

GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN PLANS FINANCED BY ECHO

EVALUATION FOOD SECTOR  
1998/1999 AND 1999/2000  
ECHO TAJIKISTAN

(ECHO/TJK/215/1999/O1O128B)

FINAL REPORT

**QUEST-Consult  
Annemarie Hoogendoorn**

**January – February 2000**

This report has been established at the request of the European Commission and is financed by the European Commission. The comments in this report reflect the opinion of the consultant only.

## CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
1. Evaluation objectives and methodology used	4
2. ECHO Tajikistan Food Sector Global Plans 1998/1999 and 1999/2000	6
3. Relevance of the ECHO Food Sector Operations 1998 - 2000	7
3.1. Food needs and nutritional status	7
3.2. Objectives of the global plans	8
3.3. Selection of beneficiaries for free food distributions	8
3.4. Ration scale for free food programmes	9
3.5. Strategies used in food security programmes	10
4. Co-ordination and Coherence	12
5. Effectiveness, Cost-effectiveness and Efficiency	13
6. Conclusions and Recommendations	14
6.1. Assessment of needs in the food sector	14
6.2. Free food distribution programmes	14
6.3. Food-for-work and food security programmes	16
7. Lessons learned	17
Annexes:	
A. Terms of Reference	
B. Itinerary and persons met	
C. Map of Tajikistan	
D. Nutrition Surveys in Tajikistan 1994 - 1999	
E. Beneficiary Selection for ECHO-funded Free Food Aid in Tajikistan	
F. ECHO-funded Agricultural Inputs Programmes in Tajikistan	
G. ECHO 1998/1999 Food Sector Budgets in Tajikistan	
H. ECHO 1999/2000 Food Sector Budgets in Tajikistan	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1. Global plans evaluated

Country:	Tajikistan
Partners:	WFP, Mission East, German Agro Action, Aga Khan Foundation, IFRC, MSF-H
Decisions:	ECHO/TJK/215/1998/03000 ECHO/TJK/215/1998/01000 ECHO/TJK/215/1999/02000
Period Covered:	April 1998 – January 2000
Amounts:	1998 – 16,620 MEURO 1999 – 18,830 MEURO

### 2. Description of the evaluation

The evaluation team consisted of a public health expert (Mr. Pierre-Yves Lambert) and a food and nutrition expert (Ms. Annemarie Hoogendoorn). The objective was to review the execution and impact of the ECHO-funded food activities in Tajikistan since April 1998. Recommendations on gradual phasing-out strategies for the Global Plan 2000 and beyond were provided. The mission stayed in Central Asia from 20 January till 15 February 2000, in which period various regions in Tajikistan were visited. In Dushanbe, a variety of people from relevant UN- and USA-funded NGO's were met. The mission organized a Food and a Health Workshop for discussion on current activities and future strategies. Debriefings were held in Dushanbe, Almaty and Brussels.

### 3. Conclusions

- Although the transition from communism to new economic structures appears to be a slow process, in Tajikistan the past years certainly have shown an increase in agricultural and economic activities. Because the combination of commercial food imports and food aid flows have more or less filled the cereal gap in local production, wheat flour has been available on the local markets in sufficient amounts.
- Nutrition surveys have been executed regularly in Tajikistan at regional level, although not in a co-ordinated and systematic way. Malnutrition rates for children under five years appear to have stabilized at rather high levels. Between 30% to 50% of children are chronically undernourished (stunting), while 7% to 15% are acutely malnourished (wasting). However, there is substantial regional variation. Leninabad Oblast in the north is relatively well off. In Khatlon Oblast in the south, nutrition problems mainly appear to be related to inappropriate child feeding and hygiene practices.
- The evaluation mission feels that more restricted criteria for beneficiary selection are needed, with an indicative total of 25,500 households to be covered by ECHO. The poorest households in Tajikistan, like single pensioners and families with no breadwinner and little or no access to lands to cultivate, are considered to be food insecure and should continue to be targeted. They have insufficient access to wheat flour, which is a basic need as traditional flat bread is the main staple food. Targeting procedures should be kept as simple as possible. Community-based beneficiary selection at village or neighbourhood levels functions rather well.
- The mission concludes that the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the 'ECHO' free food distribution programmes should be increased. This involves changes in the number of beneficiaries, the number of rations provided per household, the composition of the ration, the number of distribution cycles per year, and possibly also the change to local or regional purchase of food commodities.
- Up to spring 2000, the shift (away from free food aid) to food security programmes has been slow. ECHO has left most of the initiative in this field to the partner organizations and has not set clear goals. Several partners have functioned with relatively inexperienced staff, leading to less strategic vision and operational capacity. The number of target households for food security projects and the type of activities to be included under this chapter were never clearly set. The ECHO partners so far have little

experience with income generating activities in urban areas. However, this type of projects is executed by some NGO's from the USA.

#### 4. Recommendations

- Although a continuation of targeted free food assistance is justified, in the coming years the total amount of free food aid into Tajikistan should be substantially reduced. It is suggested that WFP gradually takes over from ECHO a 'core caseload' of poorest households in dire needs. The evaluation mission advises to provide free food aid to about 12% of the population in Khatlon, 5% in Dushanbe town, 5% to 10% in the RRS and 2% to 5% of the population of urban areas only in Leninabad province. It is suggested to focus on single pensioners, families without breadwinners in urban areas and families without breadwinners and no access to kitchen garden (at least 0.1 ha) in rural areas. At the same time, some room should be left to include people who are in need but don't fall in the specified categories. Community-base beneficiary selection at village (kishlak) or neighbourhood (makhala) level has proved to function rather well. For improved efficiency, all partners should adopt a system of two distribution cycles per year. Single-person households should receive one ration, and larger households should receive a maximum of two rations (exceptionally three) rations. It is advised to compose a food ration of a bag of 25 kg of wheat flour, a tin of 5 litres of vegetable oil and 1 kg of iodized salt per beneficiary. In this way, the food aid supplies about one-third of the dietary needs of an average adult and strong dependency on external food aid is avoided.
- It is recommended to establish a nutrition monitoring system (e.g. with Action Against Hunger as leading agency) to assess the impact of the reduction in food aid flows.
- Food security programmes including food-for-work should be quickly expanded to promote self-reliance of many households which up to now have received free food aid. ECHO should try to provoke a clear shift to food security projects, for instance with more technical backstopping to the partner organizations and through stronger co-ordination. ECHO should set the number of households to participate and should provide a general framework for food security projects. Both food-for-work programmes and provision of agricultural inputs should be eligible options. To avoid that programmes become unbalanced, the amounts of benefits/inputs per household should be kept to a small size. Autonomy for selection of specific food security activities should stay with the partner organizations themselves.
- ECHO should not become involved in programmes for income generating activities and vocational training in urban areas. This type of projects is rather complicated and the area is covered already by some NGO's from the USA.

#### 5. Lessons Learned

- Free food aid programmes are expensive but appropriate to alleviate the suffering of highly needy households without any perspective on sufficient access to the staple food.
- In Tajikistan, community-based targeting functions rather well, but only when this is done at the lowest level (village or neighbourhood).
- Although the definition of end terms and the provision of a general project framework lies within ECHO's mandate, partner organizations within limits can be free to 'customize' their operations to their own perceptions and capacities.

## 1. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY USED

Since 1993, ECHO has been funding humanitarian aid programmes in Tajikistan. From the beginning onwards, the ECHO-funded programmes have been carried out by a mixture of UN-organizations, several international NGO's and local organizations. An earlier ECHO-commissioned evaluation study was executed in May 1997 with the aim to assess the results and effects of ECHO's humanitarian aid and to study appropriate policies for substitution of humanitarian aid. For several reasons, the ECHO-budget for Tajikistan in the past few years has continued to be substantial (around 16 million EURO) and EU development assistance to Tajikistan has remained fairly small.

The current evaluation focused on the 1998 and 1999 Global Plans of ECHO Tajikistan. This study aimed to review the impact of the ECHO-funded activities during these past two years and to provide recommendations to ECHO on gradual phasing-out strategies for the Global Plan 2000 and beyond. The evaluation team consisted of a public health expert (Mr. Pierre Yves Lambert) and a food and nutrition expert (Ms. Annemarie Hoogendoorn). This report deals specifically with the evaluation of the food sector.

The objectives of the evaluation mission for the food sector were as follows (See Annex A for the detailed Terms of Reference):

- Analysis of the relevance and the level of implementation of the food sector activities in the ECHO Tajikistan Global Plans 1998 and 1999
- Analysis of the extent to which the food sector objectives in these Global Plans were reached.
- Analysis of the impact of the food sector Global Plans on Tajikistan
- Analysis of the role played by ECHO in the decision making process
- Examination of the links between emergency, rehabilitation and development, with an eye on the gradual phasing out of ECHO from Tajikistan
- To give precise and specific recommendations for ECHO's financial inputs in Tajikistan in the coming years

The evaluation started with a two-day briefing at ECHO headquarters in Brussels on 20 and 21 January 2000. A meeting was held with the involved ECHO 2 and ECHO 5 staff, and the available materials on ECHO's operation in Tajikistan in 1998/99 and 1999/2000 and some background documents were studied. En route flying in and out of Tajikistan, meetings were held with staff of the EU Delegation based in Almaty. The evaluation team visited Tajikistan from 23 January to 13 February 2000 (see Annexe B: itinerary and list of persons met). During the stay in Tajikistan, various regions of the country were visited: Khatlon Oblast in the south (Kulyab, Kurgan-Tube and Shartuz regions), the capital Dushanbe with the surrounding districts, and Leninabad Oblast in the north. For security reasons and the limited time frame, no visits were made to the civil-strife Karategin Valley and to Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast in the east. Instead, representatives of the ECHO partners working in those regions were met in Dushanbe. The ECHO Correspondent's office in Dushanbe has facilitated the mission during the stay in Tajikistan.

The country offices in Dushanbe and the project sites of all ECHO partners in the food sector were visited. The food sector evaluator visited a sample of food programme beneficiaries of the free food distribution and food security activities at their homes. A number of food programme activities were visited on site: distribution of free food, soup kitchens, food-for-work, land lease scheme, and a supplementary feeding centre. Representatives of relevant UN- and other non-ECHO funded NGO- agencies in Tajikistan involved in food and nutrition activities<sup>1</sup> were met. As part of the evaluation mission, the food sector evaluator organized a half-day Food Workshop in Dushanbe to promote exchange of information and discussion on current activities and future strategies. The workshop was attended by nearly all ECHO food

---

<sup>1</sup> Action against Hunger-UK, USAID, Mercy Corps International, UNICEF, Ministry of Health

partners and some other relevant organizations<sup>2</sup>. One bimonthly WFP food co-ordination meeting, which discussed beneficiary selection criteria, was attended. For all ECHO partners in the food sector and other interested agencies, the evaluation team held a debriefing session in Dushanbe on 11 February 2000. A debriefing meeting was held in Brussels at 6 March 2000 with the involved staff members of ECHO 2 and ECHO 5. Please refer to annex B for a detailed overview of the mission's itinerary and the persons met, and Annex C for a map of Tajikistan.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Food Workshop was attended by representatives of Children's Aid Direct (CAD), Action against Hunger (AAH), German Agro Action (GAA), Mercy Corps International (MCI), Save the Children - US, Refugee Children and Vulnerable Children (RCVC), World Food Programme (WFP), International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan (RCST), and Mission East. Unfortunately, the workshop coincided with a big Aga Khan Foundation (AKF) Workshop on Agricultural Strategies in GBAO.

## 2. ECHO TAJIKISTAN FOOD SECTOR GLOBAL PLANS 1998/1999 and 1999/2000

The Global Plan 1998 of ECHO Tajikistan stresses that the implementation of the peace agreement for Tajikistan, which was signed in Moscow in 1997, was still expected to be a lengthy and complicated process. A series of evaluations and studies conducted in 1997/1998 (ECHO<sup>34</sup>, WFP, and WB<sup>5</sup>) confirmed the existence of a very difficult humanitarian situation in Tajikistan. On top of the severe poverty situation in the country (about 85% of the population below the poverty line), Tajikistan also has had to deal with natural disasters (e.g. the floods and landslides in 1998) and with medical emergencies (like the typhoid outbreak in 1997). Moreover, the humanitarian assistance to Tajik returnees who came back from Afghanistan in the past 5 years, including the rehabilitation of destroyed houses, irrigation canals and medical facilities in Khatlon Oblast, had to continue as well. While most other major donors for humanitarian aid were not present in Tajikistan, ECHO provided substantial budgets to its implementing partners for food aid in 1998/1999 for about 310,000 beneficiaries.

ECHO's Global Plan 1999 for Tajikistan firmly underlined the need to start creating a link between emergency programmes, rehabilitation and development. Nevertheless, it was realized that new problems or armed confrontations could still occur, possibly leading to the need to redirect programmes in certain regions of the country. Also it was stated that the poverty and suffering in Tajikistan, among others because of the economic crisis in Russia, certainly had not diminished. For these reasons, it was intended to continue in 1999/2000 with the provision of food aid to 350,000 to 400,000 of the most needy and vulnerables in the country, with a possible increase in food aid if unaddressed dire needs would become apparent during the year. This was framed within the bigger picture of Tajikistan receiving humanitarian food aid in 1999/2000 for around 950,000 beneficiaries<sup>6</sup>.

In the last years, ECHO Tajikistan for the food sector has collaborated with WFP, Mission East (DK), German Agro Action, Aga Khan Foundation, IFRC and MSF-Holland. The ECHO Food Sector contributions in 1998/99 and 1999/2000 were as follows:

Implementing Partner	Geographical Area	1998/99 Budget (ECU)	1999/2000 Budget (ECU)
WFP	Khatlon	1,250,000	1,500,000
Mission East	Kulyab	700,000	700,000
GAA	Leninabad	1,400,000	1,400,000
GAA	Karategin	1,600,000	1,600,000
AKF	GBAO	500,000	500,000
IFRC	Dushanbe, RRS	3,000,000	3,100,000
MSF-H	Leninabad	135,000	-
Total		8,585,000	8,800,000

<sup>3</sup> ECHO Evaluation Mission Reports, May 1997 (on the socio-economic and political situation, food assistance and rehabilitation, medical and sanitary assistance).

<sup>4</sup> Freckleton A, Who's Needy? Assessment of household food insecurity in Tajikistan, ECHO, August 1997.

<sup>5</sup> World Bank, Note on Poverty in the Republic of Tajikistan, May 1998.

<sup>6</sup> According to statistics on amounts of food aid and numbers of beneficiaries of the various international agencies as collected and collated by WFP Tajikistan.

### 3. RELEVANCE OF THE ECHO FOOD SECTOR OPERATIONS 1998 - 2000

#### 3.1. Food needs and nutritional status

Without any doubt, Tajikistan still remains the poorest country in the former Soviet Union. Agriculture is the most important sector in the national economy. Cotton and wheat are the main crops on the irrigated fields on the plains of Khatlon Oblast in the south and Leninabad Oblast in the north. The valleys of the RRS and GBAO are suitable for production of a variety of grains, vegetables, fruits and nuts, but little arable land is available, and marketing outlets often are missing.

The national wheat grain consumption needs are estimated to be around 750,000 MT. The demand for wheat is high as bread forms the basis of the national diet. The domestic wheat production logically depends on weather conditions, presence of diseases, the availability and application of high quality seeds and other inputs, and the condition of the irrigation systems. However, in the case of Tajikistan the most important limiting factor is the acreage allocated by the kolkhozes to cotton instead of wheat, as cotton is the main export and cash crop and the cornerstone of the Tajik economy. The average grain deficit over the last five years was about 300,000 MT per year. Food imports from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan (estimated at 200,000 MT to 300,000 MT per year) and food aid have made up the deficit. For poverty-stricken households, which according to a World Bank study in 1998<sup>7</sup> form 85% of the population of Tajikistan, the access to inputs to produce wheat themselves or the financial means to buy wheat flour on the market is extremely limited. This especially applies to the 'destitute' and the 'extremely poor', around 17% of the population, like single elderly who have to survive on very low pensions, families without breadwinner and little or no access to lands for cultivation.

In the last years, humanitarian aid to Tajikistan amounted to approximately 100,000 MT of wheat grain per year, in the form of monetization programmes of the US Government through international NGO's (around 50,000 MT of wheat flour per year) and targeted food distribution programmes. In the last years, WFP distributed about 25,000 - 30,000 MT of food aid per year, for which the EU (DGDEV as well as ECHO), USAID, Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands were the main donors. USDA provided around 15,000 MT of direct food aid per year for free distribution through US NGO's present in Tajikistan. Since 1998, ECHO has provided, through its implementing partners, an average of 20,000 MT of food aid per year.

Various regional nutrition surveys show that malnutrition rates of children under five years during the past five years have stabilized at comparatively high levels (see Annex D). Acute malnutrition (wasting) is seen in 7% to 15% of children under five years, while chronic malnutrition (stunting) affects 30% to 50% of children. This contrasts sharply with the results of the CARE nutrition survey in 1994, which showed that 4% of children were wasted and 30% stunted. Within Tajikistan, the nutritional status varies considerably between regions and seasons. Leninabad Oblast appears to be somewhat better off, although chronic malnutrition certainly forms a big problem in the mountainous areas. GBAO shows rather low acute malnutrition, but has the highest record for stunting. The children in Dushanbe seem to be somewhat better off. This applies to a lesser extent to children in Khatlon, where unhygienic practices and lack of safe water supplies contribute to high wasting rates in summer time. Finally, the civil-strife RRS shows to be a region where rather high acute malnutrition levels are found, especially on the more remote plains. The surveys consistently show that acute malnutrition is most prevalent among children between 6 and 24 months of age, which reveals inappropriate weaning, child feeding and hygiene practices.

---

<sup>7</sup> World Bank, Note on Poverty in the Republic of Tajikistan, May 1998. The documents states that 5% of the population is 'destitute' (the unemployable, pensioners without family support etc.), 12% is 'extremely poor' (surviving by selling assets, begging, stealing), and 66% is 'ordinary poor' (household income insufficient to meet basic food and other needs).



### 3.2. Objectives of the global plans

In 1998, the global objective of ECHO Tajikistan was geared towards the provision of inputs for subsistence of the most vulnerable segments of the population. At the same time, it was intended to move away from free food aid to food security projects. In the Global Plan for 1999/2000 these objectives were repeated, emphasizing the need for further development of exit strategies. The positive impact of the ECHO assistance on the stability in the country and the peace process was stressed. The improvement of the co-ordination between the various ECHO partners and stimulation of complementarity if possible and appropriate was added as a new objective.

The socio-political situation in mid-1998 certainly justified a continuation, if not expansion, of relief activities like distribution of free food. As will be explained further on, it is believed that this food aid, spread over nearly all parts of the country, indeed has made a significant contribution towards the basic needs of the Tajik population and thus has had stabilizing effects. The introduction of a small component for food security projects is seen by the evaluation mission as very positive. It implies awareness of the importance of dependency avoidance and self-reliance promotion. However, as the Global Plan 1999 already indicated, the process to move away from free food aid was rather slow.

### 3.3. Selection of beneficiaries for free food distributions

In line with the Global Plans 1998/1999 and 1999/2000, ECHO has continued with substantial amounts of free food aid for vulnerable people in Tajikistan. The ECHO-funded food distribution programmes have covered a total of 310,000 to 400,000 beneficiaries per year. The programmes were spread over nearly all parts of the country.

The 1998 and 1999 global plans stated that further improvement of targeting mechanisms to reach the most vulnerable was highly needed. In line with the recommendations of the ECHO-commissioned Freckleton study in 1997 on household food security in Tajikistan, ECHO's food partners have sought better targeting through the introduction of community-based beneficiary selection processes. An overview of the various selection mechanisms currently deployed for free food distributions is attached as Annex E. It was acknowledged in the Global Plan 1999 that in practice the community-based method was not without its problems. For instance, the demarcation line between the real vulnerables and 'just a little bit better-off' appeared difficult to draw, the old Soviet norm of equal shares for everyone sometimes still appeared to prevail, and the community-based approach appeared not at all appropriate in regions where various ethnic groups co-exist. The existence of these problems is widely acknowledged among the implementing partners, but so far no final solutions were identified.

