventions, most of them could barely afford 1 meal a day.

The backyard home vegetable garden beneficiaries reported an increase in individual farmer income by between 100,000 Naira and 240,000 Naira. This increase accounted for between 20% to 49% of the total annual household income for the farmers.

2. Protection sector

During FGD with protection beneficiaries who had attended the community leaders protection workshop, numerous cases as described below, were provided on how the communities benefitted from the protection interventions.

-
- Reduction in cases of children molestation as a result of the protection awareness creation
 - Reduction in cases of teenage pregnancies due to protection awareness creation
 - Reduction in cases of drug abuse due to protection awareness creation
 - Reduction in cases of underage marriage due to protection awareness and individual protection assistance
 - Reduction in cases of ethnic based conflict in IDP camps due to protection awareness
 - Reduction in commotion during food distribution due to protection awareness and engagement of community leaders
 - Significant reduction in harassment of IDPs by members of the Civilian Joint Task Force (CJTF), with a case in Farm center where the community leaders with support from DRC managed to have CJTF who harassed the IDPs relocated
 - Reduction in cases of child labor due to protection awareness and multi-purpose unconditional cash grants
 - There were cases of individual protection assistance reported by the community leaders during FGDs where an IDP who experienced mental instability was provided with relevant psychosocial support to full recovery, cases of physically disabled IDPs transported to Kano state where they received specialized medical assistance and were fitted with appropriate assistive devices.
-

From the household survey, the protection beneficiaries had 75% reporting increased awareness of how to address protection concerns in their household and communities, while 46% of these reported being able to address all protection related issues.

The evaluation despite being carried post the implementation period, found that there were significant changes that can be directly attributed to the project activities. This points to the matching between the project design and beneficiary needs.

Conclusions

- ✓ *Despite the evaluation being carried out shortly after the implementation period, the project has achieved significant changes in the lives of the target beneficiaries as outlined above. There is a need to build on these benefits accrued in the design of a new phase of this project.*
- ✓ *During the evaluation, there were numerous cases that provided significant change stories that the project could benefit from in terms of documenting successes of the project..*

Recommendations

- ✓ The evaluation recommends on building on the benefits accrued from this project in the design of future projects targeting the same beneficiaries and locations

- ✓ The evaluation recommends that *the project in future invests in communication and documentation of such change stories both in writing and audio-visual recordings*

6 Annexes

- ✓ Terms of Reference
- ✓ Household survey data collection tool
- ✓ Focused group discussion guide
- ✓ Data collection work plan
- ✓ List of FGD and KII participants
- ✓ Evaluation Matrix

www.nrc.no

Norwegian Refugee Council
Postboks 148 Sentrum
0102 Oslo, Norway



NORWEGIAN
REFUGEE COUNCIL