

GCP/INT/750/FIP

**EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN IN IRRIGATION AND
WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT FOR IMPROVED
HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY, NUTRITION AND HEALTH
(WIN PROJECT)**

Report of the Midterm Evaluation Mission

July 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Executive Summary (Main Findings and Recommendations)**
- II. Introduction**
- III. Background and Context**
- IV. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design**
 - A. Justification
 - B. Objectives
 - C. Project Design
- V. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management**
 - A. Project Budget and Expenditure
 - B. Activities and Outputs
 - 1. Zambia
 - 2. Nepal
 - 3. Cambodia
 - C. Government Support
 - D. Project Management
 - E. Technical and Operational Backstopping
- VI. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness**
 - A. Effects and Impact
 - 1. Zambia
 - 2. Nepal
 - 3. Cambodia
 - B. Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results
 - C. Cost-effectiveness
 - D. Major Factors Affecting the Project Results
- VII. Conclusions and Recommendations**
- Annex I Terms of Reference**
- Annex II List of Persons Met**

I. Executive Summary (Main Findings and Recommendations)

The mission's overall conclusion is that the WIN project is potentially significant as an action-research project to develop gender-sensitive approaches to particular aspects of local community development. Its novelty comes from the strong effort to promote joint approaches to address commonly problems found at village level.

The expected contribution from the project has not been defined in a sufficiently precise manner. There is a need to re-define the project around a single purpose, which could include different elements. This should be done, taking advantage of the fact that project implementation has been slow.

Recommendation 1: UNF/UNFIP and FAO should the extend project for 1 ½ - 2 years, within existing resources, subject to re-formulation along the lines indicated below.

Recommendation 2: Before the end of 2002, there should be an International WIN Workshop, involving the main stakeholders and using an outside facilitator to conduct it. The Workshop should produce a revised project document that includes:

1. reformulated project objectives and a list of major outputs to be produced by the project;
2. a coordinated work plan;
3. more precise identification of intended project beneficiaries;
4. a defined project management structure and operational procedures, with responsibilities of various stakeholders;
5. a unified format for project progress reporting, both for countries and for the project as a whole.

Recommendation 3: The long-term development objective of this project should have a gender/socio-cultural, rather than irrigation focus. Accordingly, the mission suggests that the Workshop consider re-formulation of the long-term objective as:

“Rural, poor women participate effectively in the development of their communities, particularly in the areas of water resource management, community health and nutrition”.

Recommendation 4: The project should now focus much more on developing common approaches, learning lessons and documenting them for future application. Therefore, it is suggested that a more focused immediate objective for the WIN project would be:

“Methodologies are developed and applied for gender-sensitive strategies in water resources management, community health and nutrition”.

The suggested re-formulation does not imply a major shift in the interventions being carried out, but rather focuses on purposeful action-research.

Recommendation 5: In each country, national consultants who have had significant involvement with the project should prepare a synthesis of national experience and lessons learned, to be presented at a national seminar (three seminars in total) at the end of the project. Should funds be available, the three National Coordinators should attend each of the workshops.

Recommendation 6: Using existing district and national teams, the number of sites in each country should be increased in line with resources available to support such an expansion.

Recommendation 7: In re-formulating the project and extending it to new sites, the methodology outlined in the project document should be followed and the process documented. Reasons for site selection, choice of interventions and lessons expected to be learned from each should be specified.

Recommendation 8: KAP (Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices) surveys should be used as part of project effects and impact monitoring and training provided in how to conduct them. Such surveys should also involve non-WIN farmers in the same village, as a control and to assess the degree to which the community as a whole benefits from WIN, as opposed to those participating directly in groups.

Recommendation 9: WIN project resources should not be used for design, installation and construction of irrigation equipment, except for limited demonstration purposes. Furthermore, the project should not engage in academic studies without a clear relationship to the project purpose (e.g. ergonomics of treadle pump use).

Recommendation 10: WIN should assist in determining to what extent a Farmers' Field School approach is actually being applied and if so, to what extent this approach is suitable for integrated methods such as those being advocated in WIN.

Recommendation 11: The CTA should receive reports at least twice a year on the project's financial status. The CTA should also approve all country work plans, before they are submitted to FAO HQ. The TOR of the CTA should be revised accordingly.

Recommendation 12: As part of her mission visits to each country, the CTA should brief concerned staff on relevant developments in other project countries.

Recommendation 13: National Project Coordinators should consult with other UN agencies and NGOs, to draw lessons from their experience, particularly in the areas of community health and sanitation and nutrition. Cooperative working arrangements with other agencies should be further encouraged in these areas particularly.

II. Introduction

A midterm evaluation of GCP/INT/750/FIP (hereafter called the WIN project) was scheduled to take place after two years of project life, i.e. in mid-2001. However, because of the rather late start in project activities, it was decided to postpone the midterm evaluation until the present time, approximately 6 months before the end of the current phase.

The midterm evaluation mission was to make recommendations for any changes in the orientation and design of the project and for future follow-up. Because project implementation has been slow in terms of delivery, the evaluation should be considered as formative, intended to re-direct future activities, rather than a definitive assessment of the project. The terms of reference are attached as Annex I. Key persons met by the mission in each country are listed in Annex II.

The evaluation visited all three of the WIN participating countries according to the following schedule:

Zambia: 3 June – 8 June

Nepal: 24 June – 29 June

Cambodia: 30 June – 5 July

The mission also met with concerned officers from the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific on 8 July and completed its draft evaluation report in the field. Debriefing was held at FAO Headquarters on 12 July.

The evaluation team consisted of four members. Two visited all three countries. They were: Mr. Robert Moore, FAO Senior Evaluation Officer (Team Leader) and Ms Elizabeth Visser, independent consultant, representing the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP). Each participating country was to assign a team member for the duration of the mission in the country. National team members were:

Zambia: Mr. Mwase Phiri

Nepal: Mr. Binod Sharma

Cambodia did not assign a national team member.

The evaluation team would like to thank all the persons who answered our questions and gave their views on the activities of the project. Special thanks go to the FAO Representations in each of the countries visited that provided all the needed logistical support to carry out the mission.

III. Background and Context

The WIN project resulted from the interests of various technical units within FAO to find ways to work together in an interdisciplinary fashion while addressing concerns within their own programmes. The project idea was developed by officers from the Land and Water Division (AGL), the Nutrition Division (ESN) and the Women and Population Division (SDW). The main focus was to broaden the relevance FAO's Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) by taking into account other rural development concerns identified by local communities.

SPFS is a flagship programme of the Organization, primarily aimed at rapid increases in food production and productivity. In so doing, SPFS also strives to improve food access, increase farmers' income, and promote rural employment, social equity and gender sensitivity. The SPFS operates in the first instance through a pilot phase, which includes four components:

- water control – essentially promotion of small-scale technologies for water harvesting, irrigation and drainage;
- intensification;
- diversification of farm production; and
- constraints analysis – identification of socio-economic constraints to the extension of the pilot phase.

Based on the results of the pilot phase, there may be an extension into an expansion phase focusing on adoption of appropriate national policies and agricultural investment programmes.

Cambodia, Nepal and Zambia were three of the earliest countries to participate in the SPFS. FAO's assessment of the pilot phase of the SPFS in all three countries was largely positive and it was felt that there were possibilities to build on this experience to better address the constraints faced by rural people, and in particular women, in household food security, nutrition and health. Thus, the project played to the concerns of AGL, with its interest in improving irrigation and agricultural production, of ESN with its focus on nutrition and health and of SDW in order to improve the livelihoods of disadvantaged rural women.

The opportunity to implement such a project was made possible when funds were made available from the United Nations Foundation (UNF) through UNFIP. A project proposal was initially prepared by officers from AGL and ESN. The idea of the project was to build on the pilot phase of the SPFS, with a greater emphasis on initial problem identification by communities and, most particularly, a coordinated approach to problem-solving by local line agencies. An important feature of WIN was that it should work within the framework of the SPFS, or SPFS-related activities that included an irrigation component. For Cambodia, it was the SPFS itself. In Nepal, it was the World Bank-funded On-Farm Water Management (OFWM) Programme (for which FAO was responsible for technical assistance) while in Zambia they were the IFAD-funded Smallholder Irrigation and Water Use Programme (SIWUP) and the Belgian-funded, FAO implemented project for Improvement of Household Food Security and Nutrition (IHFSAN).

The project document was discussed extensively within FAO before its submission to UNF/UNFIP. It is understood that earlier drafts included a larger technical assistance component, but the version submitted for approval to UNF/UNFIP had this reduced

considerably. The project was approved for a duration of three years and a total donor budget of \$1,691,011.

IV. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design

A. Justification

While the project document recognizes the importance of a more holistic approach to irrigation development, the relevance of this project is not made immediately clear. The document states that many irrigation development projects have not sufficiently considered gender issues. This has led to decreased access of women to the water resources and as a result, a plethora of undesirable consequences including decreased food availability, variety and safety at household level, poor health care and ultimately malnutrition. This is not new; the consequences of not considering gender in project planning, implementation and follow-up have been widely documented for many years now.

The project looks at this problem from the perspective of a need to adopt approaches to irrigation and water resources development that mitigate possible negative environmental impacts and ensure benefits are spread more equally, including to women. Thus, the unstated project rationale was that on-going water resources development activities (presumably including those like the SPFS implemented by FAO) did not sufficiently take into account gender, health and nutrition considerations. By taking a more holistic approach, the WIN project was to develop methodologies that could be applied in other irrigation and water resources development activities.

The project document very much looks at the project from the viewpoint of AGL, i.e. how to improve a “normal” irrigation project. It clearly mentions that the project was to work at SPFS sites and enhance women’s empowerment, household food security and health, and states in general the ways in which existing approaches are deficient. It states that WIN will develop “innovative approaches”, for improving agricultural production, health and nutrition, through participatory mechanisms. However, it leaves open what these may be and does not state the deficiencies of the SPFS, which is purported to be gender-sensitive already. Health and nutrition were generally not specific concerns of the SPFS but surely could have emerged from the constraints analysis, at least theoretically. A more analytical approach of the role of the SPFS and how WIN could improve it would have been useful.

In a certain way, the choice of the three countries for the project is curious. While all were SPFS countries, the project document mentions the importance of gender, health and nutrition policy in each of them. A gender-focused project would be relevant if clear indications exist that – notwithstanding the gender-sensitive policy environment – women’s issues are not sufficiently considered. Such indications are not made in the WIN document for the three countries. Again, further elaboration would have been useful.

The project document thus suffers from a lack of clear expression of the problem, or rather why the problem exists. Not surprisingly, this led to a definition of objectives that was very broad and unfocused. It would have been better to define the project in terms of methodology development, to identify the main problems and bottlenecks experienced in the translation of gender mainstreaming and policies into the actual application thereof. In fact the most innovative aspects were on the institutional side, i.e. bringing together of various actors in countries, including line agencies and NGOs, to make a common approach to identification, planning and implementation of solutions for community development, with varying degrees of success, each providing its own lessons. While this aspect is mentioned briefly in the project document, the mission feels that this should have received more emphasis. The fact

that the project was small and relied largely on existing capacity and resources was also innovative and this also could have been more emphasized.

B. Objectives

The project's stated overall objective is "to ensure the sustainability of irrigation development and its positive impact on household food security, nutrition and the health situation of the local population, as well as regional and national food security". This extremely broad statement seems to suggest a project working towards sustainable irrigation systems and does not mention gender or women at all, which is not in line with the project title, "Empowerment of Women in Irrigation and Water Resources Management for Improved Household Food Security, Nutrition and Health". The development objective is supported by four so-called "immediate objectives", i.e.

- Increase women's capacity to participate in and influence irrigation and water resources management and increase their access to productive resources;
- Assist poor households in increasing and diversifying agricultural production for auto-consumption and increased farm income, introducing time-saving and income-generating technologies;
- Incorporate public health considerations in the design and development of irrigation and rural water management projects, including safe domestic water supply and preventive measures against water-borne diseases, at household, scheme and community level;
- Strengthen the local and national capacity to effectively assist in the incorporation of gender, household food security, nutrition and health into irrigation and water management projects.

The immediate objectives are poorly expressed. Each of them could have been the subject of a project in itself. They lack specificity in terms of target beneficiaries (which are likely to be different from one objective to another) and time. Most importantly, post-project success indicators are not provided. In most projects, this is not a serious problem because they are usually focused on a single area and success indicators can be inferred. WIN's broad objectives make such inference impossible. Indeed, in the mission's discussions with staff in the three project countries, the CTA and the core team in Rome, it was apparent that these objectives have been interpreted in different ways. Some persons have given emphasis to development of technologies and distribution of inputs. Others have stressed joint planning and conduct of activities. Others have "compartmentalized" the project, on the apparent assumption that addressing in one way or another each of the immediate objectives will result in achievement of the desired developmental outcome. There is little consensus on what is the sum of the various parts.

There is a clear need to re-define the project objectives. In the mission's view, the objectives should relate to application of planning methodologies (see Findings and Recommendations).

C. Project Design

In view of the above, it is not surprising that the mission found overall project design to be deficient. Because of the unclear justification and poorly formulated objectives, the cause-and-effect linkage between problems identified and solutions proposed by the project is not apparent.

The list of project outputs exemplifies this design problem. Many of the project outputs are in fact objectives in themselves, e.g. increased representation of women in water users' associations, increased household income through sale of surplus agricultural production,

improved nutrition, hygiene, food security and health status. The relation of some outputs to the overall objective is not clear, e.g. construction of irrigation infrastructure, which would presumably be part of any irrigation project.

The project document is better and rather more specific on the methodology to be followed for establishing each national plan of operations, starting with an initial agreement for arrangements for implementation of the project, followed by a tentative country work plan, local planning-cum-training workshops to identify food insecure groups, develop a strategy and design a local benchmark survey. A participatory constraints analysis was to be conducted at each site and, after analysis, a national plan of operations was to be developed, to be discussed at a national workshop involving many stakeholders. While this methodology appears sound, in no case was it followed as indicated in the project document.

The project document states that farmer training should be undertaken following the Farmers' Field School (FFS) approach, as was done for the SPFS. The document ties the training to the various cropping seasons in each country and thus is closely related to the agricultural production component of the project. The same can be said for the technical and extension staff training. However, the document is silent on how gender, health and nutrition training could be woven into the FFS approach and it was left for each country to decide how this would be done.

The project document contains little information about implementation arrangements, although it was stated that local institutions, government services and NGOs should not be remunerated for interventions falling within their normal mandates. This was a good idea to ensure sustainability. However, participation in WIN was a part-time job for the persons involved in its implementation. As a result, special care should have been taken to ensure that clear strategies were developed for project implementation, with simple and straightforward indicators for assessing project progress.

Details on implementation arrangements (including support from other irrigation development projects) were considered to be an initial, post-project approval activity. In discussions with the core team, it was pointed out that the project document was prepared in some haste because of the need to submit it for donor approval. The absence of detail for arrangements, a normal part of project documents, had considerable consequences for subsequent project implementation in all countries, and particularly in Zambia.

V. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management

A. Project Budget and Expenditure

Although the project has been operational since 1999, as of 5 July 2002 only 31% (\$518,669) of the total budget of \$1,691,025 had been entered as expenditure in the FAO accounts. This is extremely low by normal standards. As a percentage, delivery has been highest for inland travel (96% of the allocation in the project budget) and international consultants (66%). Most of the items of in-country expenditure are vastly underspent. Only \$44,566 of the total amount for contracts has been spent (9%), the training budget has been only 25% used; delivery of materials and supplies stands at 23% while equipment is at 26%. FAO Mission costs have been 18% spent, but that will increase after the current midterm review mission which represents almost 20% of the total allocation for this particular budget item (\$30,000 out of \$149,000).

Allocations are made for each of the three countries for National Consultants and Temporary Labour; Inland Travel; Contracts; Training; Materials and Supplies; Equipment; and General Operating Costs. Individual country allocations for expenditure were made in 2001 and 2002, when project implementation began in earnest. Expenditure by country as at 5 July 2002 is shown in the Table below:

Country	2000 expend.	2001 allocation	2001 expend.	Delivery	2002 allocation	2002 expend. (to 5.7)	Delivery (to 5.7)	Country % of total expend. to date
Cambodia	\$9,780	\$125,000	\$100,980	81%	\$109,000	\$41,193	38%	45%
Nepal	\$2,402	\$125,000	\$57,942	46%	\$119,000	\$35,758	30%	29%
Zambia	\$9,641	\$125,000	\$61,637	49%	\$179,305	\$17,832	10%	26%
Total	\$21,823	\$375,000	\$220,559	59%	\$407,305	\$94,783	23%	100%

Although all countries have underspent their allocations, Cambodia has spent more than any of the other countries. Relative to the others, Cambodia has spent much more on equipment, materials and supplies (78% of total project expenditure on these items), training (56% of total project expenditure) and national consultants (43% of total project expenditure). Nepal represents 77% of the total expenditure on contracts, but as noted before this item as a whole has been very little used as NGOs have played a very minor role in the project compared to what was envisaged.

The overall underspending in Nepal can be partly attributed to the prevailing security situation in the country that has hampered operations, but the extremely low rate of expenditure in Zambia for 2002 is particularly disturbing. The project has had trouble gearing up and very little has been done so far, compared to the others.

The extremely slow rate of delivery means that there is considerable scope for re-designing the project within existing resources. Even if it is optimistically assumed that FAO Headquarters-controlled items are delivered at the same dollar level in 2002 as in 2001, in addition the entire amount for the evaluation mission is spent, and delivery of the country-based items is at the same 59% as last year, there would still be some \$952,000 to carry forward to 2003 and beyond. The mission's recommendations for the future are based on that assumption.

B. Activities and Outputs

The project was declared operational in December 1999 with the appointment of a CTA. Although not foreseen in the project document, APOs were assigned to the project in each country to assist in project implementation. The original CTA resigned from the project in July 2000 and was replaced in October 2000 by the present incumbent.

1. Zambia

Project activities in Zambia were slow to get started and are still at an early stage, especially considering that the project became operational in December 1999. The project began in Zambia in March 2000 with the appointment of a National Project Coordinator (who was also National Project Director for the SIWUP project).

Project management

While conceptually it was useful for WIN to be intimately involved with the SIWUP project, in practice the arrangement did not work satisfactorily. The original National Project Coordinator (NPC), who was also NPC for SIWUP, left WIN in September 2000, because administratively it was not possible for him to be paid as NPC for both SIWUP and WIN-Zambia. The present NPC took over in January 2001. It was only at this point that a national team began to be put in place effectively. The APO for the project began her assignment in March 2000. There was not a clear definition of roles between the APO and the NPC and this led to some problems in implementation that were exacerbated by FAO Headquarters communicating directly with the APO on many project matters. This situation reportedly improved after intervention by the FAOR. National consultants have been recruited on a part-time basis in accordance with the project document. Logistical support for WIN from SIWUP was not always easily forthcoming, and the project had to rely to a large extent on the office of the FAO representative, in particular for transportation facilities and computer access.

National Plan of Operations

The National Plan of Operations was the first envisaged activity in the project document. It was to define the “agreement, conditions and arrangements for the implementation of the project...(and) the institutional framework, responsibilities and detailed plan of action”. The Plan of Operations did not contain any formal agreements on support for WIN activities, nor an institutional framework for coordinated action. As a result, WIN has operated with its own very limited resources and little other support. A “Plan of Operations” was made for Zambia in March 2001, but it was an annual work plan and not the type of document foreseen in the project document. Furthermore, it appears that quite a few of the activities planned for 2001 in the Plan of Operations were never carried out.

Project area and site selection

Six sites were chosen for project activities in three Provinces (two per Province). The sites in Lusaka (Chipapa and Funzwe) and Southern (Gamela and Siafufwende) Provinces were linked with the SIWUP project, while two sites in Luapula Province (Mwense East and Chilolo) were linked with the IHFSAN project. These sites have already existing and functioning groups, with a total of 602 farmers. Sites were chosen in collaboration with district agricultural staff; selection criteria included proximity to irrigation works or the potential suitability for irrigation works. Recently the project has added two sites (one of which was visited by the mission), in an effort to increase the number of beneficiaries closer to the target established in the project document of 1200 per country.

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)

One of the first project activities included training for project staff on participatory approaches and the implementation of PRA surveys. An initial Participatory Constraints Analysis was carried out in 2000 and a follow-up PRA was conducted in April 2001 at the project sites in Lusaka and Southern Provinces. PRA work was not done in Luapula as this had already been done by the IHFSAN project. The PRA were carried out by national consultants and the APO and made use of focus groups comprising men, women and youth. The results have been well documented in PRA reports- which include some information which can be used as baseline data, as detailed quantitative and qualitative information has been collected for the whole group. Some of these groups have been functioning prior to the arrival of the project and that the number of women in these groups is significant.

WIN district teams

As a result of the PRA, District stakeholder workshops, were held in 2001, which resulted in the creation of WIN district teams in Kafue and Choma districts. The WIN district team is typically composed of the concerned camp extension officers and district subject matter specialists on irrigation and livestock as well as representatives from other line agencies. These teams meet among themselves to co-ordinate and plan their activities based on the action plans that have been prepared for each site. Team members visit project sites to meet with intended beneficiaries and are supposed to make monthly monitoring reports. However, it is understood that such reports are not regularly received by WIN at national level. This has been attributed to lack of communications facilities between district and national Subject Matter Specialists; WIN has attempted to address this by installation of land line telephones.

Appropriate technologies

Considerable emphasis has been given to the development of irrigation technologies appropriate to the given areas. Topographical surveys were conducted at project sites. An improved treadle pump was introduced through the project, but little interest was expressed in it because of its high cost (over US\$ 100) and because women found it difficult to use. The project introduced the shadouf at the Frunzwe site in Kafue District, where women had to go up and down a steep embankment to carry water to small vegetable plots near a river. Although the shadouf is thousands of years old, it is understood this was its first use in Zambia. Work on the shadouf was coordinated with Nanga Irrigation Research Station, which initially rejected the technology. Reportedly, interest has now been created although the signs do not appear to be convincing (see Effects and Impact below). Canal rehabilitation was identified during the PRA as a priority for the Chipapa group. After seeking other sources to finance this, the work will now be undertaken with funding from the WIN project.

Leadership training

Perhaps the most successful project activity to date has been the leadership and gender sensitization training carried out by the local NGO 'Women for Change' at project sites in Kafue and Choma Districts (other consultants implemented this training in Luapula Province). The trainers came first to the project sites and conducted discussions with local people before embarking on the training courses, which emphasized leadership skills. Training was provided for both men and women and was oriented towards collective responsibility for work. This training took place only recently (April-May 2002). As follow-up, it is believed that further training is needed in business management and leadership skills (e.g. bookkeeping, how to conduct meetings, how to resolve disputes).

National Steering Committee

At national level, a National Steering Committee has been created. Membership includes representatives from WIN project staff, FAO, Government ministries (Agriculture, Food and Fisheries; Health; Community Development and Social Services), other Government bodies and programmes (Programme Against Malnutrition; National Food and Nutrition Commission) and the Zambia Chamber for Small-scale Business Association. The Committee has met twice, for the first time in December 2001. The meetings have been well attended. The National Steering Committee meetings are formal and have largely been used for information exchange and to provide general direction to the project, without getting into conceptual or management issues. However, the Steering Committee members that were met by the mission appeared well informed about the project. It is recommended that the project seeks a closer collaboration with the members. The Steering Committee was also quick to recognise the pilot nature of the project.

Backstopping

The incumbent CTA has visited Zambia three times (February 2001, October 2001, May 2002) for project supervision. In addition, an ENSP officer made a 4-day visit in connection with backstopping for the IHFSAN project and short consultancies took place on household food security and nutrition (5 days, September 2001), group-based micro credit (3 days, March 2002) and HIV/Aids (one day, March 2002). While said to be useful, the timing of the consultancies was said in some cases not to be ideal, due to lack of consultation with the staff in Zambia.

2. *Nepal*

In Nepal, project activities were launched after the start-up mission by the CTA and the subsequent appointment of the National Coordinator in November 2000.

Project Management

The original National Coordinator was replaced in November 2001. Nepal is the only country where the project benefits from the presence of a Deputy National Coordinator, who has served continuously. An APO, originally assigned to the office of the FAO Representative, assisted the project during the entire duration of her appointment, from October 2000 until May 2002. Two full time national consultants were recruited, one in project implementation and management and one specialist in gender and community participation. Since June 2002, a third consultant has been recruited on a part time basis. Of the three WIN countries, Nepal benefits most from the support by national consultants and this has contributed to the positive results that have been obtained. However, here also, the project suffers from a lack of inputs from the intended supporting project (OWFM) and relies very much on the office of the FAO Representative for access to computers and other logistical support. Delays in the receipt of funds has also hampered smooth project implementation. On a positive note, the project has been able to give its own interpretation to the original project design and to define a clear focus, understood by all stakeholders. Besides, the current national development policy identifies gender mainstreaming as a core strategy for poverty alleviation and recognises the important role of women in development. This meant that the project received considerable support at policy level, where the project is considered as a useful pilot activity on gender mainstreaming.

Selection of sites and beneficiaries

WIN Nepal is implemented in three districts of West-/Far Western Nepal, namely Kanchanpur, Doti and Bardiya. Two to three sites have been selected per district. Four sites (in Kanchanpur and Bardiya) are located within the On Farm Water Management (OFWM)

project, where groups of the most food insecure women had been identified during a participatory analysis. OFWM had proven that collaboration between two departments (Irrigation and Agriculture) had positive results and it was thus proposed that the WIN project should try to develop ways to expand this collaboration to include other departments and development partners in the field (e.g. NGOs). Other sites outside OFWM, include groups of ex-bonded labourers and groups of extremely poor women who had been formed by other organisations and NGOs (LWF, GTZ/WFP). The total number of beneficiaries is 750. All group members are women.

Implementation strategy

The implementation strategy of the WIN project gradually evolved during a series of workshops and consultations. Already at the very beginning of the project, it had been decided to work with the poorest of the poor and to focus exclusively on women. Gradually, the project developed a 'development package' of services and small inputs, to be provided to the beneficiaries. This package is roughly similar for all sites, with some small variations if the PRA had identified specific needs. The development package reflects the multi-disciplinary approach and the combination of services of the different line agencies. Training was provided on topics such as health, nutrition, vegetable cultivation, group formation and each group received some production inputs such as chicks and a piglet.

WIN district teams

The WIN national team had organised workshops for the district teams at the very beginning of the project to present the project and to provide training in participatory approaches and gender analysis. This resulted in the development of a District Gender Action Plan. However, to what extent this is actually being implemented and how reporting and monitoring on this is done, could not be assessed by the mission. The co-ordinator of the WIN team at district level is the agricultural extension officer- who also co-ordinated the OFWM district team. The team meets once a month and more frequently if considered necessary. Members of all line agencies reportedly appreciate the meetings and the improved co-ordination. Although in theory they should have been providing services to the same beneficiaries even without the project, shortage of Government operational funds prevents this. Also, the extension officers would not generally target extremely poor women groups.

Group formation

The groups within the OFWM area did not exist prior to the start of the project and therefore had to be created. With support from the project, the Department of Women Development recruited social mobilisers to assist the groups with their establishment and follow-up activities. These mobilisers, who have been selected from the local community seem to be very efficient and form a useful interface between the district teams and the groups. Furthermore, it is an opportunity for these women to enhance their own capacity as they increase their knowledge and understanding of the issues. Their improved standing within the community is also reflected by the fact that one has already been elected as a member of the Water Users Committee. Every woman's group meets typically once every month. During the monthly meetings, various issues are discussed. In addition, an informal credit and savings scheme is being organised, whereby the savings are distributed to group members as credit for an interest rate of 2% interest per month, much less than the local money lenders charge. Credit is sometimes used for investment purposes but also often to solve urgent cash demands (e.g. to pay for medicines or school fees).

Appropriate technologies

Access and the availability of water is often mentioned as a main priority by the beneficiaries. The project is therefore assisting in certain sites with the procurement of treadle pumps and is collaborating with another NGO for the development of an improved drip irrigation technique. Even though the costs for a treadle pump in Nepal are much less than in Zambia, the mission feels that the project should be careful not to provide rather high cost inputs to a small number of individuals, beyond what is necessary for research and demonstration purposes.

PRA survey

The PRA surveys done with the target beneficiaries served not only to identify the needs and priorities of these groups but also, more importantly for capacity-building, to increase the awareness of the field workers of the different departments on the needs of the local communities and the use of need based participatory planning and gender sensitive approaches. The PRA survey resulted in a very interesting document on the socio-economic conditions of the target populations. It identifies the needs and priorities of these communities and served as the basis for the development package which the WIN project would be providing. However, the survey was too general and not sufficiently quantified to serve as an actual baseline survey. No OVIs were identified and /or measured.

3. *Cambodia*

Cambodia was first visited by the then CTA in May 2000. Project activity can only be considered to have actually started with the appointment of the National Project Coordinator, at the time of the first visit by the present CTA. The Cambodia component of the WIN project is therefore generally considered to have only effectively started in January 2001.

Project management

The management of the Cambodia component of the WIN project, differs quite substantially from the other two countries. The project is fully implemented by government staff and only one national consultant (on gender) has been occasionally employed thus far. Following the procedures which were initially developed under the SPFS programme, government staff receives a monthly incentive to cover expenses for travel and other allowances. The project is thus mainly implemented through the national team, composed of line ministry staff at national level. Notwithstanding the fact that these are assigned for 15 days per month to WIN, most are not experienced in the management of a project such as WIN. As a result, the National Co-ordinator performs many project-related tasks himself even though he also has only been assigned on a part-time basis. Project management therefore does not make use to the same degree of various fields of expertise as in Nepal, which is also reflected in the quality of reports that lack the necessary depth of analysis. WIN Cambodia has not benefited from an APO except for a short period, and currently receives assistance from a UNV who is shared with the SPFS programme. Cambodia is the only one of the three WIN countries in which the SPFS programme is actually still ongoing. Here, the complementarity of the two programmes could be tried.

The WIN district teams

Similarly to what is done in the other countries, the WIN district teams meet regularly, to plan and coordinate the next activities to be implemented. Leading agency is the Ministry of Agriculture, as it was also heading the SPFS teams. In addition to the WIN district team, WIN teams have also been established at national and provincial levels (in Siem Reap, Takeo and Kompot Provinces). Prior to the training programme, PRA exercises have been done at 5

of the 15 WIN villages. However, the implementation strategy of the project is not well defined nor elaborated.

Farmers Field Schools (FFS)

A key element of the SPFS programme is an innovative training and extension approach which was developed by FAO- the Farmers Field School (FFS). This approach involves a process of participatory rural appraisal techniques, during which farmers define priorities and adopt new technologies suitable for their environment. A package of improved techniques and technologies is introduced to improve water control, to increase crop production and to increase farm income through diversification in small animals, aquaculture and horticulture. The WIN project document refers to this approach and further mentions that the specific elements of women empowerment, household food security and health of the FFS can thus be particularly emphasised during the WIN project. As agricultural production is the main focus of the Farmers Field School, training is provided in the fields of agronomy, livestock and irrigation. The WIN project in Cambodia applies the Farmers Field School method by simply extending the team which worked under SPFS to include trainers in the field of gender, public health and nutrition. Similarly, this was done at national level, where the National Steering Committee for the SPFS programme was expanded to include representatives of the Ministry of Women and Veteran Affairs, Health and Rural Development.

Development package

According to the Farmers Field School methodology, farmers receive training during a period of 15 weeks. The same period was adhered to by the WIN district teams, with a division over the different topics as follows:

- Health and Nutrition	6 weeks
- Gender	4 weeks
- Irrigation	2 weeks
- Livestock	2 weeks
- Agronomy	1 week

Training lasts typically one full day, with more theoretical training in the morning and the practical application in the afternoon. After this period of formal training of 15 weeks, the WIN district team continues to pay regularly visits to follow-up on ongoing activities. Similarly to what was found in the other 2 WIN countries, the training was supplemented with the provision of some inputs for demonstration and trial purposes. However, some other capital-intensive inputs (latrines, biogas digesters, irrigation pumps) were also distributed. Most training activities focus specifically the Farmers Field School groups, but the district teams also performed some activities from which all village members could benefit directly, such as growth monitoring of all children below five years of age. The mission observed this taking place twice and is scheduled to be done once every three months per village.

Selection of sites

Site selection was already completed in May 2000. The SPFS programme in Cambodia is being implemented in more than 50 villages in 4 provinces. However, the WIN project is only implemented in 3 provinces, in 5 districts. In each district, 2 villages were selected for inclusion in the 2001 programme and in 2002 one new village was added to each district. The total number of villages is thus currently 15. All sites are within the SPFS project area, apart from one site in the province of Siem Reap (Prasath Char). The reasons for including this village are that it is very remote and that it has an irrigation scheme- which was rehabilitated by another project.

Group formation

In general the WIN project continued to work with the same Farmers Organisations (FO) or 'graduates' of the Farmers Field School who had received training by SPFS in the previous year. In some instances, where the groups were small or the gender balance of the group very much in favour of men, additional members were selected. Selection criteria are not quite clear but for the FFS these had included the ability to read and write and possibly an effort was made to recruit the most responsive and innovative farmers. Combined with the fact that the FFS is held for a full day for a period of 15 weeks, it seems unlikely that the poorest farmers are well represented in this group. Indeed, when the mission questioned some non WIN group members, it was explained that one of the reasons for not joining was shortage of time. The total number of WIN group members is currently 503, and with the number of women at 265, the balance is slightly towards women. In some villages, the FFS group is again composed of several other sub-groups such as Farmer Water User Communities. However, the project does not appear to have a clear strategy towards forming or even strengthening the groups. Furthermore, groups are very much accepted 'as they are' - whereas in one group the women appear far more articulate than in others. No training is provided in leadership skills or participatory decision making.

Appropriateness of technologies

Some of the new technologies which are being introduced in the village are rather expensive. Even though most (but not all) of the latrines, pumps and biodigesters are being used, very few person have as yet duplicated the technique with their own resources. This means that the techniques are not fully appropriate and the project should put more efforts in developing more affordable technologies. Furthermore, some of the techniques do not appear to be rightly used, for instance the treadle pump which in some instances was mainly used to provide drinking water. It was quite interesting to note that some women here also complained that the treadle pump seemed hazardous to use, something which had also been mentioned in Zambia.

Distribution of inputs

As stated above, the project is distributing some rather capital intensive inputs. According to project management, the allocation of these amongst the different group members is decided upon by the groups themselves. In some instances, the farmer will have to provide some construction inputs such as labour or wood, so the group reportedly chooses amongst those who are actually willing to participate. However, no guidelines for this selection process seem to exist. Furthermore, as the project does not specifically provide training in participatory decision making and very much accepts the existing hierarchical structure in the group, it is not quite clear to what extent this decision is actually made in a truly participatory manner. It is not surprising then to find that a small number of group members often has several of the new techniques on their compound. This may have been decided by the group but this has obviously not always led to an even distribution amongst the members or a bias towards the poorest. When questioned, all group members reply that they can and are using the latrines and pumps even if they are in the compound of someone else, but this should be confirmed. In addition, the distribution of inputs amongst the different WIN groups is not equal. Some villages receive more latrines or treadle pumps than others. The division is reportedly based, among others, on the needs that were identified during the initial PRA. However, this does not fully explain the situation. It is important that these capital intensive inputs are distributed in a very transparent manner and is closely supervised by the project. The project reports mention the total numbers which have been distributed but not how many per village. It is recommended that this be included in the reports.

The SPFS programme also distributed some small inputs such as piglets, chicken and seed. As the WIN project is working with more or less with the same group of farmers, this means that this group is benefiting from this type of support twice, compared to none for the non-FFS members.

C. Government Support

At the policy level, Government support for the project in all three countries has been good. One of the reasons for selecting the three project countries was the high priority given in their national policies and strategies to the incorporation of gender, health and nutrition aspects into development activities. In all three countries, there has been a general willingness to allow different line agencies to work together under this project to promote inter-disciplinary approaches to the problems being addressed.

Since the project has worked with existing Government bodies and mechanisms, and because Government staff work with the project on a part-time basis, there were no major needs for infrastructural support. This was supposed to come from other projects in each country which, as noted before particularly for Zambia but also for Nepal, was not very forthcoming.

D. Project Management

Project management is an area requiring improvement. The project has an unusual structure within FAO; a Core Team at Headquarters which now consists effectively of two persons, one of whom is the Budget Holder, a part-time CTA who conducts periodic country visits but does not have management responsibilities and independent and different country management structures, each operating under the guidance of the FAO Representative for day-to-day issues. Each country has a National Steering Committee for the project, but National Steering Committee members are generally too senior to be involved in specific technical and operational issues and in any case do not meet often (1-2 times a year). As a result, there are multiple channels of communication, almost inevitably leading to conflicting guidance and instructions.

The mission feels there is a need to give greater managerial responsibility to the CTA. Although the CTA works on a part-time basis, she can devote more time to the project than do the members of the Core Team. While the CTA discusses project activities during country visits and through correspondence, it is understood that, at present, the CTA has no role approving country work plans and budget allocations. Nor does she receive regular information on the level of project expenditure. There is a need to discuss this issue between the parties concerned and agree on a more regular flow of information. The mission also suggests that the CTA should be asked to approve country work plans as part of her management responsibility.

At country level there are similar management structures in each of the three countries, with national steering committees and district level teams. In Cambodia additionally there are provincial-level teams in each of the three provinces where the project operates. These committees exist because of the project and cannot be expected to outlive the duration of the project. The National Project Coordinator plays the most important role in project management in each of the three countries. In Cambodia the NPC has been the same throughout the project and he plays a strong role in directing the project. In both Nepal and Zambia, the NPC has changed during the project (quite recently in Nepal). In these countries, until very recently an APO has been attached to the project. The APOs in both cases shared

significant management responsibilities, including for liaison with the FAO Representatives and the Core Team in Rome. Now that they have left the project, the NPC will have to take on a stronger directive role than heretofore.

E. Technical and Operational Backstopping

Technical and operational backstopping responsibilities for the project are exercised by FAO Headquarters, with the Core Team member from the Land and Water Division acting as the Budget Holder for the project. Annual allocations are made to the FAO Representative in each country for all budget items except the international consultant (CTA) and FAO mission travel.

Attempts have been made to coordinate backstopping visits from FAO Headquarters with missions by the CTA, but this has not been done systematically. Backstopping visits have been infrequent, as evidenced by the fact that only \$27,000 out of \$119,000 budgeted has been spent thus far. In two cases, however (Zambia and Nepal), backstopping visits were organized in connection with other duty travel. It is recommended that missions by the CTA should be planned well in advance, so backstopping missions can overlap if possible.

The idea has circulated for some time to decentralize some technical backstopping responsibilities to the Sub-Regional Office for Eastern and Southern Africa in Harare for Zambia and to the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok for Nepal and Cambodia. The mission feels that this is a good idea, especially for the gender component of the project, for which there is no core team member in Rome. It is understood that the gender expert in Harare is interested in further involvement with the project and the mission interviewed the gender officer in Bangkok, who is familiar with project operations in Nepal and Cambodia. A recently appointed APO in the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific on gender is available to assist with project support; she will be attending a National Workshop in Cambodia soon after the evaluation mission.

VI. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness

A. Effects and Impact

1. Zambia

As stated previously, project implementation is not highly advanced and therefore it is premature to talk about impact of the project. Only a few activities (topographical surveys, PRA, gender training) have taken place on project sites and some training has taken place for WIN district teams and extension staff.

Nonetheless, the gender training seems to have had very positive effects thus far. For example, at the Chipapa site in Kafue Province, Lusaka District, a dam management committee has been in place for over 20 years. Although three-quarters of the garden work utilizing water from the dam is done by women, there had never been a woman on the dam committee, until this year after the training carried out by the NGO Women for Change. Furthermore, previous dam committees had apparently not been very active. Subsequent to the training, a new dam committee was elected, with six of the ten members women. The new dam committee seems to be much more active, meeting regularly and having already initiated two activities in the area (a ditch to bring excess water from a nearby well and community garden plot). In nearby Frunzwe, three groups (men, women and a group of youth) were formed for garden plots and in Sifufwende (Choma District) women were elected to leadership positions (President and Treasurer) in a vegetable gardening group that makes use of water from a dam rehabilitated by the SIWUP project.

Other than this, there are no evident project effects in Zambia. District WIN teams, comprising representatives from various Ministries, have been formed and apparently do meet regularly, but there seems little evidence of action plans being effectively implemented and leading to concrete results for communities at project sites. The technical activities carried out by the project have not yet been demonstrably successful; the canal rehabilitation in Chipapa has not yet been undertaken and the shadoufs installed by the project in Frunzwe have not been used since December 2001 because they are too heavy. It is disappointing that, after six months, researchers from Nanga Irrigation Research Station have still not carried out necessary modifications to make the shadoufs usable. It is understood that no irrigation-related activities have been carried out in Luapula, where appropriate water use (either irrigation or drainage, depending on the site) for oil palm was raised as an important issue.

There are good prospects, however, that there will be considerable interest in vegetable production in Chipapa. The mission was informed that after the irrigation scheme has been rehabilitated, production will increase considerably and that private companies have already showed an interest to use farmers in the area as outgrowers of high-value crops for export (green beans, baby corn). In anticipation of this, the mission noted that some previously unused plots were being cleared for cultivation this year. However, the mission was also informed that many of the poorest farmers could not afford to clear the land or purchase seed and had to leave their plots fallow. It should further be noted that the current drought is affecting all farmers in Zambia. Crops have failed and the harvest has been minimal. This may affect project implementation for the next six months.

2. Nepal

The WIN activities in Nepal are effective in that they are strengthening and indeed empowering groups of women who would otherwise have received no support at all. Due to

security problems, the mission could not visit the field, but was nevertheless able to meet with representatives of 22 of the 27 groups that have been created in Bardiya district. All beneficiaries reported satisfaction with the project and they mentioned for instance that previously they would have been too shy to speak with foreigners whereas now they felt much more confident. They further mentioned to have improved their dietary habits and to have a better understanding of hygienic practices. Besides, they were pleased to be now actively targeted by the district team officers and were gaining confidence to ask for services when they were needed.

Another accomplishment of WIN Nepal is the close collaboration between the national coordinators and the national consultants, which is contributing to the effectiveness of the project. The project is managed in an efficient manner, with detailed workplans and progress reports. Team building efforts are good, also at the level of the WIN district teams. This underlines the benefits of or rather the necessity for full time national consultants, as the national coordinators have only been assigned on a part-time basis and can therefore not be expected to be involved in the more operational details of the project management.

With the development package and the focus on groups composed of women, Nepal has certainly developed in a different direction than WIN in the other two countries and it therefore is important that the results are carefully monitored and studied. A small number of key indicators should be selected as well as baseline information (KAP studies). Considering that the project is benefiting from the support of 2.5 national consultants, this should be possible and it was reported that the project is indeed planning to do so.

3. Cambodia

The project has not collected any baseline data against which project effectiveness could be measured. The group members who benefit from the training mentioned that they have specifically increased their understanding of gender, health and nutrition aspects. Men reported that they have changed their behaviour as a result, but to what extent this is actually the case could not be assessed. Women admitted that their workload had increased due to the fact that they now knew that they had to boil the drinking water and wash the children more often.

It is not clear to what extent the knowledge gained by the Farmers Field School attendees is actually being transferred to the non-group members. The villages appear to be small so this is likely to happen, but should nevertheless be further investigated. Furthermore, it is not evident that the same methodologies that were developed for the Farmers Field School, with its strong link to the agricultural season and the participatory planning as a result, will also be appropriate for topics such as health and nutrition. The project should study this also more carefully because so far the training does not appear to have been very participatory. This is not necessarily inappropriate; health and nutrition training may not require this, it should just be recognised so that appropriate conclusions can be drawn.

So far, the project has been very input-delivery oriented. However, the distribution and use of the often expensive inputs does not appear to be well monitored and this should be enhanced. It is further recommended that the project refrains from purchasing and demonstrating any inputs which the farmers are unlikely to be able to afford. Especially WIN Cambodia should place much more emphasis on changes in attitudinal behaviour and study the socio-economical environment in which it operates. Obviously, the information gained should be

fed back into further improvement of the services which are being provided to the beneficiaries.

Incorporating nutritional and health messages in the FFS, and being involved with the construction of latrines and pumps for drinking water, the project is entering a domain which is not traditionally FAO's mandate. The project has reportedly been in touch with representatives from both UNICEF and WHO but it is not clear to what extent this has led to effective collaboration. It is therefore recommended that the project ensures that all activities benefit from the lessons learned by these UN agencies and that this co-operation is further formalised.

National consultants could be effective in collecting and analysing this sort of information. It is therefore strongly recommended that at least one National Consultant is recruited to assist the national coordinator and possibly more if needed. Considering that the gender balance in the national team is already much in favour of men, it is further strongly recommended that this national consultant is a woman.

Lastly, it should be noted that two new SPFS projects are currently being submitted for funding by FAO Cambodia but that very little of the WIN approach has been incorporated. This shows that impact of WIN so far has been very limited and that it has not yet been able to prove the added benefits of its approach in a sufficiently convincing manner.

B. Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results

Obviously, the main aim of the project is to empower women and to reduce gender inequality. The title and project document indicate that the project will focus specifically on empowering women in irrigation and water resources management. With respect to empowering women in irrigation management, it should be noted that the majority of the WIN sites are not located within large irrigation schemes. Reading the project document, one would expect the project to be situated within major irrigated rice or other staple crop producing areas, where Water User Groups (WUG) play an important role in the design, maintenance and management of the schemes. In Zambia, the SIWUP programme aims to promote small scale irrigated vegetable production and in both Nepal as well as in Cambodia, the areas under irrigation are not cultivated on a year round basis but only once a year. This means that the role of water user groups is much less formal and that they only play a role during a certain part of the year. Furthermore, none of the WIN partner projects is performing rehabilitation work, so that involving women in the planning hereof becomes irrelevant.

Combined with the strong emphasis which the project places on nutrition and health, the project tends thus to concentrate on irrigated small scale vegetable production. However, vegetable cultivation is an activity which in most countries- and certainly in the three WIN countries- is traditionally regarded as one in which women play an important role. The project has been effective in ensuring that this important role is better reflected in the management committees of these schemes, but this is probably a less important stride than if this had been made in the still male dominated domain of large scale irrigation.

The project has performed PRA studies in all three countries, which did consider the division of labour and tasks between the sexes. However, more focussed gender studies might have been able to identify more specific areas on which the project could focus its efforts.

With respect to empowering women in water resources management, the project document mentions that both men and women will actively participate in the planning of a community-level water and sanitation plan, which the project will assist in implementing. The mission found no indications that such a plan has been prepared in any of the WIN sites.

Furthermore, the project itself seems to reconfirm the gender bias that nutrition and health of the family are mainly a concern for women. This also helps to explain the focus on vegetable cultivation. Besides, the risk exists that the increased awareness on health and nutrition further increases the burden on women. Indeed, during some of the interviews, women reported that their workloads had increased.

The gender training which the project has provided seems generally to have been well received and has able to sensitize the men on their duties as well as on the often uneven burden on women. To what extent this has effectively changed their behaviour has not been assessed by the project.

With respect to targeting of the WIN activities, it can be observed that in Nepal, the development packages are directly targeted at women whereas in Zambia and Cambodia mixed groups of the community are addressed.

With respect to staffing, it can be observed that none of the three National Coordinators is female, with the exception of the Deputy National Coordinator in Nepal. Here also, two of the three national consultants are female, whereas in Zambia the national consultant who will be recruited per July 2002 is a women.

C. Cost-effectiveness

One of the strong points of the project is its reliance on existing capacity in countries to a major extent. National staff participating in district and national teams serve on WIN in addition to their normal duties and, except in Cambodia, do not receive salary supplements. While the practice of paying salary supplements in Cambodia is not desirable, it is followed by all development projects in that country because of very low Government salaries. However, even in Cambodia the salary supplement is also intended to cover costs of visiting project sites as part of team members' WIN-related duties.

Normal practice within the project is to provide allowances only when participating in project activities, i.e. per diem during training, costs of overnight stays. These allowances are paid at Government, rather than UN rates, thus reducing costs.

The WIN project was supposed to have close links, and rely on inputs from, other projects in each of the countries. This should have promoted cost-effectiveness, but the arrangement worked effectively only in Cambodia. The fact that WIN was able to draw on technical personnel (in irrigation, livestock and agronomy) from the SPFS was highly cost-effective.

The project has a part-time CTA, based in the United States. The mission believes a part-time CTA is an appropriate solution for a project which should have occasional requirements for technical advice and progress monitoring. It is reported that the CTA is heavily engaged in correspondence on project matters between her missions to the various countries; it is understood that she is now paid for six days a month when not on mission and this seems an equitable and cost-effective way to compensate her for this work.

Particularly in Nepal and Zambia, the project has made use of local and international NGOs to provide expertise. The quality of the work performed by the NGOs is very good; the mission was particularly impressed by the gender training performed by Women for Change in Zambia and the work carried out by Lutheran World Federation at Doti in Nepal. Such arrangements are believed to be very cost-effective and should be encouraged more, especially since the budgetary provision for contracts has hardly been spent.

As noted previously, project delivery has been very unsatisfactory thus far and it is believed that cost-effectiveness of the project could be increased also by greater use of national consultants, such as is being done in Nepal. Qualified, dedicated national consultants can provide needed technical inputs and provide support to NPCs. The system appears to work very well in Nepal and could be emulated more in the other two project countries.

D. Major Factors Affecting the Project Results

In terms of developing methodologies for including gender, health and nutrition considerations in irrigation-related activities, the project is still at an early stage, even though it has been under implementation for over two years. The reasons are different from country to country, but clearly the most progress has been achieved in Nepal. Progress probably would have been even greater in Nepal except for the present security situation which has constrained the movement of staff in project areas.

In Zambia, the project has been very slow to obtain needed support. There was never an effective link with the SIWUP project. The fact that SIWUP has now ended may even be a blessing for WIN since there will be no more pressure to obtain any support from it. At present, there is little coming out as results from Zambia, except for an encouraging increase of women representatives in Water Users' Associations at project sites.

In Cambodia, there has been a strong emphasis on input distribution by WIN. Recently, gender training has begun and the project has been promoting health and nutrition messages (sanitation, consumption of vegetables) at project sites. But in Cambodia a formula approach has been followed, with seemingly little emphasis on deriving lessons through experimentation with different approaches in different areas. Thus, it will be difficult to extract lessons unless this becomes a greater focus within the project.

All projects rely on people and the fact that the original CTA resigned after a short time meant that project implementation accordingly was set back. This may have contributed to some of the shortcuts in applying the methodology for site and intervention selection outlined in the project document. Another important factor was that project implementation arrangements did not develop as foreseen, with respect to support from other projects (SIWUP in Zambia, OWFM in Nepal). Only in Cambodia was this achieved.

Perhaps the major factor, however, has been the lack of clarity of what the project is trying to achieve. The problems associated with this are documented throughout this report and include differences in opinion and direction from the Core Team and very different approaches to the project taken in different countries without explanation. Closely associated with this the need to clarify the management structure of the project, including the role of the respective stakeholders (Core Team, CTA, NPCs, national and district teams and steering committees, Regional Offices if they are to be involved). The need to clarify the project design and management structure forms a major part of the evaluation mission recommendations that follow.

VII. Conclusions and Recommendations

The mission's overall conclusion is that the WIN project is potentially significant as an action-research project to develop gender-sensitive approaches to particular aspects of local community development. Its novelty comes from the strong effort to promote joint approaches by line agencies and other development actors to address commonly problems found at village level. A strong point of WIN has been its reliance on existing capacity in countries and use of existing resources.

This being said, the expected contribution from the project has not been defined in a sufficiently precise manner. The interpretation given to the project objectives has varied among the stakeholders and there is a need to reach common agreement on the thrust of the project. Having four immediate objectives, each in a different area, has not been helpful. There is a need to re-define the project around a single purpose, which could include different elements.

For a variety of reasons, project implementation thus far has been slow. Although the midterm evaluation takes place 2 ½ years into an originally-approved three years project, less than one-third of the project budget has been spent. There is an opportunity to re-define the project objectives, building on project experience to date.

Recommendation 1: UNF/UNFIP and FAO should the extend project for 1 ½ - 2 years, within existing resources, subject to re-formulation along the lines indicated below.

Recommendation 2: Before the end of 2002, there should be an International WIN Workshop, involving the main stakeholders. The Workshop should use an outside facilitator to conduct it, who is a specialist in management and, if possible, familiar with project design methodology. The Workshop should produce a revised project document that includes:

6. reformulated project objectives and a list of major outputs to be produced by the project;
7. a coordinated work plan;
8. more precise identification of intended project beneficiaries;
9. a defined project management structure and operational procedures, with responsibilities of various stakeholders;
10. a unified format for project progress reporting, both for countries and for the project as a whole.

Because two of the three project countries are in Asia, it could be envisaged to hold the Workshop at the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok. It is recommended that the participants include:

- members of the Core Team in Rome from AGL and ESN;
- the CTA;
- National Coordinators from each of the three project countries;
- One national consultant from each country with significant responsibility for project implementation;
- gender officers from RAP (Bangkok) and SAFR (Harare).

Subsequent recommendations of this evaluation are intended to serve as inputs for consideration in revision of the future project strategy, ideally by the Workshop as recommended above.

As stated above, the mission recommends that the objectives should be reformulated to indicate a greater unity of purpose. The mission believes that the long-term development objective of this project should have a gender/socio-cultural, rather than irrigation focus. However, the project should remain with AGLW as the lead technical unit to ensure mainstreaming in the technical division. Although the project is working in areas where there is irrigation, the ways of working and topics covered suggest that the lessons may be applied in other circumstances where rural development is being pursued.

Recommendation 3: Accordingly, the mission suggests that the Workshop consider re-formulation of the long-term objective as:

“Rural, poor women participate effectively in the development of their communities, particularly in the areas of water resource management, community health and nutrition”.

Even more important is a re-formulation of the project’s immediate objective. The four current immediate objectives are all related to integrated rural development, but they are different and the attention given to them individually has varied considerably from country to country. As a result, there is no pattern being followed, although some similar activities are conducted in each country. Reasons for the various interventions at each site are, except in Nepal, not well explained. The mission believes that the project should now focus much more on developing common approaches, learning lessons and documenting them for future application.

By definition, an “immediate objective” describes the change in development that will occur at the end of a project, or very shortly thereafter.

Recommendation 4: Therefore, it is suggested that a more focused immediate objective for the WIN project would be:

“Methodologies are developed and applied for gender-sensitive strategies in water resources management, community health and nutrition”.

The suggested re-formulation does not imply a major shift in the interventions being carried out, but rather focuses on purposeful action-research.

If methodological development is accepted as a key focus of the project, it should be envisaged that the culminating event of the project will be a synthesis of experience in each country and an overall, comparative study of the approaches followed and lessons learned.

Recommendation 5: In each country, national consultants who have had significant involvement with the project should prepare a synthesis of national experience and lessons learned, to be presented at a national seminar (three seminars in total) at the end of the project. Should funds be available, the three National Coordinators should attend each of the workshops.

In order to generate more lessons, and because the project relies largely on existing resources, it should be possible to expand the number of sites in each country to other areas where water resources development is taking place. However, occasional follow-up at present sites should continue, to consolidate group formation that has already occurred.

Recommendation 6: Using existing district and national teams, the number of sites in each country should be increased in line with resources available to support such an expansion.

Because of starting-up problems, including the early replacement of the original project CTA, the methodology included in the project document for planning and designing interventions

has not been followed in any of the countries. However, this methodology appears sound and, with some modification, could be followed in the future, especially if there is a workshop to re-formulate the project as a whole.

Recommendation 7: In re-formulating the project and extending it to new sites, the methodology outlined in the project document should be followed and the process documented. Reasons for site selection, choice of interventions and lessons expected to be learned from each should be specified. Baseline data related to the results expected should be collected and a few development (rather than implementation) indicators should be monitored.

The WIN project is very much concerned with changes in attitudes - to the participation of women and improvement of health and nutrition conditions in villages.

Recommendation 8: KAP (Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices) surveys should be used as part of project effects and impact monitoring and training provided in how to conduct them. Such surveys should also involve non-WIN farmers in the same village, as a control and to assess the degree to which the community as a whole benefits from WIN, as opposed to those participating directly in groups.

Recommendation 9: While the project works in irrigation areas and should continue to do so, the recommended re-focus of the WIN project implies that its resources should not be used for design, installation and construction of irrigation equipment, except for limited demonstration purposes. Furthermore, the project should not engage in academic studies without a clear relationship to the project purpose (e.g. ergonomics of treadle pump use).

The project has been said to follow a Farmers' Field School approach in Cambodia and similar methodologies relying on groups in the other two countries.

Recommendation 10: WIN should assist in determining to what extent a Farmers' Field School approach is actually being applied and if so, to what extent this approach is suitable for integrated methods such as those being advocated in WIN.

The project, although complex, does not have a formal management structure. While this may not be strictly needed, there is a clear requirement for greater specification of responsibilities of the Core Team members in Rome, the CTA, regional officers, national coordinators and consultants (it is assumed that APOs will no longer be used at country level). This is a presumed output of the Project Workshop advocated by the mission. In particular, there is a need for the CTA to have access to project financial information, in order to recommend adaptations in field activities and to exercise more responsibility for their conduct.

Recommendation 11: The CTA should receive reports at least twice a year on the project's financial status. The CTA should also approve all country work plans, before they are submitted to FAO HQ. The TOR of the CTA should be revised accordingly.

There is a need for improved information exchange within the project itself. Exchange of project reports is not sufficient, as these are not sufficiently detailed or analytical to be of interest to other project countries. Furthermore, because some areas of project activity are not those within FAO's mandate, more effort should be made to draw upon the experience of other development agencies.

Recommendation 12: As part of her mission visits to each country, the CTA should brief concerned staff on relevant developments in other project countries.

Recommendation 13: National Project Coordinators should consult with other UN agencies and NGOs, to draw lessons from their experience, particularly in the areas of community health and sanitation and nutrition. Cooperative working arrangements with other agencies should be further encouraged in these areas particularly.

Annex I - Terms of Reference

Mid-Term Evaluation Mission

Project GCP/INT/750/FIP

UN Foundation (UNF)/ UN Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP)

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia

Government of the Kingdom of Nepal

Government of the Republic of Zambia,

PROJECT DETAILS

Project code:	GP/INT/750/FIP
Project title	<i>“Empowerment of Women in Irrigation and Water Resources Management for Improved Household Food Security, Nutrition and Health”</i> and referred to as WIN project (Women, Irrigation and Nutrition)
Executing agency:	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN (FAO)
Main implementing ministry	
<u>Cambodia:</u>	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
<u>Nepal:</u>	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
<u>Zambia:</u>	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
Designated partner programme/ institutional linkages	
<u>Cambodia:</u>	Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS)
<u>Nepal:</u>	The On-Farm Water Management (OFWM) component of the Nepal Irrigation Sector Programme funded by IDA/World Bank
<u>Zambia:</u>	The Smallholder Irrigation and Water Use Management (SIWUP) project funded by IFAD Improving household food security and nutrition in the Luapula Valley, FAO programme funded by Belgian Survival Fund
Donor Organisation:	United Nations Foundation (UNF)
Duration of project:	3 years, Started December 1999, scheduled end date December 2002

1. BACKGROUND AND BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

1.1 Background

Irrigation development can increase considerably food production and reduce the negative effects of insecure rainfed food production. Experience has shown however that in the design, planning and management of irrigation development projects, gender issues are not

sufficiently considered. This lack of women's participation in project planning, training and system management, often leads to a negative impact on the accessibility to water - including domestic water supply and irrigation- for women, leading to decreased food availability, variety and safety at household and local levels, poor health care and ultimately malnutrition.

To ensure the sustainability of irrigation schemes and to evolve appropriate strategies for household food security, nutrition and health for all stakeholders, the project envisages the formulation and testing of a holistic approach to irrigation development and water resources management in three countries: Cambodia, Nepal and Zambia. The countries have been selected in view of their involvement in the FAO supported Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) and the priority given to the incorporation of gender, health and nutrition aspects into development objectives in general and irrigation development objectives in particular.

The Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) was launched in the wake of the World Food Summit of 1996 as a world-wide programme to combat hunger and to put food security as a global priority for the 84 Low-Income and Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDC). The programme aims to assist LIFDCs in improving the level of their national food security through rapid increases in agricultural productivity and food production. In the implementation, the SPFS gives strong emphasis to the promotion of irrigation development as well as crop intensification and increase of income through diversification of farm production. Through the constraint analysis special attention is given to socio-economic constraints in the introduction of new technologies, sustainable livelihood options and the involvement of women and vulnerable groups.

By integrating its activities with the Special Programme for Food Security and related irrigation development programmes, the WIN project aims to provide a special contribution to a main stream FAO activity. Its achievements will have a direct impact on a global approach and strategy to combat poverty and achieve food security at household level for women.

In Cambodia the SPFS programme has been initiated in 1997 with FAO TCP funds and has been initiated in seven pilot sites in four provinces. The WIN project has initiated activities in three of the SPFS pilot sites.

In Nepal the SPFS programme was started in 1995 and its approach introduced through the water control component has been further piloted through the On-Farm water management component of the WB funded Nepal Irrigation Sector Project. The WIN project has initiated activities in three districts of Mid and Far Western Province, cooperating with the OFWM project.

In Zambia the SPFS programme was initiated in 1995. The introduction of low-cost irrigation techniques for small-holder farmers promoted under the water control component of the SPFS was further expanded through the Small holder Irrigation and Water Use Project (SIWUP) with IFAD funding. The WIN project initiated its activities in six pilot sites, of which four with irrigation developments under the SIWUP project. Furthermore two sites of the FAO assisted project entitled *Improving household food security and nutrition in the Luapula Valley* were taken up as pilot sites in order to integrate experiences and approaches in promoting household food security.

1.2 Project objectives and planned major outputs

The project seeks to develop an innovative approach that integrates gender, nutrition and health issues in irrigation and rural water management and development. It would also enhance women's capacity to participate in and influence irrigation management and increase their involvement in SPFS water control activities as well as their access to productive resources.

The project's overall objective is to ensure the sustainability of irrigation development and its positive impact on household food security, nutrition and the health situation of the local population, as well as regional and national food security. The immediate objectives of the project are to:

1. increase women's capacity to participate in and influence irrigation and water resources management and increase their access to productive resources;
2. assist poor households in increasing and diversifying agricultural production for auto-consumption and increased farm income, introducing time-saving and income-generating technologies;
3. incorporate public health considerations in the design and development of irrigation and rural water management projects, including safe domestic water supply and preventive measures against water-borne diseases, at household, scheme and community level;
4. strengthen the local and national capacity to effectively assist in the incorporation of gender, household food security, nutrition and health into irrigation and water management projects.

In order to achieve the project's overall objective, the expected outputs of the project are defined in four main areas as related to:

- Empowerment of Women in Irrigation and Water Resource Management:
- Crop Diversification and Intensification for Household Food Security and Income
- Incorporation of Public Health Considerations in Irrigation Development
- Capacity Building, Public Awareness and Guidelines

The project will be implemented on the sites of the water control components of the SPFS programme in three selected countries, namely Cambodia, Nepal and Zambia. In each country, 12 pilot sites will be implemented. It is estimated that around 3600 food-insecure households will benefit directly from the project, of which 20 to 40% is female headed.

1.3 Major activities and outputs to date

In the progress report for 2001, key outputs and impacts were summarised as follows:

- Activities specified in the 2001 work plans were generally achieved for all three countries, including planned training activities at national, district and farmer levels;
- Comprehensive participatory constraints analyses have been completed, resulting in a basic data base for project sites in all three countries (not all available in English);
- Basic monitoring frameworks have been established, although more work is needed in capacity building;
- Gender sensitization and training was performed in all three countries, resulting in district-level gender action plans and individual (officer level) gender action plans in Nepal;

- Capacity-building was done at national and district levels in gender, health and nutrition aspects (Zambia and Nepal);
- Capacity-building was done at national, district and farmer levels in technical subject matter (Cambodia);
- Irrigation works were rehabilitated at Chipapa (Zambia);
- Inter-Ministerial and inter-agency collaboration were fostered (Zambia and Nepal). This is regarded as an important operational initiative by HMG in Nepal, which was fostered by WIN;
- Gender-sensitive very low-cost irrigation technology were developed (Zambia) through adaptive, on-farm participatory research, with early acceptance by women farmers;
- New partnerships established were held with NGOs in health and nutrition at remote sites (Nepal);
- National workshop held on WIN and SPFS joint activities (Cambodia).

1.4 Major problems identified by management

In each of the three countries, the project has evolved in different directions and in many cases good progress has been made.

Some problems can be identified:

- a) Integration of the WIN project and the pre-designated project partner on which the WIN design and management was based has not been realised in all aspects as originally anticipated, effecting the resources and management structure of the project;
- b) to graft the gender, health, nutrition and other socio-economic dimensions of the WIN project into irrigation projects proves a long-term process;
- c) Limited local capacity to implement participatory and gender sensitive programmes
- d) Many of the national staff at all levels (national, district, village) are only part-time available for WIN activities;
- e) Shortage of inputs- especially staff- due to budget restrictions
- f) Limited national ownership of project and results
- g) Management difficulties, mainly caused by the limited availability of staff and manmonths- especially for the CTA.

2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

In accordance with the project document, a joint tri-partite review will be held at the end of the second year, to review results and constraints, to make detailed recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project and to recommend a successful conclusion of the project in line with the project objectives and also to recommend a national and regional follow-up.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The mission will assess the:

- a) Relevance of the project to development priorities and needs
- b) Clarity and realism of the project's development and immediate objectives, including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability
- c) Quality, clarity and adequacy of project design including: .

- * clarity and logical consistency between, inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity and time-frame);
 - * realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks);
 - realism and clarity of external institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and the work plan;
 - * likely cost-effectiveness of the project design.
- d) Efficiency and adequacy of project implementation including: availability of funds as compared with the budget for both the donor and national component; the quality and timeliness of input delivery by both FAO and the Government; managerial and work efficiency; staffing and communication; implementation difficulties; adequacy of monitoring and reporting; the extent of national support and commitment; the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO; and the extent of the national support and commitment and the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO
- e) Project results, including a full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives). The mission will especially review, the status and quality of work on:
- Assessment of project impact (collection of OVIs), analysis of results and dissemination of project findings
 - Capacity building- both at local as well as at national level
 - Collaboration with the project partners and integration between the project and its partner
 - Community participation- and the gender balance of this participation- in all project activities at grass root level
 - The perception of project benefits by the direct beneficiaries (access, use)
 - The identity of the WIN project- ownership, accomplishments, responsibilities, role vis-à-vis partner projects, SPFS and national government
 - Exchange of experiences between the three countries, identification of cross cutting issues and cross fertilisation of experiences
 - Methodologies and ideas which have been developed as a result of the pilot activities of the project
 - The ability of the project to respond and adapt to changing circumstances and conditions
 - Whether secondary effects (planned or not) are consistent with project objectives
 - Environmental benefits of the project- suitability newly developed techniques
- f) The prospects for sustaining the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project. The mission should examine in particular:
- The level of policy support provided and the responsibility assumed by the recipients
 - The extent to which the project is effectively contributing to capacity building and changes in attitudes and practices towards more participatory and gender sensitive approaches- especially in the more technically oriented disciplines
 - The suitability of the newly developed technologies and methodologies to be disseminated
 - The extent to which the project results will be incorporated in the guidelines for the SPFS
- g) The mission should also examine the technical and operational support provided to

the project through the technical divisions involved at headquarters and regional offices, the role of the Chief Technical Advisor and Associate professional officers assigned to the projects and the national staff recruited under the project.

Based on the above analysis the mission will consider the cost-effectiveness of the project, with respect to the overall objectives and design of the technical cooperation, as well as the actual implementation results. Specific conclusions will be drawn and proposals made for any necessary further action by the Government of the three countries, FAO, the United Nations Foundation (UNF) and UNFIP to ensure sustainable development. Attention will be drawn to any lessons of general interest.

The mission will make proposals for a possible extension of the project making use of the savings of the project with specific recommendations that will further enhance the objectives and outputs of the project taking into account the general development priorities of the respective governments, FAO and the donor agency

4. COMPOSITION OF THE MISSION

The mission will comprise of the following persons:

1. Team leader (FAO), specialist in evaluation, participation and community development;
2. Representative nominated by UNF/UNFIP, specialist in gender, agronomy, participatory methods
3. In each country, a representative from the government will join the team- to ensure the tripartite nature of the mission

All team members should have experience of evaluation and participatory methodologies. They should also be able to undertake multi-disciplinary work and be familiar with concepts of gender issues, irrigation, household food security and nutrition. The international mission members should have working experience in Asia and Africa.

International Mission members should be independent and thus have no previous direct involvement with the project either with regard to its formulation, implementation or backstopping.

The National Mission members will be a representative from the Government of each of the three countries, endorsed by the National Steering committee and familiar with the relevant national policies in agricultural and irrigation development, food security, gender and nutrition.

5. TIMETABLE AND ITINERARY FOR THE MISSION

The total duration of the mission will be 4 weeks.

Both international consultants will be technically briefed by the various FAO units involved in the project (AGLW, ESNP, SDWW). The team will travel to Lusaka, Zambia on 2nd June 2002 and will monitor the Zambia component for one week. On 23 June, the international consultants will travel to Nepal for one week and will continue for Cambodia on 30 June, where they will also stay for one week.

The mission will try to visit all operational project sites.

On 7 July, the international consultants will leave for Bangkok where they will draft the report and debrief the FAO Bangkok office and later on in that same week, will continue for Rome where they will debrief the concerned technical officers Friday 12 July 2002.

6. CONSULTATIONS

The mission will maintain close liaison with the Representatives of the donor and FAO and the concerned national agencies, as well as with national and international project staff. Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorised to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor, or FAO.

7. REPORTING

The mission is fully responsible for its independent report, which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government, the donor or FAO. The report will be written in conformity with the FAO Guidelines.

The report will be completed, to the extent possible, in the country and the findings and recommendations fully discussed with all concerned parties and wherever possible consensus achieved with all stakeholders.

The mission will also complete the FAO Project Evaluation Questionnaire.

The mission leader bears responsibility for finalising the report, which will be submitted to FAO within two weeks of mission completion. FAO will submit the report to Government(s) and donor together with its comments.

Annex II – List of Persons Met

Zambia

Lusaka

Mr. Richard Fuller, FAO Representative
Ms. Karlyn Eckman, Project CTA
Mr. George Phiri, National Project Coordinator
Ms. Margaretha Bakker, APO
Ms. Emily Sikazwe, Executive Director, Women for Change
Mr. Freddie Muhanga, Acting Executive Director, National Food and Nutrition Commission
Mr. G. Sikuleka, National Project Coordinator, SIWUP Project
Mr. Akayombokwa, Deputy Director, Technical Services Bureau, MAFF
Mr. F. Nyerinda, Environmental Health Officer, Central Board of Health

Kafue District – WIN Team Members

Mr. Rodney Chileka
Mr. Zoole Newa
Mr. Elliot Mwangwa
Mr. Paul Muwowo

Chipapa and Funzwe Project Sites

Ms. Lessy Mwiinga
Mr. Stephen Moyo
Mr. Isaac Kazadi

Choma District – WIN Team Members

Mr. Morton Mwanza
Mr. Joseph Mukwesa

Saifakwenda Project Site

Mr. Ernest Chikote
Mr. Green Mukombwe

Nepal

Kathmandu

Mr. Winston Rudder, FAO Representative
Mr. Ganesh K.C., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Bhairab Raj Kaini, Director-General, Dept. of Agriculture
Mr. Dal Ram Pradham, DDG, Dept. of Livestock Services
Mr. K.K. Shrestha, National Coordinator
Ms. Niru Dahal Pandey, Deputy National Coordinator
Mr. Shanti Kumar Hyoju, National Coordinator, On Farm Water Management Project
Mr. Govinda Prasad Pandey, DDG, Dept. of Agriculture (former NPC)
Mr. Pitambar Gautam, National Consultant
Ms. P. Bhattarai, National Consultant (Gender)
Ms. Kanchan Lama, National Consultant
Mr. Narayan P. Bhattarai, DDG, Dept. of Irrigation
Mr. Umesh Nath Parajuli, Research and Human Resources Branch, DOI
Mr. Krishna Bahadur Rawal, Programme Coordinator, Lutheran World Federation
Ms. Shashi Rijal, Lutheran World Federation

Field

Mr. Magan Singh Thapa, WUA Secretary, Kirin Nala OFWM site

Mr. Khalid Ahmad Khan, Chief District Agricultural Development Officer, Gulariya
Ms. Shiva Shahi, Women Development Officer
Ms. Ghatana Shahi, Women Development Officer
Ms. Shanti Chand, Women Development Officer
Mr. Ram Charitra Rajak, District Irrigation Officer
Mr. Ded Prakash Bhatta, Veterinarian, District Livestock Service Office
Mr. D.B. Shrestha, Technician, District Livestock Service Office
Mr. Rataa Lal Shrestha, Senior Public Health Officer
Mr. Hari Har Sapkota, Health Post In-Charge
Mr. Mahesh Gautam, District Red Cross Society
Ms. Sita Uphadya, Thakurdwara Social Mobilizer
Ms. Chandrakala Gyawali, Sanoshree Social Mobilizer

Cambodia

Phnom Penh

Mr. J-C. Levasseur, FAO Representative
Mr. Mak Soeun, National WIN Coordinator
Mr. Kean Sophea, National SPFS Coordinator
Mr. Khun Borin, SPFS National Consultant
Ms. Satomi Akaida, UNV
H.E. Mam Bun Heng, Secretary of State, Ministry of Health
Ms. Sok Chancharvy, Deputy Secretary, MOWVA
Mr. Nuth Sakhan, Director, DAALI
Mr. Eng Cheasan, Deputy Director, Fishery Dept.
Mr. So Khan Rithykun, Deputy Director, Ag. Extension
Mr. Hang Chuon Chamrong, Deputy Director, DPSI
Ms. Bun-Hean, Director General, MOWRAM
Mr. Kir Monthiruth, Vice-Chief, DAALI
Dr. Chhin Lan, Infant and Young Child Programme Coordinator, Min. Health
Dr. Yim Sam Oeurn, Dept. Director, Ministry of Rural Development
Mr. Kiom Siphath, Deputy Director, MWVA
Mr. Sir Nhan, Deputy Director, Animal Health Dept.
Mr. Veng Sakhon, Undersecretary of State, MOWRAM

WIN Counterparts

Khou Ieng Ou, National Health Counterpart
Svay Sary, National Nutrition Counterpart
Sithon Soth, National Gender Counterpart

Siem Reap

Em Phallamony, Gender
Sok Somealea, Health and Nutrition
Chea Kimly, Health and Nutrition
You Chamroeun, Irrigation

Takeo

On Sary, Gender
Ung Bunlay, Health and Nutrition
Si Sarom, Health and Nutrition
Neu Rorn, Irrigation

SPFS Counterparts working with WIN

Kan Dajy, Animal Health
Chroeung Phanna, