

## DFID PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT - Annex D

**Type of Report:** Output to Purpose Review<sup>1</sup>

### PART A.

<b>Country:</b>	Bangladesh	<b>Project:</b>	CARE Bangladesh – Rural Livelihoods Programme (RLP)
<b>Project Officer:</b>	Christine Marsh	<b>Start Date:</b>	01 Oct 2003
<b>Date of Visit:</b>	12-29 Jan 2004	<b>End Date:</b>	31 Mar 2004
<b>Date of Report:</b>	10 Feb 2004	<b>MIS Code:</b>	
		<b>Risk Category:</b>	

Goal Statement	OVI
Contribute to poverty reduction in Bangladesh.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replicable development models which address the root causes of poverty, and that include measurable livelihood and food security indicators, are developed, piloted, documented and shared by CARE with partners and other organisations.</li> <li>2. Partner organisations and relevant service providers, at all levels, have a greater understanding of how social and civil infrastructure inhibit or impede the rural poor from improving their livelihoods and begin to adopt strategies which address these issues.</li> </ol>

Purpose Statement	OVI
To improve the livelihood security of men and women living in 221,375 poor and vulnerable rural households in Bangladesh.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Decrease in the percentage of partner households that face difficulties in accessing food during lean periods.</li> </ol>

<sup>1</sup> A logframe for RLP was approved in July 2003, bringing together the work of three projects: 1) Greater Opportunities for Integrated Rice–Fish Production Systems (GO-Interfish), 2) Strengthening Household Access to Bari Garden Extension Services (SHABGE), 3) Livelihoods Monitoring Project (LMP). The RLP budget was approved in September 2003, at which time the earlier projects were formally closed by DFID. Consequently, this form provides an assessment of only a few months of work by RLP. A more detailed assessment is provided in a separate report produced by the OPR team.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. Percentage of FFS participants with declining assets is lower by comparison with non-participants</li><li>3. 60 % of women FFS members show higher levels of participation in household decision making related to;<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. marriage plans for daughters &amp; sons</li><li>b. daily cash expenditure</li><li>c. major capital expenditures</li><li>d. food distribution within the household from 24 months following FFS formation</li></ol></li></ol> |
|--|---|

Outputs /OVIs	Progress		Comments
	Planned (period under review)	Actual (including comments if required)	Planned for next period
<p>Output 1. Enhanced utilisation of local resources for increasing homestead and agricultural production, processing, and other value-added activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 75% of target households (at least 10 percent of these are headed by women) increase the portion of their monthly cash HH income on average by 15% by EoP</li> <li>2. 75 % of FFS members (at least 50 percent are women) are applying new option(s) for increasing homestead and/or agriculture production from month 18 of the FFS formation</li> <li><b>3. 50 % of FFS farmers receiving at least one service useful for homestead and agriculture production from month 18 of the FFS formation</b></li> <li>4. 15 % of FFS farmers increase their income from other “value added activities”.</li> </ol>	<p>The RLP workplan was only recently finalised (December 2003). Although a draft was prepared some months earlier, RLP staff have not been following plans based on this logframe.</p> <p>Most RLP activities focus on the Farmer Field Schools (FFS). Currently there are 1,239 FFS on-going through Direct Delivery; and 1,568 on-going through Partner NGOs.</p> <p>Total participants of on-going activities is approx 70,175 (70% women).</p>	<p>M&amp;E systems are not currently collecting data based on the RLP logframe, and very different information is available from the two field projects that make up RLP. Nevertheless, RLP’s major activity, the FFS, is clearly contributing to enhancing homestead and agricultural production of the targeted households.</p> <p>OVI #1-3: selected data suggests more than 80% of participating households adopt some new technologies, more than 50% receive services, and the increase in HH income is 25% and above. No data is being collected on female headed households.</p> <p>OVI #4: No data available for income from ‘other activities’</p>	<p>On-going FFS will be completed, plus new batch of 560 FFS through PNGOs starting in Jan 2004.</p> <p>RLP will carry out a thorough review of the FFS methodology.</p> <p>Piloting of more intensive experiential learning will continue.</p> <p>Cross visits are planned with other institutions, to improve understanding of technologies for homestead production.</p> <p>Training to improve staff skills in livestock and sanitation</p>
<p><b>Output 2</b> Relevant service providers, institutions, and partner organisations are more responsive to the needs of poor and vulnerable women and men.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. FFS participants report increased satisfaction with institutions relevant to their livelihoods by EOP</li> <li>2. Strategies will be developed to address Government, institutional, and service provider policies and approaches, which prevent improvement in the livelihood of the RLP target group, especially women.</li> <li>3. Potential long-term partners are identified and selected for developing future common livelihood initiatives.</li> </ol>	<p>Note what was said under Output #1. Staff have not been following plans based on the RLP logframe.</p> <p>The Technical Coordination Unit and Social Development Unit both have workplans that include training activities for CARE staff and Partner NGOs. Both are involved in a number of pilot activities (e.g., governance pilots, phased FFS, khas ponds) that explore ways of improving the RLP strategies.</p>	<p>Since the last OPR, the programme has given more attention to working with Local Govt and GOB service providers.</p> <p>OVI #1: Satisfaction with services has been rated very highly by GO-Interfish participants, but no before/after comparison available. Data from SHABGE on this issue was not available at the time of review.</p> <p>OVI #2: It is not clear what type of strategies RLP can develop to address the policies of service providers. In practice, RLP staff are linking ex FFS CBO’s to service providers.</p> <p>OVI #3: Long-term partners not yet identified.</p>	<p>Training of FFS members and leaders will be carried out to improve an understanding of available services, entitlements and social context.</p> <p>The RLP experience with governance pilots and helping groups to access khas ponds will be reviewed.</p>
<p><b>Output 3. A simple and replicable system for monitoring change in the livelihoods and entitlements of the rural poor is developed, documented and shared internally and externally.</b></p>	<p>The Livelihoods Monitoring Project (LMP) and the RLP M&amp;E Unit both have their own workplans. See OPR report for comments on the work of these units.</p>	<p>The work of LMP has been the subject of evolving demands from CARE and DFID, and the connection with GO-Interfish and SHABGE has not been clear. Since the arrival of the RLPC more attention is being paid to developing a coherent</p>	<p>LMP will facilitate a review of draft livelihoods indicators at a workshop before April 04. Following which a revised livelihoods survey will be implemented in both NW and SE.</p> <p>Greater collaboration with other</p>

<b>General progress assessment - Project Purpose</b>	2
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>The purpose is likely to be largely achieved. Different tools and indicators are being used by the projects that make up the RLP, but available M&amp;E data shows that that participating households experience a substantial increase in productive assets and food security. See table at section 2.3 of full report.</p> <p>The targeted number of households is 221,375. Current projections show that the project activities will have a total of 167,580 participants. The number of poor and vulnerable households reached will be less than this, because (a) some male and female participants of Go-Interfish activities come from same HH, and (b) some HH are not poor or vulnerable.</p> <p>Women's involvement in decision making is difficult to measure, but some improvement appears to be taking place (see Progress against Purpose OVI, below).</p>	
<b>General progress assessment - Project Outputs</b>	3 (2+3+3+3+3)
<b>Justification</b>	
<p>Most project outputs will only be partially achieved. This is largely as a consequence of the way in which the new logframe was formulated, rather than a result of any serious deficiencies on the part of the programme. (See comment under 'quality of scoring below')</p>	

## PART B.

<b>Purpose /OVIs</b>	<b>Progress</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Decrease in the percentage of partner households that face difficulties in accessing food during lean periods.</li> <li>2. Percentage of FFS participants with declining assets is lower by comparison with non-participants</li> <li>3. 60 % of women FFS members show higher levels of participation in household decision making related to;</li> </ol>	<p>OVI#1: Studies in GO-Interfish indicate that the number of FFS participants who assess themselves as having high levels of household food security is 37% greater than non-FFS participants. Studies in SHABGE show a 77% increase in the number of participants who assess themselves as having high levels of food security between the baseline survey and after 18 months of attending FFS sessions.</p> <p>OVI#2: SHABGE participants have significant increases in productive assets between baseline and re-sampling after 18 months. Eg. 100% increase in fruit trees, 80% increase in timber trees, 60%</p>	<p>GO-Interfish and SHABGE are using different indicators, but both depend on the quantification of subjective assessments made by participants.</p> <p>A large amount of information is available regarding the productive behaviour of FFS members during the course of the FFS. Much less information is available about behaviour <i>after</i> the FFS (which would help in the assessment of sustainability) or from non-participants (which would help in attribution).</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. marriage plans for daughters &amp; sons</li> <li>b. daily cash expenditure</li> <li>c. major capital expenditures</li> <li>d. food distribution within the household from 24 months following FFS formation</li> </ul>	<p>increase in poultry. In GO-Interfish, 56% of participants state they have increased their productive assets in previous 12 months.</p> <p>OVI#3. SHABGE monitoring suggests an 18 % increase in number of women who influence household cash expenditure between baseline and re-sampling at 18 months. In GO-Interfish there is a 38% difference between the number of female participants who claim they have a major influence on household decisions and the number of non-participants who make the same claim.</p>	<p>There is a lot of anecdotal evidence about the impact on women' decision-making, but detailed case studies are lacking.</p>
--	---	--

**Attribution**

Learning of new improved technologies as part of Farmer Field Schools is clearly contributing to a significant increase in productive assets and food security for the participating households. The OPR team has not seen any evidence of a significant spread of these benefits to other members of the community.

The productive skills and - possibly – the social status that women are gaining through FFS membership appear to be causing a modest improvement in the influence they have on some household decision-making.

**Purpose to Goal**

RLP's direct contribution to poverty reduction in Bangladesh is limited by three factors: (a) the projects are not targeting the poorest of the poor because the FFS technologies cannot be applied without access to some land; (b) the group approach, as currently applied, focuses all benefits on a small portion of the targeted communities; (c) the projects have only recently begun to give significant attention to the improvement of other types of capital, and this is being done in a way that may be providing greater benefits to the relatively wealthier members of the group.

The indirect contribution, through the development of replicable models and a wider understanding of what works and what does not, is potentially very high. But not enough has been done to capture and disseminate the experience of the projects that make up RLP.

**DOES LOGFRAME REQUIRE REVISION?**

The logframe developed in mid 2003 does not use indicators that are consistent with the data being collected by RLP M&E units. Nor is the wording fully consistent with planned activities or staff understanding of their job. For example, most staff are unable to explain what the RLP is doing about female-headed households, value-added activities, household food allocations, and government policies towards women, all of which are mentioned in the logframe. Consequently, the logframe is of limited use as a tool for assessing the progress of the programme. (See also OPR report, section 3.1.3 regarding logframe).

At this late stage, with little more than a year left, the OPR team is *not* recommending a revision of the logframe. Instead it would be more appropriate for CARE to give urgent attention to developing the vision and policies that will guide the development of a future programme. (See Key Issues and recommendations below).

**DO PIMS MARKERS REQUIRE REVISION [ Mandatory for projects approved prior to 1.8.98 ]**

No

**Quality of Scoring**

The scoring is of very limited value. The projects that make up RLP are highly successful examples of participatory extension, but the logframe includes indicators that are confusing, of questionable relevance, impossible to measure or over-ambitious. With a different logframe, the RLP could be scored very differently. There is a fundamental question that needs to be answered about what CARE and DFID expect to get from the programme. This issue is explored in more detail in the OPR report.

**Lessons learned, and suggested dissemination**

The main report of this OPR is designed to support the changes that are currently taking place in CARE Bangladesh. It should be widely disseminated among RLP staff.

The programme is generating broader lessons about a range of issues relating to livelihoods, gender and rights based approaches to development. As noted above, not enough has been done to capture and disseminate those lessons. This issue has been addressed in the recommendations made by the OPR team.

**PART C.****Key Issues / Points of information**

During the life of the programme and the preceding projects there has been an accretion of objectives, methods and technologies. At the current point in time there is a lack of coherence in what the programme is trying to accomplish, and this makes it very difficult to measure overall achievements. The RLP has reached a critical juncture and CARE should urgently make some decisions about future directions. These decisions should be reflected in a vision statement, policy paper and subsequent programme proposals and work plans.

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Date for completion</b>
1. CARE Bangladesh should undertake a process to explicitly define a <i>rural livelihoods vision</i> that which will act as a framework and guideline for RLP. A Vision Statement should be approved within 60 days.	CARE Bangladesh	31 March 2004
2. With a vision statement as a starting point, the RLP should undertake participatory analyses to examine what interventions have had most impact on rural poverty and gender. This process should lead to the publication of a policy paper on Rural Livelihoods within six months	CARE Bangladesh	31 July 2004

3. Once the vision statement and policy paper has been produced, these documents should guide the subsequent planning and implementation of a future programme, including the formulation of proposals to prospective donors.	CARE Bangladesh	Aug 2004 and onward
4. [See main report for other issues and recommendations made by the OPR team].		
5.		

<b>Review team:</b>	Andrew Bartlett (Team Leader), Zahurul Alam, Alice Jay, Kamal Kar, John Meyer, Arif H Sarker
<b>People met:</b>	DFID-B Livelihoods Advisors, CARE-B Senior management, RLP management and field staff, Executive Directors of Partner NGOs, targeted communities in NW and SE Bangladesh

*Scoring system:*

*1 = likely to be completely achieved*

*2 = likely to be largely achieved*

*3 = likely to be partially achieved*

*4 = only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent*

*5 = unlikely to be realised*

*x = too early to judge extent of achievement*