



## EVALUATION OF ECHO'S 1999 TO 2002 FUNDED ACTIONS IN SUDAN

April 3 – July 7, 2003

### WATER AND SANITATION, FOOD SECURITY AND NON FOOD ITEMS DISTRIBUTIONS



Philippe Lothe

**S.H.E.R. Ingénieurs-Conseils s.a.**

[www.sher.be](http://www.sher.be)

**This Evaluation Report has been financed by and produced at the request of the European Commission for a total amount of 135.250 €(ECHO/EVA/210/2002/01011).  
Total of ECHO funds for period 1999 – 2002 was 58.424.000 €**

**The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultants only.**

July 7, 2003

## Table of contents

<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>A. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>B. RELEVANCE OF ECHO INTERVENTIONS.....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
B.1. WATER AND SANITATION .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
B.2. FOOD SECURITY .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
B.3. NON FOOD ITEMS.....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>C. EFFICIENCY OF INTERVENTIONS.....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
C.1. WATER AND SANITATION .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
C.2. FOOD SECURITY .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
C.3. NFI AND OTHER RELIEF ACTIVITIES .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>D. EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERVENTIONS.....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
D.1. WATSAN .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
D.2. FOOD SECURITY INTERVENTIONS .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
D.3. NFI AND OTHER RELIEF ACTIVITIES .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>E. IMPACT OF INTERVENTIONS .....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
E.1. WATSAN .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
E.2. FOOD SECURITY ACTIVITIES .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
E.3. NFI AND OTHER RELIEF ACTIVITIES .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>F. SUSTAINABILITY, COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND LRRD ISSUES.....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
F.1. SUSTAINABILITY .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
F.2. LRRD .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>G. RECOMMANDATIONS.....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
G.1. GENERAL RECOMMANDATIONS .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
G.2. WATER AND SANITATION .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
G.3. FOOD SECURITY .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
G.4. NFI .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>H. LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>Description</b>
ACF	Action contre la Faim
AHA	Animal Health Auxiliary
ARI	Accurate Respiratory Infection
CARE	Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere
CAHW	Community Animal Health Worker
CMA	Christian Mission Aid
CSB	Corn Soy Blend
CHW	Community Health Worker
COSV	Coord Committee of the Org for Voluntary Service
CVHW	Commission of Voluntary and Humanitarian Workers
DOP	Declaration of principles
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Office
EPI	Expanded Program for Immunisation
EP+R	Emergency Preparedness and Relief
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
GAA	German Agro Action
GOS	Government of Sudan
HAC	Humanitarian Assistance Commission
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IAC	International Advisory Committee
HRs	Human rights
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDP	Internal Displaced Person
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
LOU	Letter of Understanding
LRRD	Link to Relief, Rehabilitation and Development
MOH	Ministry Of Health
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSF	Médecins Sans Frontières
NDA	National Democratic Alliance
NFI	Non Food Items
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation

---

NID	National Immunisation Day
NIF	National Islamic Front
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
OLS	Operation Lifeline in Sudan (UN)
PHC	Primary Health Care
PHCC	Primary Health Care Centre
PHCU	Primary Health Care Unit
PSF	Pharmaciens Sans Frontières
RASS	Relief Association for Southern Sudan
SCF	Save the Children Fund (UK)
SFP	Supplementary Feeding Programme
SMEWES	State Ministry of Engineering and WES
SMOH	State Ministry Of Health
SMPU	State Ministry of Public Utilities
SPDF	Sudan Popular Democratic Front
SPLA/M	Sudan People's Liberation Army / Movement
SRRA	Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Association
SRRC	Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Committee
SSIA/M	South Sudan Independence Army / Movement
STD	Sexual Transmitted Diseases
TA	Technical Assistant (Assistance)
TBA	Traditional Birth Assistant
TB	Tuberculosis
TFC	Therapeutic Feeding Centre
TOR	Terms of References
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WATSAN	Water and Sanitation
WES	Water and Environmental Sanitation
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organisation
WVI	World Vision International

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

This document reports on the sectoral analysis of the different water and sanitation, food security and emergency relief projects implemented by the partners in Southern Sudan under ECHO funding.

The evaluation was based on specific visits to field and on different meetings with staff in Nairobi, Lokichoggio and Khartoum: 13 projects were finally visited (8 in the South and 5 in the North).