Since 1997, all partners have introduced community-based targeting. However, there are considerable differences in the approaches adopted by the various partners. WFP has delegated the responsibility for beneficiary selection to the local government authorities at 'jamoat' (group of villages) level, while Mission East, the IFRC/RCST and GAA all have chosen the lower 'kishlak' (village) or 'makhala' (neighbourhood) level as the entry point. It was often stated to the evaluation mission that selection at the lowest levels works much better: there is a community feeling with functioning solidarity networks. Generally, the ECHO partners execute pre- and post distribution monitoring checks. They visit a selection of households to verify the level of need. This mechanism works to eliminate some 'false positives', households who are included but should not receive aid. A sample of 10% seems reasonable, but not all ECHO partners do this. Another important mechanism is a complaints procedure. Households who feel falsely excluded ('false negatives') can request a visit by the agency monitors to their house.

A region-specific approach has been adopted during the past years. The proportion of the population that receives free food aid varies considerably between regions. For instance, GAA in Leninabad Province provides food to 2% to 7% of the households, while Mission East and the IFRC/RCST provide food to about 15% of the population in East Khatlon and in the RRS. As discussed under paragraph 3.1, the nutrition conditions vary significantly between the regions of Tajikistan, which justifies a differentiated approach within the country.

In 1998/1999 and 1999/2000, ECHO has funded substantial amounts of free food aid. Based on discussions with ECHO's food partners about the level of needs and appropriate responses, the evaluation mission feels that the amount of free food aid should be more limited in the coming years. More restricted criteria for beneficiary selection are necessary. The aim is to include the poorest and most needy households only. This means that there should be few false positives (people who are included but actually should not have received free food aid) and few false negatives (very needy people who are not covered by free food aid programmes). However, as is widely known in the humanitarian aid sector, a 100% perfect selection system is hardly possible. The main message here is that targeting procedures should be kept as simple and transparent as possible. It was generally agreed by the ECHO-partners that there is a continued need to focus on single pensioners, families without breadwinners in urban areas, and families without breadwinners and no access to kitchen gardens (at least 0.1 ha) in rural areas. Also, it was felt that there was a need for some flexibility at the field level, to include households who evidently are in need, but who don't fall in the specified categories.

#### 3.4. Ration scale for free food aid programmes

Scrutiny of the food baskets distributed to beneficiaries in the ECHO-funded programmes reveals sizeable differences in the quantities of food provided and the number of distributions per year. A ration usually consists of wheat flour, rice, vegetable oil and iodized salt<sup>8</sup>. Rice is the most expensive but least liked item. Related to the recommendations of Freckleton' study in 1997, all ECHO-partners except WFP have taken sugar out of the ration. Various experiments were done with the provision of beans and other pulses in the basket, but there appeared to be very little acceptance of these items. Currently, ECHO partners have two to four distributions per year.

Most ECHO-partners purchase the food commodities in Europe. A comparison of the budgets reveals that wheat flour is supplied at more or less the same price by all agencies<sup>9</sup>, while for vegetable oil, there appears to be a considerable price range<sup>10</sup>. GAA in Leninabad mentioned that local or regional purchase of wheat flour and vegetable oil would be feasible. However, IFRC experiences with regional purchase in Kazakhstan in 1998/99 were not very positive. The small quantities of iodized salt are usually bought in Tajikistan without any problems.

The current practice of calculation of the number of food rations based on a mix of numbers of households and of beneficiaries is rather confusing. It hampers comparisons between the programmes of the various ECHO partners. Sometimes, implicit targeting to individual household members has continued. Also, distribution of rations to all members of the family in the case of large households easily leads to unbalanced concentration of the food aid.

---

<sup>8</sup> For instance, the IFRC/RCST provides two rations per beneficiary per year, each consisting of 25 kg wheat flour, 10 kg rice, 5 litre oil and 1 kg of salt. This implies a total cost for international purchase and transport of the food items of EURO 35 per beneficiary per year. Mission East provides an adult ration twice per year of 8 kg of wheat flour, 2 litre of oil, 2 kg of rice and 1 kg of salt. Children up to 12 years receive half of the amounts. This represents a cost of EURO 10 per adult beneficiary per year.

<sup>9</sup> Approximately EURO 280 per MT of wheat flour (purchase in Europe and transport to Tajikistan).

<sup>10</sup> From EURO 783 to EURO 1006 per MT of vegetable oil.

### 3.5. Strategies used in food security programmes

The second issue in the Global Plans of 1998 and 1999 for the food sector was the possibility to the ECHO food partners to use 10% of the budgets for food security projects. In this respect, the Plans state that ECHO wanted both food production projects and income-generating activities. Logically, these would have longer lasting effects than free distribution of food. Also, in the short-term this approach would serve to multiply the impact of the food aid provided. The Global Plan 1999 mentions that the ECHO food partners already started to experiment with some of these projects in rural areas in 1998/99, either in the form of provision of agricultural inputs or through food-for-work projects. As it was seen to be much more complicated to develop these food security activities in urban areas, the main focus for these projects in 1999/2000 continued to be on rural areas. However, the process to establish food security projects in villages has been rather slow. Some programmes of food-for-work and food security projects were implemented, but on a small scale only.

The evaluation mission visited various food-for-work programmes implemented by WFP and GAA. The programmes usually provide improvements for the community as a whole, e.g. in the form of better transport possibilities (roads, bridges), drinking water supply, and improvement of pastures on communal lands. It was stated various times during this mission that there are always sufficient people who are interested in participation in the food-for-work project. The payment is 3 kg of wheat flour per day of work, which equals US\$ 1 per day against local market prices. This may seem rather low from an outsider's perspective, but it certainly compares well with official government salary rates (US\$ 7 to US\$ 30 per month). At the same time, it provides labour opportunities in remote places, and improves the availability of wheat flour as the staple food. Food-for-work projects with a direct link to agriculture, like repair of irrigation and drainage systems, by principle have the most direct and biggest effect on household food security. However, as the experience with the land-lease schemes promoted by WFP in Khatlon already has shown, kolkhoz authorities expectedly will take these fields for cotton production as soon as they can. Therefore, to ensure the impact of these programmes, it certainly is a good idea to promote lease agreements with a longer duration, e.g. ten years instead of four years.

Another type of food security programme is the provision of agricultural inputs. This approach has been piloted in the past two years with ECHO funds provided to the IFRC/RCST and Mission East. A description of these experiences is provided in Annex F. Some programmes provide a number of food rations per household, which are then supposed to be bartered for agricultural inputs. Other programmes have shifted to the direct supply of the inputs. The latter option of direct provision of agricultural inputs reduces leakage of assistance away from food security purposes. To avoid that the programmes become unbalanced, the amounts of inputs should be kept to a small size. Provision of seeds and fertilizers for the cultivation of kitchen garden plots (about 0.1 hectares) seems reasonable. Similar to the experience of GAA in Leninabad Province (funded by DG VIII), it could be considered to shift to distribution of seed potatoes instead of wheat seeds. Potatoes are a suitable option for kitchen gardens, because the crop shows a high productivity per hectare and has a high market value<sup>11</sup>.

An alternative option would be the provision of vegetable seeds, e.g. for tomatoes, pumpkin, carrots etc. However, these are less favourable crops if one aims to sell the produce on the local markets. The piloting with the provision of chicken and cattle to selected households appears quite successful. However, it is questionable whether these experiences can be copied at a larger scale. The required financial input for cattle per household is unrealistically

---

<sup>11</sup> For a kitchen plot of 0.1 hectare, 300 kg of seed potatoes would be needed as input, leading to a harvest of 3 MT, with a total market value of US\$ 170. Wheat cultivation needs an input of about 20 kg of seeds for a garden plot of 0.1 hectare, which will produce a harvest of about 100 kg with a market value of US\$ 12. The usual practice is to sow 3 MT of seed potatoes per hectare, which will produce a harvest of 30 MT. Market prices vary according to the season from 75,000 TR to 120,000 TR per MT (approximately US\$ 45 tot US\$ 70 per MT of potatoes).

high. With chicken there are often problems with diseases requiring vaccination, which makes them a less viable option for remote areas etc. Also, these types of inputs would make the food security components in the programmes more complicated than is really necessary. It should be borne in mind here that the main aim of this type of intervention is to gradually replace the food ration distribution with food security related self-reliance activities. Both the food packages and the agricultural inputs are of a supplementary nature, and will not address the core problem in terms of overall access to food. The last requires big scale interventions, like e.g. the EU DG VIII food security programmes implemented by GAA.

#### **4. COORDINATION AND COHERENCE**

Tajikistan, the poorest former Soviet state in the CIS, has greatly suffered from civil war leading to displacement of substantial numbers of refugees and destruction of a lot of infrastructure. Also, Tajikistan has seen natural disasters in various parts of the country. Most of the aid to the country in the past ten years has been humanitarian assistance and has come from the USA and the EU. The main implementers are UN-agencies (especially WFP, UNOPS and WHO), NGO's with funding from the USA (mainly CARE - US and MCI; both with food monetization programmes; institutional feeding, income generation schemes, health interventions, rehabilitation works), and the partners of the EU through ECHO, DG VIII and DG IA.

After the security incidents in 1997, most of the EU bilateral development aid through DG IA (TACIS) and DG VIII to the Tajikistan Government was suspended. Recently, DG IA has started funding of a new two-year infrastructure rehabilitation programme in the Karategin Valley implemented by UNOPS (4 MEURO). The total available DG IA budget for Tajikistan amounts to 7.2 MEURO for 1998 and 1999, and another 1.5 MEURO for 2000. The three DG VIII food security programmes in Tajikistan through NGO-partners have continued up to now, with a total budget of 4 million EURO in 1998 and 3.5 million EURO in 1999. These programmes are executed through Euronaid, and include two programmes for provision of agricultural inputs by GAA and CARE, and provision of wheat flour for local bakeries through Acted.

The ECHO programme for humanitarian relief in the health sector is executed in co-ordination with the Tajikistan Government and relevant UN-bodies like WHO. For the food sector, the co-ordination efforts mainly consist of contacts with ECHO's own partner organizations including WFP through visits to project sites and meetings about ongoing activities. The evaluation mission feels that at Dushanbe-level more established procedures for collaborative planning with active involvement of ECHO and its food partners are necessary. The ECHO correspondent usually participates in the two-weekly food co-ordination meeting chaired by WFP. Some of the ECHO food sector partners maintain informal contacts with each other on a regular basis. Unfortunately, for several reasons the contacts of the ECHO correspondent in Tajikistan with the USA-funded food aid programmes have been rather limited. There has been some but rather irregular contact with the technical assistant (based in Kyrgyzstan) of the EC (DG VIII) Food Security Unit in Central Asia.

## 5. EFFECTIVENESS, COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

The 1998/1999 and 1999/2000 programmes of ECHO's partners in the food sector have been effective with regards to the distribution of free food aid as such. However, it should be analyzed here whether the free food aid levels were appropriate for the levels of needs, and whether the programmes have covered the poorest and most needy households.

The ECHO-funded food sector programmes in Tajikistan since 1998 have been substantial, covering 300,000 to 400,000 beneficiaries per year. The overall level of free food aid provided by ECHO is seen as rather high (20,000 MT out of a total of 60,000 MT of free food per year). While the humanitarian situation in 1998 justified major food aid inputs, it is questionable whether this level should have been maintained in 1999. At any rate, the amount of free food aid has to be more limited in the coming years. This implies a reduction in the number of beneficiaries and scrutiny of the composition of the food basket provided.

As discussed under paragraph 3.3, in the past years the food partners have tried to improve their targeting mechanisms in order to reach the most vulnerable. Based on the recommendations of ECHO's household food security study in Tajikistan in 1997, the community-based beneficiary selection process was introduced by most partners. The experiences with the approach have been mixed. Selection by local authorities at 'kishlak' (village) or 'makhala' (neighbourhood) levels seems to work acceptably well. At 'jamoat' (group of villages) level the community sense and internal solidarity networks appear to be too weak for proper case selection.

Both among ECHO and the implementing partners, the awareness of the cost levels of the free food aid programmes appeared to be limited. For instance, the costs of the food rations per beneficiary per year are not systematically analyzed and/or calculated. The partners apparently do not consider it a problem that the complicated food distribution and monitoring systems lead to rather high overhead costs. Definitely, it is possible to substantially reduce the cost level per beneficiary for the free food distribution programmes. A breakdown of the budgets of the food aid partners for 1998/1999 and 1999/2000 is provided in the Annexes G and H.

The operational management of the food sector programmes shows a mixed picture. Unfortunately, the monitoring by ECHO mainly focuses on output of the projects. Information is mainly obtained through interviews with beneficiaries. Thus, insight in the project processes remains rather limited, and technical and managerial aspects of the projects are not sufficiently discussed between ECHO and its food partners. During the evaluation mission, some partners clearly appeared to be more organized than others. Having said that, every organization evidently has its own strengths and weaknesses. A compilation of strengths that were encountered in one or more food partners is given here:

- working according to the planned time frames with few delays
- having the paperwork in good order
- employing field monitors of high quality
- availing of good warehouses
- well functioning lay-out of food distribution sites
- regular monitoring before and after distribution through home-visits to beneficiaries
- creativity in identification of appropriate food-for-work projects
- execution of regular nutrition surveys to monitor the impact of the food sector programmes
- regular contacts with and reporting to ECHO

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1. Assessment of needs in the food sector

The transition from communism to new economic structures appears to be a slow process. In the short term, for the majority of the population, it has led to much hardship and suffering. However, **it is a promising sign that the increases in agricultural and economic activities were clearly visible and were indicated by many resource persons met during this evaluation mission.** The substantial food imports and food aid flows into Tajikistan of the past years more or less filled the cereal gap in local production. As a result, **wheat flour has been available on the main markets of Tajikistan in sufficient amounts.**

**A range of nutrition surveys has shown that malnutrition rates of children under five years of age have stabilized at relatively high levels.** Chronic malnutrition (stunting) is a problem for 30% to 50% of the children under five years. Acute malnutrition (wasting) is a problem for children up to two years, especially in remote plains in the RRS and in Khatlon. The last type of malnutrition mainly appears to be related to inappropriate child feeding and hygiene practices. **It calls for health and nutrition education interventions and improvement of water and sanitation systems in Khatlon.** For the poorest households, food insecurity is related to insufficient access to inputs for production of food by themselves and low purchasing power to buy food on the market. This especially applies to single elderly who have to survive on very low pensions, and families without breadwinner and little or no access to lands for cultivation. As the Tajikistan government in the years to come presumably will not provide social benefits of any substance, a **continuation of free food assistance to the poorest and most needy households in Tajikistan is justified.** However, definitely there should be a substantial reduction in free food aid flows. In the coming two years, food security programmes including food-for-work should be quickly expanded to promote self-reliance of most households which up to now have received free food aid.

### 6.2. Free food distribution programmes

**It is suggested that WFP will gradually take over from ECHO the 'core caseload' of most needy households. This could be combined with WFP Tajikistan's workplan 2000 to start to work through implementing partners.**

**Geographically differentiated food aid programmes should remain the approach in the coming years,** as the causes and extent of nutrition problems vary substantially between the various regions in Tajikistan. Based on various dialogues with the ECHO food partners, **the evaluation mission advises to provide free food aid to about 12% of the population in Khatlon, 5% in Dushanbe town, 5% - 10% in the RRS, and 2% - 5% of the population of urban areas only in Leninabad province.**

**More restricted criteria for free food assistance are necessary. It is suggested to focus on single pensioners, families without breadwinners in urban areas, and families without breadwinners and no access to kitchen gardens (at least 0.1 ha) in rural areas. Also, there should be some room left to include households who are evidently in need, but who don't fall in these specific categories.** For instance, families with severely malnourished children (identified through the local health care structures) should be eligible for food aid. Monitors should visit the additional cases for pre-distribution verification purposes. Thus, the number of beneficiaries would go down considerably. Some **indicative figures** for the number of households thus to be included are given below<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> For GBAO, no recommendation can be given, as the local circumstances there were not assessed during this mission.

Organization	No. Households	No. People	Oblast (Districts)
Mission East	5,500	37,000	Khatlon (Kulyab, Khovaling, Muminibad)
IFRC/RCST	9,000	45,000	Dushanbe and RRS (Sakhrinav, Varzob, Kofarnihon, Tursunzade, Leninsky)
GAA	7,000	50,000	RRS (Karategin Valley)
GAA	4,000	15,000	Leninabad (urban areas only)
Total	25,5000	147,000	

Targeting procedures should be kept as simple as possible. They should ensure a focus on the poorest and most needy households. **Community-based beneficiary selection at 'kishlak' (village) or 'makhala' (neighbourhood) level has proved to work rather well, and should be considered by other ECHO partners as well.**

Up to now nutrition surveys were executed regularly but not in a co-ordinated and systematic way. **It is recommended to establish a nutrition monitoring system to assess the impact of the reduction in food aid flows.** ECHO should consider inviting Action Against Hunger to execute a yearly round of nutrition surveys in collaboration with the ECHO food partners for the various regions.

With a close eye on the costs per beneficiary and the nutritional contents of the basket, **it is advised to compose a food ration of 25 kg of wheat flour, 5 litres of vegetable oil and 1 kg of iodized salt. To make the programmes more efficient, there should be two distribution cycles per year. These are preferably held at times when household food supplies are most limited, e.g. at pre-harvest and in winter time. With two cycles and the mentioned ration composition, 707 kCal and 15 g of protein are provided per person per day for the whole year round, at an estimated cost of EURO 25 to EURO 30 per person per year<sup>13</sup>.** This ration will cover 34% of the energy needs and 30% of the protein needs of adults leading a sedentary life. It should be kept in mind here that the food ration is a supplement to other sources of food and/or income. It thus can never be expected to cover more than around one-third of the nutritional needs. Also, in this way a strong long-term dependency on external food aid is being avoided.

The number of rations per household should depend on the level of needs in the family. As a rule of thumb, **one ration should be provided to single-person households, and a maximum of two (exceptionally three) to larger households.** This means that project proposals to ECHO in future should state the number of households planned to be covered and the number of rations planned to be distributed. The current practice of calculations based on a mix of numbers of households and of beneficiaries is confusing and should be abandoned.

Especially with the smaller quantities needed for the 2000/2001 food sector programmes, possibilities for **local purchase or regional purchase in Kazakhstan** could be explored. It would substantially reduce transport costs, and has the added advantage of less distortion of the food preferences (the high-quality imported wheat flour is not appropriate for the local 'libjoska' flat bread). However, there are possible flaws in terms of delays and delivery of inferior quality food items.

### 6.3. Food-for-work and food security programmes

**The mission concludes that ECHO could have shown more leadership and guidance to assist the implementing partners in a coherent realization of a shift away from free food aid. Up to spring 2000 the proportionality of food security programmes has been very small in comparison with the amounts of free food aid. In the past two years,**

<sup>13</sup> This budget per person includes international purchase of the food items and transport to Tajikistan. Comparison with retailer prices at Dushanbe markets shows that this estimated cost would also suffice for local purchase within the country.



ECHO has left most of the initiative in this field to the partner organizations. However, several partners have functioned with relatively inexperienced expat staff, leading to less strategic vision and operational capacity. In the near future, ECHO should intend to provoke a clear shift to food security, e.g. through the organization of a series of technical and strategy workshops for the food sector partners. Another suggestion would be for ECHO to contract a short-term consultant to assist in the elaboration of household food security interventions together with the partners and relevant agencies in Tajikistan.

The ECHO partners so far have little experience with income generating activities in urban areas. Some NGO's from the USA already execute small-scale credit schemes and vocational training in the larger cities of the country. As this type of projects is rather complicated and ECHO anyway in the coming years will phase out from Tajikistan, **it is felt that ECHO should continue to focus on programmes for rural areas only.**

**For planning purposes, it is needed that ECHO sets the number of households to participate in household food security projects. ECHO should also provide a general framework for these projects.** As the various ECHO-partners each have their own expertise and their own niche in the Tajikistan context, **autonomy for selection of specific food security activities should be left to the organizations themselves.** Definitely, both food-for-work programmes and provision of agricultural inputs will have a positive impact on household food security. The effects of the executed programmes in the short term and longer run should be closely monitored. To avoid that the programmes become unbalanced, the amounts of benefits/inputs per household should be kept to a small size.

**The mission feels that ECHO's co-ordination in the food sector should be stronger. The ECHO-funded food sector programmes (both free food aid and food security programmes) so far have not been completely coherent with each other.** This is seen as part of the explanation for the slow shift away from free food aid. Sometimes, two food distribution programmes are executed independently in the same area. This applies especially to food aid for institutions (like in Leninabad where various donors provide food to medical facilities), but also happened in Kulyab with free food aid distributions by Mission East and WFP. In some areas, free food is distributed by an ECHO-programme without any link to a food security programme of another organization. E.g., this happens in Leninsky district in the RRS where the IFRC/RCST provide free food aid and agricultural inputs without any coordination with the CARE agricultural programme in the same area.

## **7. LESSONS LEARNED**

- Free food aid programmes are expensive but appropriate to alleviate the suffering of highly needy households without any perspective on sufficient access to the staple food.
- In Tajikistan, community-based targeting functions rather well, but only when this is done at the lowest level (village or neighbourhood).
- Although the definition of end terms and the provision of a general project framework lies within ECHO's mandate, partner organizations within limits can be free to 'customize' their operations to their own perceptions and capacities.

## ANNEX A. TERMS OF REFERENCE



COMMISSION EUROPÉENNE  
OFFICE D'AIDE HUMANITAIRE (ECHO)

Evaluation (ECHO 5)

# ***TERMES DE RÉFÉRENCE***

***POUR L'ÉVALUATION DES PLANS GLOBAUX DE L'AIDE HUMANITAIRE FINANCÉE PAR ECHO  
AU TADJIKISTAN***

**ECHO/TJK/215/1999/01028B**

Nom de la société : Quest Consult

Nom du consultant : HOOGENDOORN

### **Plans Globaux à évaluer**

- Pays : TADJIKISTAN
- Période couverte : mi-1998 à début 2000
- Secteurs à évaluer : alimentaire et médical
- Décision(s) :
  - ECHO/TJK/215/1998/03000 : 16.420.000 ECU
  - ECHO/TPS/215/1999/02000 : 20.000.000.€ en faveur des Nouveaux Etats Indépendants (NEI)  
dont 2.830.000 € pour le Tadjikistan
  - ECHO/TJK/215/1999/01000 : 16.000.000 €

### **Introduction**

ECHO est présent au Tadjikistan depuis 1993 et le budget alloué à ce pays n'a pas cessé d'augmenter.

En raison de l'importance de ce budget et en vue de l'élaboration de son plan global 2000 qui définira la stratégie future à adopter, ECHO a décidé d'effectuer une évaluation des actions financées par les plans globaux 1998-1999.

Cette évaluation portera plus particulièrement sur les domaines de l'aide alimentaire et médicale (y compris réhabilitation et approvisionnement en eau en rapport avec la santé publique).

Les principaux partenaires de ECHO au Tadjikistan pour la mise en œuvre des opérations sont German Agro Action, le FICR et le PAM pour le secteur alimentaire ; la Netherlands Red Cross, Pharmaciens Sans Frontières, Merlin, l'OMS et MSF Netherlands pour le secteur médical ; UNDP/UNOPS et Caritas CH pour la réhabilitation ; UNDP/UNOPS pour l'eau.

Le contexte dans lequel se déploie cette assistance est particulièrement critique. Depuis son indépendance en 1991, le Tadjikistan connaît une crise économique grave, amplifiée par une guerre civile de 1992 à 1997, interrompue par un accord de paix qui reste chancelant. De plus, le pays est affecté par une chute générale des prix mondiaux des deux principaux produits d'exportation, le coton et l'aluminium, et par la crise économique en Russie. Le Tadjikistan a rejoint le groupe des pays les plus pauvres du monde, avec 85% de la population vivant sous le seuil de pauvreté. Dans de telles circonstances, le gouvernement actuellement en place dispose de très peu de ressources

pour mettre en œuvre son plan de développement économique. La situation en termes d'amélioration des conditions de vie et de fourniture des services de base à la population évolue donc très peu.

## **Rôle du consultant**

L'évaluation de l'aide humanitaire constitue une tâche très importante pour la Commission européenne non seulement en raison des sommes considérables consacrées à cette activité, mais également en raison du souci constant d'améliorer le travail humanitaire et d'utiliser au mieux les crédits qui lui sont consacrés.

Pendant le déroulement de la mission, tant sur le terrain que lors de la rédaction du rapport, le consultant devra faire preuve de bon sens et d'indépendance de jugement. Il fournira des réponses précises et directes à tous les points des termes de référence en évitant d'utiliser un langage théorique et académique.

## **Buts de l'évaluation**

Les buts poursuivis par la présente évaluation sont les suivants :

ANALYSE DE L'OPPORTUNITÉ ET DU DEGRÉ DE RÉALISATION DES PLANS GLOBAUX HUMANITAIRES EN FAVEUR DU TADJIKISTAN, DANS LES SECTEURS MENTIONNÉS AU POINT 1. ;

ANALYSE DU DEGRÉ D'ACCOMPLISSEMENT DES OBJECTIFS POURSUIVIS DANS LES DIFFÉRENTS SECTEURS D'ACTIVITÉ ET DE L'EFFICACITÉ DES MOYENS MIS EN ŒUVRE ;

ANALYSE ET QUANTIFICATION DE L'IMPACT DES PLANS GLOBAUX AU TADJIKISTAN ;

ANALYSE DU RÔLE JOUÉ PAR ECHO DANS LE PROCESSUS DÉCISIONNEL AINSI QUE DES AUTRES ACTIVITÉS DONT LES SERVICES DE LA COMMISSION SONT RESPONSABLES ;

VÉRIFICATION DE LA VISIBILITÉ DE ECHO TANT DANS LES RÉGIONS BÉNÉFICIAIRES DE L'AIDE QUE PARMIS LES AUTORITÉS ET PARTENAIRES LOCAUX ;

EXAMEN DU LIEN ENTRE URGENCE-RÉHABILITATION-DÉVELOPPEMENT, DANS UNE OPTIQUE ÉVENTUELLE DE « PHASING OUT » PROGRESSIF DE ECHO ;

ETABLISSEMENT DE RECOMMANDATIONS PRÉCISES ET CONCRÈTES SUR LE FUTUR DES FINANCEMENTS DE ECHO ET RELATIVES À L'EFFICACITÉ DES INTERVENTIONS. CES RECOMMANDATIONS, DÛMENT JUSTIFIÉES, DEVRONT ÊTRE ÉTABLIES PAR SECTEUR D'AIDE IDENTIFIÉ.

## **Objectifs spécifiques de l'évaluation**

Les objectifs spécifiques suivants s'appliquent à tous les secteurs évalués ainsi qu'au rapport de synthèse.

Les consultants développeront les points suivants pour le secteur qui leur est attribué au point 8 ci-dessous. Ils indiqueront uniquement les éléments nouveaux apparus depuis la mise en place du dernier plan global.

## BRÈVE DESCRIPTION DES PLANS GLOBAUX ET ANALYSE DE LEUR CONTEXTE : LA SITUATION SOCIO-ÉCONOMIQUE, LES BESOINS HUMANITAIRES ET LES CAPACITÉS LOCALES POUR Y RÉPONDRE.

L'analyse de la situation actuelle du pays, en termes socio-économiques, devra inclure une vue d'ensemble permettant d'y situer le plan global financé par ECHO. Cette analyse devra être tant quantitative que qualitative et contenir des informations sur différents secteurs de l'économie telles les politiques sociales et économiques en vigueur, les niveaux de revenus et leur répartition au sein de la population, politiques sanitaire et médicale, l'accès à la nourriture, etc.

La deuxième partie de l'analyse du contexte devra être consacrée à l'identification des groupes vulnérables et leur répartition dans le pays ainsi qu'à l'estimation des besoins par catégorie.

L'analyse devra aussi permettre d'apprécier la capacité des pouvoirs publics et de la population à faire face aux problèmes mis en évidence.

## ANALYSE DE LA PERTINENCE DES OBJECTIFS DES PLANS GLOBAUX, DU CHOIX DES BÉNÉFICIAIRES ET DE LA STRATÉGIE UTILISÉE PAR RAPPORT AUX BESOINS IDENTIFIÉS.

### EXAMEN DE LA COORDINATION ET DE LA COHÉRENCE POUR CHACUN DES SECTEURS CONSIDÉRÉS AVEC :

- les autres donateurs, les opérateurs sur le terrain ainsi que les autorités locales ;
- les interventions éventuelles d'autres services de la Commission dans la zone avec des projets similaires ou en relation avec les plans globaux évalués. Les projets identifiés seront décrits avec leur montant et les éléments de l'aide ;

### ANALYSE DE L'EFFICACITÉ EN TERMES QUANTITATIFS ET QUALITATIFS POUR CHACUN DES SECTEURS.

### LE RAPPORT COÛT-EFFICACITÉ DOIT ÊTRE MIS EN ÉVIDENCE SUR BASE, NOTAMMENT, DES ÉLÉMENTS QUANTITATIFS TELS QUE DÉFINIS AU POINT 5.4.

### ANALYSE DE L'EFFICIENCE DE LA MISE EN ŒUVRE DES PLANS GLOBAUX PORTANT SUR :

- la planification et la mobilisation de l'aide ;
- la capacité opérationnelle des partenaires ;
- la stratégie déployée ;

- les éléments principaux de la mise en œuvre des plans globaux tels que : personnel, logistique, administration, respect des habitudes locales, choix des bénéficiaires, etc. ;
- la gestion de l'entreposage des marchandises et des installations ;
- la qualité et les quantités de marchandises et de services mis en œuvre et leur correspondance avec les spécifications contractuelles (y compris les conditions d'emballage, l'origine des marchandises et le prix) ;
- les systèmes de contrôle et d'auto-évaluation mis en place par les partenaires.

ANALYSE DE L'IMPACT DES PLANS GLOBAUX. CETTE ANALYSE DEVRAIT INCLURE, NOTAMMENT, LES ÉLÉMENTS SUIVANTS :

- contribution à la réduction des souffrances humaines ;
- création de dépendance vis-à-vis de l'aide humanitaire ;
- effets de l'aide humanitaire sur l'économie locale ;
- effets sur les revenus de la population locale ;
- effets sur la santé et les habitudes nutritionnelles ;
- effets sur l'environnement ;
- conséquences des programmes humanitaires sur les « capacity-building » locales.

Une attention particulière sera portée à l'impact dans les domaines de **l'alimentaire et de la santé**, ainsi que les effets éventuels sur **le processus de paix**.

ANALYSE DE LA VISIBILITÉ DE ECHO.  
ANALYSE DE L'INTÉGRATION DES QUESTIONS DE « GENRE »  
(ANALYSE SOCIALE, ÉCONOMIQUE ET CULTURELLE DE LA  
SITUATION DES FEMMES ET DES HOMMES) DANS  
L'INTERVENTION.

ANALYSE DES MESURES PRISES POUR ASSURER LA SÉCURITÉ  
DU PERSONNEL HUMANITAIRE TANT EXPATRIÉ QUE  
LOCAL : MOYENS DE COMMUNICATION MIS À LEUR  
DISPOSITION, MESURES DE PROTECTION SPÉCIFIQUE, PLAN  
D'ÉVACUATION D'URGENCE.

EXAMEN DES ÉLÉMENTS DE VIABILITÉ DES PLANS GLOBAUX  
ET NOTAMMENT DE L'OPPORTUNITÉ DE METTRE EN PLACE  
DES POLITIQUES DE DÉVELOPPEMENT ET/OU DE  
COOPÉRATION POUVANT SE SUBSTITUER À L'AIDE  
HUMANITAIRE.

SUR BASE DES RÉSULTATS OBTENUS LORS DE LA  
RÉALISATION DE LA PRÉSENTE ÉVALUATION, LE  
CONSULTANT FORMULERA DES RECOMMANDATIONS  
OPÉRATIONNELLES SUR LES BESOINS DE TYPE  
HUMANITAIRE QUI POURRAIENT FAIRE L'OBJET D'UN

FINANCEMENT COMMUNAUTAIRE. CES RECOMMANDATIONS PEUVENT COUVRIR, SI NÉCESSAIRE, DES DOMAINES AUTRES QUE CELUI DE L'HUMANITAIRE, TELS LE DÉVELOPPEMENT OU LA COOPÉRATION.

Ces recommandations seront formulées par rapport à une stratégie éventuelle de « phasing out » progressif et, le cas échéant, aux actions prioritaires à maintenir pendant la phase de transition et aux processus de retrait adéquats.

ANALYSE DE LA MÉTHODE DE PROGRAMMATION UTILISÉE PAR ECHO DANS L'ÉLABORATION DES PLANS GLOBAUX 1998 ET 1999 POUR LE TADJIKISTAN À FAIRE FIGURER DANS LE RAPPORT DE SYNTHÈSE.

FORMULATION DES « LEÇONS APPRISSES » DANS LE CADRE DE CETTE ÉVALUATION. LES LEÇONS APPRISSES DEVRONT ÉGALEMENT PORTER SUR LE RÔLE JOUÉ PAR ECHO ET LES AUTRES SERVICES DE LA COMMISSION DANS LE PROCESSUS DÉCISIONNEL ET DE MISE EN ŒUVRE DES PLANS GLOBAUX.

### **Méthode de travail**

Pour l'accomplissement de sa tâche, le consultant utilisera l'information disponible à ECHO, auprès de son correspondant sur le terrain, dans les autres services de la Commission, auprès de la Délégation de la Commission sur place, auprès des partenaires de ECHO au siège et sur le terrain, auprès des bénéficiaires de l'aide ainsi qu'auprès des autorités locales, des organisations internationales et d'autres donateurs.

Le consultant analysera l'information en profondeur et la synthétisera dans un rapport cohérent répondant aux objectifs de l'évaluation.

Il fournira des informations concrètes et opérationnelles. Dans ce but, il utilisera entre autres les apports méthodologiques de l'approche du cadre logique, y compris les indicateurs.

### **Étapes de la mise en oeuvre**

BRIEFING À ECHO AVEC LE PERSONNEL CONCERNÉ PENDANT 3 (TROIS) JOURS MAXIMUM ET MISE À DISPOSITION DE L'ENSEMBLE DES DOCUMENTS NÉCESSAIRES À L'ÉVALUATION ;  
MISSION SUR PLACE : 25 (VINGT-CINQ) JOURS ; LE CONSULTANT TRAVAILLERA EN ÉTROITE COLLABORATION AVEC LA DÉLÉGATION DE LA COMMISSION À ALMATI, LE CORRESPONDANT DE ECHO, AVEC LES PARTENAIRES DE ECHO, LES AUTORITÉS LOCALES, LES ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES ET D'AUTRES DONATEURS ;  
LE CONSULTANT CONSACRERA LE PREMIER JOUR DE SA MISSION SUR PLACE À DES DISCUSSIONS PRÉLIMINAIRES ET PRÉPARATOIRES AVEC LE CORRESPONDANT DE ECHO ET

LES PARTENAIRES DE ECHO SUR PLACE;  
LE DERNIER JOUR DE LA MISSION SERA CONSACRÉ À UNE  
DISCUSSION AVEC LE CORRESPONDANT ET LES  
PARTENAIRES DE ECHO SUR LES OBSERVATIONS  
DÉCOULANT DE L'ÉVALUATION;  
LES PROJETS DE RAPPORT (EN 10 EXEMPLAIRES) SERA  
ENVOYÉ À L'UNITÉ « EVALUATION » DE ECHO À BRUXELLES  
AU MOINS UNE SEMAINE AVANT SA PRÉSENTATION ET SA  
DISCUSSION LORS DU DEBRIEFING ;  
DÉBRIEFING DE 1(UN) JOURS À ECHO ;  
REMISE DES RAPPORTS FINAUX QUI PRENDRONT EN  
COMPTE LES REMARQUES ÉVENTUELLES SOULEVÉES LORS  
DU DEBRIEFING.

Une **visite au siège des partenaires** sera effectuée selon les besoins avant ou après la mission sur le terrain.

### **Consultants**

La présente évaluation sera réalisée par deux experts possédant une bonne expérience dans le domaine humanitaire et de son évaluation, et acceptant de travailler dans des zones à risques. Une solide expérience dans les domaines spécifiques de l'évaluation qui leur ont été confiés et une bonne connaissance de la zone géographique où elle se déroule est également requise.

Les membres de cette équipe d'experts sont responsables des secteurs indiqués ci-après :

**Mr. LAMBERT Pierre-Yves**, chef d'équipe :

- Secteur médical

**Mlle HOOGENDOORN Annemarie** :

- Secteur alimentaire

### **Calendrier**

L'évaluation aura une durée de 37 (trente sept) jours, répartis entre la date de signature du contrat et le 31 mars 2000.



## Rapport

L'ÉVALUATION DONNERA LIEU À L'ÉTABLISSEMENT DE 3 (TROIS) RAPPORTS (1 PAR SECTEUR ET 1 RAPPORT DE SYNTHÈSE), RÉDIGÉ EN FRANÇAIS OU EN ANGLAIS, D'UNE LONGUEUR MAXIMUM DE 15 PAGES Y COMPRIS LE RÉSUMÉ DE L'ÉVALUATION QUI DEVRA FIGURER EN TÊTE DU RAPPORT.

LE RAPPORT D'ÉVALUATION EST UN OUTIL DE TRAVAIL EXTRÊMEMENT IMPORTANT POUR ECHO. LE FORMAT DE RAPPORT, MENTIONNÉ CI-DESSOUS, SERA DONC STRICTEMENT RESPECTÉ.

### Page de couverture

- titre du rapport de l'évaluation
- période de l'évaluation ;
- noms des évaluateurs ;
- mention indiquant que le rapport a été établi à la demande de la Commission européenne, financé par celle-ci et que les commentaires s'y trouvant reflètent uniquement l'avis des consultants.

### Table des matières

#### Résumé (**voir formulaire en annexe**).

plan global évalue ( 5 LIGNES MAX.)

dates de l'évaluation:

RAPPORT N°:

Noms des consultants:

BUT ET METHODOLOGIE DE L'ÉVALUATION (5 lignes max.) :

PRINCIPALES CONCLUSIONS (+/- 25 lignes)

- *Pertinence*
- *Efficacité*
- *Efficiences*
- *Coordination, cohérence et complémentarité*
- *Impact & implications stratégiques*
- *Visibilité*
- *Questions transversales*

RECOMMANDATIONS (+/- 20 lignes)

LEÇONS APPRISES (+/- 10 lignes)

**Le corps principal du rapport débutera par un point relatif à la méthodologie utilisée et sera structuré conformément aux objectifs spécifiques formulés au point 5 ci-dessus (maximum de 10 pages).**

### Annexes

- liste des personnes interviewées et des sites visités ;
- termes de référence ;
- abréviations ;
- carte géographique des lieux des opérations.

SI LE RAPPORT CONTIENT DES INFORMATIONS  
CONFIDENTIELLES ÉMANANT DE PARTIES AUTRES QUE LES  
SERVICES DE LA COMMISSION, CELLES-CI FIGURERONT  
DANS UNE ANNEXE SÉPARÉE.

LE RAPPORT DOIT ÊTRE ÉCRIT DANS UN LANGAGE NON-  
ACADÉMIQUE ET DIRECT.

CHAQUE RAPPORT SERA ÉTABLI EN 20 (VINGT)  
EXEMPLAIRES ET REMIS À ECHO.

LE RAPPORT DEVRA ÊTRE ACCOMPAGNÉ DE SON SUPPORT  
INFORMATIQUE (SUR DISQUETTE) SOUS LE FORMAT WORD  
6.0 OU D'UNE VERSION PLUS RÉCENTE.

## ANNEX B. ITINERARY AND PERSONS MET

### 20 January - 15 February 2000

- 20/21 January \* Briefing and preparation for the mission at ECHO HQ in Brussels  
Ms. Jacqueline Coeffard, Head of the Evaluation Unit ECHO 5  
Mr. Esko Kentrschynskyj, Head ECHO 2  
Mr. Didier Merckx, Desk Officer for Central Asia, ECHO 2
- 22 January \* Travel Amsterdam - Almaty (air)
- 23 January \* Informal meeting EU Delegation Kazakhstan, Almaty  
Ms. Blanca de Toledo, Programme Officer Technical Assistance Section  
\* Travel Almaty - Dushanbe (air)
- 24 January \* Briefing meeting ECHO partners Tajikistan, Dushanbe  
IFRC, ACTED, CARE, WHO, Mission East, UN-OPS, WFP, Caritas-CH,  
MSF-H, Merlin, CAD, MCI  
\* Briefing meeting staff ECHO office Dushanbe  
\* Visit to WFP Country Office Dushanbe  
Mr. Bouchan Hadj-Chikh, Representative and Country Director  
Ms. Jolanda Hogenkamp, Reporting Officer
- 25 January \* Travel Dushanbe - Kurgan-Tube - Kulyab (road)  
\* Visit to WFP Sub-Office Khatlon Oblast in Kurgan-Tube, site visits to the  
food distribution in Kumsangir and a Land Lease project in Bokhta  
Ms. Laila Ahadi, Head of Sub-Office Khatlon
- 26 January \* Visit to Mission East field office in Kulyab, home visits to beneficiaries of the  
free food distribution in Khovaling raion (rural and urban), and to one  
beneficiary of the food security project (chicken) close to Kulyab.  
Mr. Barry Armstrong, Country Director Tajikistan  
Mr. Graeme Glover, Project Coordinator Food Assistance Kulyab
- 27 January \* Travel Kulyab - Dushanbe (road)  
\* Meeting with Mr. Peter Downs, USAID Country Development Officer
- 28 January \* Visit to IFRC/RCST country office and Dushanbe city office RCST, site visit  
to an RCST soup kitchen and home visits to free food distribution  
beneficiaries in Dushanbe city  
Mr. Eric Michel-Sellier, IFRC Head of Delegation Tajikistan  
Mr. Dawot Mohammad, IFRC Relief Administrator  
Mr. Jalol Sharipov, Coordinator Food Programme RCST  
4 RCST volunteers attached to the Dushanbe city office
- 29 January \* ECHO Evaluation Mission Food Workshop with 9 NGO's and WFP
- 31 January \* Home visits to IFRC/RCST free food distribution and food security (wheat  
seeds) beneficiaries in Leninsky raion in the RRS Oblast. Discussion at the  
IFRC office in Dushanbe on costs and effects of the food programme  
Mr. Harm Westra, IFRC Relief Coordinator  
Mr. Dawot Mohammad, IFRC Relief Administrator  
Mr. Jalol Sharipov, Coordinator Food Programme RCST  
\* Meeting with German Agro Action in Dushanbe  
Ms. Beate Schoreit, Programme Coordinator Tajikistan

Ms. Halka Otto, Food Programme Manager  
Mr. Volker Huefing, Seed Programme Manager

- 1 February \* Visit IFRC/RCST food distribution Railway Station Raion, Dushanbe  
\* Travel Dushanbe - Shartuz (road)  
\* WFP visit to food-for-work and land-lease activities for returnees in Rudahi jamoat, Shartuz Oblast
- 2 February \* Discussion with Action against Hunger, Netherlands Red Cross, WHO and Caritas-Switzerland on the needs and services in the health sector  
\* Action against Hunger visit to the supplementary feeding programme, refresher training course for midwives and general discussion on project outlines  
Mr. Jean-Michel Grand, Project Coordinator  
Ms. Caroline Wilkinson, Nutritionist  
Ms. Francis Derlin, Nurse  
\* Travel Shartuz - Dushanbe (road)
- 3 February \* Meeting with Mr. Abdul Haq Amiri, Humanitarian Affairs Officer UNOCHA  
\* Meeting with Mr. Pavel Cernohorsky, FAO Coordinator Tajikistan  
\* Meeting with Mr. Jan Harfst, Dpty. Programme Manager UN-OPS  
\* Meeting with Mr. Branislav Jekic, Asst. Representative UNICEF  
\* Meeting with Mr. Matthias Mayer, German Ambassador  
\* Meeting with Mr. Mustapha Ronis, World Bank
- 4 February \* Attending WFP Food Coordination Meeting on targetting criteria  
\* Meeting with Mr. Jalal Bhuiyan, Mercy Corps Int. on food monetization  
\* Attending UN Donor Meeting presentation UN Consolidated Appeal 2000  
\* Meeting with Mr. George Labor and Mr. Taslimur Rahman, UNHCR  
\* Meeting with Mr. Ivo Petrov, Special Representative of the Secretary General  
\* Meeting with Mr. Latipov, Deputy Minister of Health  
\* Meeting with Mr. Akbar Usmani, Actg. Resident Representative, and Ms. Pamela Hussaini, Head Programme Section, UNDP
- 6 February \* Travel Dushanbe - Khojent (air)
- 7 February \* German Agro Action: general discussion on project outlines, and visit to Kansai food-for-work project (water supply for irrigation) in Karakkum District  
Mr. Roman Kostitsyne, Project Coordinator Khojent  
Ms. Beate Schoreit, Programme Coordinator Tajikistan
- 8 February \* Visit to Gafurov psychiatric hospital in Khojent supported with food by IFRC and by MSF-Holland  
\* German Agro Action: visit to Karamazar food-for-work project (bridge construction) and grazing land development in Asht District
- 9 February \* Travel Khojent - Dushanbe (air)
- 10 February \* Visit to Aga Khan Foundation country office in Dushanbe  
\* Attending ECHO Evaluation Mission Health Workshop
- 11 February \* Health / Food Debriefing Meeting in Dushanbe for ECHO partners and others
- 13 February \* Travel Dushanbe - Almaty (air)

14 February \* Meeting with EU Delegation Kazakhstan

15 February \* Travel Almaty - Amsterdam (air)



## ANNEX D. NUTRITION SURVEYS IN TAJIKISTAN 1994 – 1999

		WHZ (wasting) (<-2 Z-score)	WHZ (wasting) (<-3 Z-score)	HAZ (stunting) (<-2 Z-score)	HAZ (stunting) (<-3 Z-score)
<b>Leninabad</b>					
Sept/Oct 99		8.8	2.4	34.0	11.8
Sept. 98	plains	7.0	1.0	44.5	17.9
Sept. 96	plains	9.5	2.9	26.6	7.4
Sept. 98	mountains	7.6	1.3	54.2	24.6
Sept. 96	mountains	9.1	1.3	51.3	23.4
<b>RRS</b>					
Sept/Oct 99	plains	13.6	3.6	37.3	13.2
Sept. 98	plains	16.6	6.0	43.9	18.2
Sept. 96	plains	12.6	4.2	44.6	18.6
Sept. 98	mountains	14.8	3.7	41.4	19.8
Sept. 96	mountains	9.5	1.6	41.0	16.3
<b>GBAO</b>					
July/Aug 98		6.7	1.6	51.5	25.6
1996		5.8	1.7	44.6	18.8
1994		2.9	n.a.	40.4	n.a.
<b>Khatlon</b>					
Sept/Oct 99		11.0	3.2	40.6	12.2
July 99	Kurgan-Tube	17.6	5.0	41.8	17.1
Febr. 99	Kurgan-Tube	6.3	1.6	38.7	14.6
June 94	Kurgan-Tube	1.8	n.a.	34.2	n.a.
Febr. 99	Kulyab	7.4	1.6	42.8	17.2
June 94	Kulyab	5.8	n.a.	30.0	n.a.
<b>Dushanbe city</b>					
Sept/Oct 99		8.8	2.6	27.5	7.5
June 94		5.1	n.a.	21.9	n.a.

Prepared by the ECHO Evaluation Mission Jan/Febr 2000

## **ANNEX E. BENEFICIARY SELECTION FOR ECHO-FUNDED FREE FOOD AID IN TAJIKISTAN**

WFP at the time of this evaluation study was in the process of defining new selection criteria for the 'vulnerable group feeding' programme in Khatlon Oblast. Up to now, WFP applied the former Soviet criteria for social assistance: pensioners (men over 60 years of age, women over 55 years), war-widows, invalids, orphans, families without breadwinner, and single pensioners (men over 50 years, men over 45 years). From 1993 till 1997, 250,000 people were included in the WFP vulnerable group feeding. In 1998, the programme was downsized by 30%. Since then, there have been 178,000 beneficiaries per distribution round. From the beginning, the responsibility for the selection of the 'most needy' within the old Soviet categories was delegated to local government authorities at 'jamoat' (group of villages) level. A small group of WFP monitors executes pre-distribution and post-distribution checks through household visits based on a 1% random sampling method. WFP staff frankly acknowledged that the selection by the jamoat often is rather fraudulent, and that the Soviet categories for social assistance are too broad for a well-targeted food aid programme.

Mission East is active in four districts around Kulyab town. For the food distribution programme that covers 69,500 beneficiaries in total (48,750 people on ECHO funds in Kulyab, Khovaling and Muminibad districts, 21,000 people with NEDA funds in Vose district) they have adopted a significantly different procedure, much more of a grassroots nature. Destitute households are identified by the 'makhalas' (neighbourhood committees), at which level there still is a solidarity network, and a perception of duties and responsibility for each other's well-being. As a second step, Mission East field workers participate with the community to check whether the lists include all needy families. Finally, the selection list is publicly displayed, and people who feel they should have been included can complain to the Mission East field worker, who then together with the makhala decides whether the household should be included or not. Although even this system can not guarantee 100% coverage of only needy households, the Mission East decision to work through the makhalas certainly seems to bear fruit. However, it can only work well when there are sufficient field workers who are strong and independent and who are sufficiently supervised. As a result of these requirements, the Mission East approach has rather high overhead costs, and seems most suitable for programmes in smaller geographical areas like at district level or in urban environments. Another remark is the need for an 'outside brake'. Currently, Mission East targets 16.4% of the households in the districts they cover, and base themselves on the outcome of the ECHO Food Insecurity Study of 1997<sup>14</sup>. At the current stage however, it is necessary to differentiate the proportion of food aid beneficiaries between regions (see 3.1), and to adjust the overall percentage of the population to be covered by this type of food aid programmes.

GAA has two feeding programmes: one for Leninabad Oblast and one in the Karategin Valley in the east of RRS. Both programmes target about 50,000 beneficiaries for free food distribution. In Leninabad the programme covers 650 kishlaks (villages) or makhalas (neighbourhoods in towns). Similar to Mission East, since 1997 the selection of beneficiaries is based on community participation. A local committee, comprised of the local doctor, the school headmaster, the social protection officer, other local leaders and a GAA monitor, make up the list of names of vulnerables like single pensioners, invalids and families without breadwinners. They target about 2% to 7% of the population in Leninabad Oblast, and 5% to 10% in Karategin Valley, the percentage varying a bit between villages according to the perceived needs in the area. For instance, in the towns in Leninabad Oblast the percentage is usually somewhat higher, as many single pensioners of Russian origin live there. GAA monitors visit about 10% of the selected households for pre-distribution monitoring. GAA keeps some budget reserve to assist needy who don't fit in with the selection process. In

---

<sup>14</sup> Freckleton concludes that at the national level, 1.1% of households can be considered as severely food insecure, 8.1% is acute food insecure, and 7.2% is marginally food insecure.



some villages in the Karategin Valley, GAA encounters a strong community where one wants to share the food aid over all households. Possibly this implies that poorer households in times of need receive assistance by the community, as a form of burden sharing. Another issue, which during this evaluation mission could not be studied in depth, is the taking of food by commanders in some villages in Karategin Valley.

The IFRC together with the RCST execute the vulnerable group feeding in Dushanbe city and the RRS, which is completely funded by ECHO. There are 75,100 beneficiaries in total: 40,000 in Dushanbe, 34,000 in the RRS (districts Leninsky, Tursunzade, Sakhrinav, Varzob, Kafornihon), and 1100 patients of psychiatric hospitals in Leninabad (in collaboration with MSF-Holland). In 1999, the beneficiary selection continued to be done by local authorities, but it was switched from the jamoat to the makhala-level. In principle the 900 makhalas have to select people who are very needy and fall within the old Soviet criteria as well. Similar to the Mission East approach, the number of beneficiaries was pre-set at 12 to 16%, with some flexibility to adjust to local needs. Pre- and post-distribution monitoring (the sample is 10%) is the responsibility of the RCST district branches (staff and volunteers). Per distribution round, thus 500 to 1000 names (7-14% of the sample) are thus removed from the list as being falsely included. Without any doubt, this only represents the tip of the iceberg. It is questionable whether such an extensive and geographically widespread food distribution programme should be executed by a national NGO that mainly depends on volunteers.

## **ANNEX F. ECHO-FUNDED AGRICULTURAL INPUTS PROGRAMMES IN TAJIKISTAN**

In 1998, the IFRC/RCST started with a food security programme for about 300 rural households in Leninsky District in the RRS. These were households with bigger plots of land, in total 1370 hectares were being cultivated by these households. Per hectare, a household received two food rations<sup>15</sup>, which were supposed to be bartered for agricultural inputs for production of wheat, green peas and/or sesame seeds. In 1999 the programme was expanded with 1500 new households. At the same time, the 300 households who started in 1998, were included again. The participants were selected from the list prepared by the jamoat authorities for free food aid. In 1999, the households received one food ration and an agricultural inputs package. The inputs package consisted of 20 kg wheat seeds and 20 kg of fertilizers (all imported from Russia), with a cost of US\$ 7.50 per package. The composition of this input package was copied from the DG8-funded programmes of GAA in Tajikistan. The inputs are sufficient for the cultivation of a kitchen garden plot of about 0.1 ha (10 sots of land). As a rule of thumb, 180 to 220 kg of wheat seeds should be sown per hectare, which will produce a harvest between 800 kg (dry farming) and 3000 kg (irrigated) per hectare. This means a multiplication factor of 4 to 14, depending on the overall farming conditions. The IFRC/RCST have the intention to expand this successful food security programme in 2000 and beyond, so that the caseload for free food distributions in rural areas within two years can be substantially reduced. The general idea is to continue provision of seeds inputs to a household for two to three years, while the provision of food rations to the households taking part in the agricultural inputs programme after one or two years is phased out.

In 1999, Mission East started with a pilot project on the provision of cocks and laying hens and distribution of tomato seedlings to about 100 households nearby Kulyab town. A significant feature of the programme was that especially the somewhat better off households (not included in free food distributions anymore) were covered. Although the programme showed a positive impact on the access to eggs (high-quality food), the households appeared to need assistance for getting their birds vaccinated. Also, a survey showed that there is a continuing need for provision of chicken feed to the households as they are not willing or not able to buy it themselves. Therefore, it should be concluded that provision of chicken does not appear to be a viable option for self-reliant food security.

---

<sup>15</sup> One food ration comprises 25 kg of wheat flour, 10 kg or rice, 5 litres of vegetables oil and 1 kg of iodized salt., equivalent to a cost per ration of US\$ 17.50.

## ANNEX G. ECHO 1998/1999 FOOD SECTOR BUDGETS IN TAJIKISTAN

For vulnerable group programmes, food security programmes and food-for-work. Amounts in EURO (%)

	GAA Garm (50,000 ben)	GAA Khojent (50,000 ben)	AKF GBAO (80,000 ben)	ME Kulyab (46,000 ben)	IFRC RRS/Dush (76,500 ben)	WFP Khatlon (257,000 ben)	Total
			n.a.			n.a.	n.a.
<b>Expat staff</b>	38,000 ( 2.4%)	38,000 ( 2.7%)	-	83,600 (11.9%)	117,800 ( 4.3%)		
<b>Local staff</b>	82,200 ( 5.1%)	44,000 ( 3.1%)	-	61,520 ( 8.9%)	66,680 ( 2.4%)		
<b>Food stuffs</b>	739,232 (46.2%)	643,132 (45.9%)		375,325 (53.6%)	2,039,301 (74.2%)		
<b>Agric. Inputs</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Emerg. Rehab</b>	107,120 ( 6.7%)	103,000 ( 7.4%)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Int. Transport</b>	418,583 (26.2%)	353,966 (25.3%)	-	-	345,829 (12.6%)		
<b>Local transport</b>	90,526 ( 5.7%)	92,019 ( 6.6%)		75,903 (10.8%)	97,624 ( 3.5%)		
<b>Training</b>	-	-	-	-	1,200 (0.04%)	-	-
<b>Other Services</b>	100,000 ( 6.3%)	79,000 ( 5.6%)	-	63,456 ( 9.1%)	32,200 ( 1.2%)		
<b>Visibility progr</b>	10,000 ( 0.6%)	10,000 ( 0.7%)		6,096 ( 0.9%)	37,500 ( 1.4%)	-	-
<b>Other</b>	5,000 ( 0.3%)	-	-	-	-		
<b>Administration</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Reserve</b>	14,340 ( 0.1%)	36,884 ( 2.6%)	-	34,099 ( 4.9%)	11,866 ( 0.4%)		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,600,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>1,400,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>500,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>700,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>2,750,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>1,250,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	

Prepared by the ECHO Evaluation Mission Jan/Febr 2000

## ANNEX H. ECHO 1999/2000 FOOD SECTOR BUDGETS IN TAJIKISTAN

For vulnerable group programmes, food security programmes and food-for-work. Amounts in EURO (%)

	<b>GAA Garm</b> (50,000 ben)	<b>GAA Khojent</b> (50,000 ben)	<b>AKF GBAO</b> (80,000 ben)	<b>ME Kulyab</b> (46,000 ben)	<b>IFRC RRS/Dush</b> (76,500 ben)	<b>WFP Khatlon</b> (257,000 ben)	<b>Total</b>
<b>Expat staff</b>	108,000 ( 6.8%)	54,000 ( 3.9%)	-	72,000 (10.3%)	153,000 ( 4.9%)	121,500 (12.2%)	<b>508,500</b> <b>( 6.1%)</b>
<b>Local staff</b>	96,240 ( 6.0%)	84,840 ( 6.1%)	-	65,400 ( 9.3%)	74,130 ( 2.4%)	9,990 ( 1.0%)	<b>330,600</b> <b>( 4.0%)</b>
<b>Food stuffs</b>	570,220 (35.6%)	550,372 (39.3%)	343,098 (68.6%)	365,902 (52.3%)	2,444,602 (78.9%)	438,084 (43.8%)	<b>4,712,278</b> <b>(57%)</b>
<b>Agric. Inputs</b>	-	-	-	-	120,000 ( 3.9%)	-	<b>120,000</b> <b>( 1.4%)</b>
<b>Emerg. Rehab</b>	100,000 ( 6.2%)	100,000 ( 7.1%)	-	-	-	-	<b>200,000</b> <b>( 2.4%)</b>
<b>Int. Transport</b>	392,815 (24.6%)	364,605 (26.0%)	-	-	-	220,670 (22.1%)	<b>978,090</b> <b>(11.8%)</b>
<b>Local transport</b>	129,842 ( 8.1%)	92,438 ( 6.6%)	153,643 (30.7%)	82,247 (11.7%)	103,446 ( 3.3%)	148,698 (14.9%)	<b>710,314</b> <b>( 8.6%)</b>
<b>Training</b>	-	-	-	-	1,200 (0.04%)	-	<b>1,200</b> <b>( 0.0%)</b>
<b>Other Services</b>	122,180 ( 7.6%)	80,900 ( 5.8%)	-	54,578 ( 7.8%)	45,680 ( 1.5%)	4,230 ( 0.4%)	<b>307,568</b> <b>( 3.7%)</b>
<b>Visibility progr</b>	10,000 ( 0.6%)	10,000 ( 0.7%)	2,000 ( 0.4%)	6,875 ( 1.0%)	11,500 ( 0.4%)	-	<b>40,375</b> <b>( 0.5%)</b>
<b>Other</b>	-	-	-	-	-	56,590 ( 5.7%)	<b>56,590</b> <b>( 0.7%)</b>
<b>Administration</b>	68,818 ( 4.3%)	60,287 ( 4.3%)	1,259 ( 0.3%)	44,500 ( 6.4%)	126,571 ( 4.1%)	-	<b>301,435</b> <b>( 3.6%)</b>
<b>Reserve</b>	1,885 ( 0.1%)	2,557 ( 0.2%)	-	8,498 ( 1.2%)	19,871 ( 0.6%)	237 (0.02%)	<b>33,048</b> <b>( 0.4%)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,600,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>1,400,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>500,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>700,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>3,100,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>1,000,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>	<b>8,300,000</b> <b>(100%)</b>

Prepared by the ECHO Evaluation Mission Jan/Febr 2000