No travel authorisation was received to visit the UNICEF and SCF UK Water and Sanitation projects in the North (Darfur and Nuba mountains). Nevertheless, the visit of other Water and Sanitation projects, implemented by UNICEF with other funds, made it possible for the evaluator to get a quite good idea about the way the partner works. Moreover, the careful reading of two evaluation reports, one on the ECHO UNICEF project in Kordofan (2001) and the other in Darfur and the Nuba Mountains (2002) gave important additional information to the evaluator.

### Water and sanitation

- Providing drinking water and improving sanitation is always relevant. These activities are essential in all situations, because –without water- there is no ability to feed oneself, no health, no life.
- An emergency or rehabilitation project has to start with a precise identification of the recipients and their needs in the zone of the project –and this, according to the evaluator, was seldom done.
- The rehabilitation of water points was seldom considered. The ignorance of the real situation in the ground by the partners was evident when reading the proposals; an incomplete knowledge of the real situation by the partners evaluated became evident when reading their proposals.
- This suggests that a first activity should have been a quick survey of the real situation of the target area, including number of persons, geographical distribution of the population, actual access to water, existing infrastructures, subsoil conditions, and propositions of the best technical solution for reliable water supply in the area, e.g. new boreholes, rehabilitation work, type of pumps needed, best location of the waterworks and for latrines, technical training and hygiene education, etc.
- Following the budget and the size of the job, a programme of total coverage of the needs in drinking water supply would have needed more than one year.
- The indicators chosen were the number of boreholes or infrastructures implemented and should have been the number of people served with and ultimately using drinking water.
- Most of the time, the means identified by the partner were not sufficient to carry out good quality work, e.g., lack of a water engineer, rig not appropriate. Sometimes, it was assumed work would be the responsibility of another partner -with no mention of this work by that partner in his proposal. This shows an unprofessional behaviour of such partners.
- The problem of water distribution and sanitation in towns was also tackled with an obvious lack of professionalism: water points, open wells or low depth boreholes and dry latrines of low quality have continued to multiply.
- Most of the boreholes in Bar el Ghazal only access shallow water. This type of infrastructure, the evaluator found, have not brought a durable solutions to the problem of drinking water supply for the rural locations visited, because unfortunately, the shallow water is, most of the time, not safe, nor a reliable source year-round. The absence of compressors makes the majority of the partners not use the most appropriate drilling operation.
- The transport-related high costs result in a reduction in the number of water points habilitated. But the costs of transport are known from the time of developing the proposal ; the high costs are thus not an acceptable explanation for the small number of water points implemented.

- Partners wait until the communities come to ask. This approach, which seems "participative", is not acceptable in the dramatic circumstances under which the distribution of drinking water is needed.
- The impact of the water activities is thus relatively weak. Indeed, this is true if one considers the quality of the work being low, the volumes of water available also being low or requiring great pumping efforts which discourages the users and makes them go to draw water from the marsh where water is more easily accessible.

### **Food security**

- Often, food security and food distribution are confused. For the last few years, a distinction has been clearly made: food distribution is a WFP job, and food security is the responsibility of NGOs (essentially through seeds and farm tools distribution).
- Activities like vegetable gardening were seldom proposed. This kind of activity is not only important to vary the diet and provide vitamins and essential minerals, but also as an income generating activity (and the lack of money is an important issue for the cost-sharing operations in health, water, etc.). An exception is the dynamic gardening activity from GAA (German Agro Action) in Bentiu.
- The activities in food security were at the borderline of relevance in the frame of emergency operations and did not have indicators of impact in the respective proposals.
- Partners have showed flexibility in targeting the most vulnerable in the population.
- The majority of the food security operations were far from efficient. Even if seeds and tools were distributed efficiently, the follow-up of their use was not satisfactory
- One partner (Vétérinaires Sans Frontières, VSF) worked to improve animal health, together with the FED-funded PACE project. The PACE project and ECHO funding did indeed help eradicate rinderpest.
- A system of cost-sharing was set up to cover the costs of animal medicines and sometimes vaccines, the payment of ad-hoc trained technicians and their supervisors. Unfortunately, this system (still) suffers from problems of transparency, after the CAHWs (Community Animal Health Workers) take their fees.
- The activities of animal health care have had an unquestionable impact on animal health, but perhaps not directly on food security. Indeed, the breeding made by the pastors is of the "contemplative" type: the cattle is regarded as a mode of saving or prestige more than a means of having meat to eat, neither for oneself even, nor for the community. The sale of an animal is not made to earn money, but only to get money when necessary. Certain animals are kept nearly ten years for sentimental reasons (to remember a dowry, a marriage, etc).

### **Non Food Items**

- The proposals seen were very poor in term of identifying the exact number of beneficiaries to receive NFIs.
- The indicators in the proposals were only focused on the number of kits distributed. The activity was identified as a distribution of kits, without follow up and supervision of the good use and non-sale of the components of the kits. Only GAA has a system (identification by different colors) for identify and monitor the recipients and avoid the abuse. The beneficiaries are besides, involved in the distribution and frequently consulted about priorities and appropriateness of the relief package.
- The NFIs distribution was relevant in certain emergency cases, mostly when people were fleeing a military clash, a drought or a flood.
- The kits were provided on time at the places where they were needed for distribution.

## Sustainability

- Limited means, and poor professional work, have led to poor quality (limited sustainability) achievements in drinking water supply. This is a lack of efficiency and has important consequences on sustainability. Indeed, how to persuade the recipients to deal with and thus to invest money in infrastructures which are of bad quality and of which they will have to support significant expenses of rehabilitation.
- The problem of the availability of spare parts for the pumps was brought up by all the partners.
- The activities related to food security were, most of the time, considered by the partners as emergency when they were more of a rehabilitation nature.
- Free distributions, by definition, do not have any sustainability.
- The activities of veterinary care have had a certain sustainability, because a system of sharing the costs was set up.
- The NFIs distribution follows the same rules as the free distribution of seeds or tools: it has no sustainability, except if educational activities are added.
- Even if the sustainability of the activities carried out in an emergency is poor, the infrastructures set up have to have a certain life-time and require to be taken in charge for their operation and maintenance.

## Conclusion

- The principal lesson learned from this evaluation is the need for working with a multi-sectoral approach, because all is linked: drinking water, sanitation, food security, hygiene and health.
- Each partner must keep his field of competence and the activities of the various partners in the same area must be better co-ordinated.
- The emergency and the lack of resources, mainly due to the high transport costs, were the two reasons mentioned for failing to complete work of adequate quality.
- The distributions of seeds, agricultural tools and NFI are, most of the time, passive distributions not framed as part of sustainable activities.
- Neither the emergency, nor the "partner does the best he can" approach can justify bad quality work, especially at the high prices paid. This does not want to say that there is no impact, but that the impact of the activities could be better if the physical achievements were of better quality.
- The logframes prepared by partners were very poor. Most of the proposals confused the specific objectives and the activities; therefore, the indicators did not reflect the expected impact, but only progress in implementation. Most of the time, beneficiaries were not well targeted.
- Using the word "emergency" seemed to be sufficient for partners to justify the relevance of their projects.
- The unit costs of activities performed seemed very high to the evaluator, even if most of the time, it was not possible to cut total expenditures for an activity, including the part funded by ECHO. One of the explanations for this is that transport costs are exceedingly high in Southern Sudan, and most of the materials have to be transported by plane.
- The quality of the work is generally poor. Minimum standards are not respected. This is due to a lack of professionalism of the technical staff and the absence of technical supervision. This observation is most visible in water supply activities.

### Some recommendations

- Work must be done by specialised different partners, each one in one field, under the co-ordination of a "leader" partner per county.
- Work with the partners in preparing their logframes and to relate their logframes to that of the respective global plan. Compel partners to prepare better logframes, and to stay in the specific area of their expertise, with specialised staff.
- Train the partners for the preparation of correct logframes that clearly distinguish objectives, results, activities and objectively verifiable indicators in order to better measure the impact of the activities (and not only reading their rather vague progress reports).
- Compel partners to have at least one professional staff for the surveys and the supervision of the work, and verify his work regularly.
- Strongly ask partners to carry out drillings by respecting minimum standards and to organise the routine supervision of work by a qualified technical office.
- Seeds and tools should be only made available on a loan basis or using the scheme "seeds or tools for work", even if symbolically to avoid the development of a dependent mentality.
- Compel the partners to use the FAO seeds laboratory in Lokichoggio before any seeds distribution, and insist the partners follow the recommendations of the laboratory.
- Select one partner leader in the activities of food security (FAO) and compel other partners to adopt the same approach. This agency has already a leader role in the TSU (Technical Supervision Unit) in Lokichoggio, but this unit is limited to make needs assessments. FAO should have a leader role in the carrying out of the activities relating to food security.
- Find a solution to the problem of cost-sharing for animal health care, at least preserving the payment of the CAHWs and their supervisors.
- The NFIs distribution to returnees should be complemented by a hygiene awareness activity.
- To increase the number of technical staff in charge of the follow-up of the activities both in Nairobi and in Khartoum ECHO offices: i.e. engineers in Water and Sanitation, agricultural engineer.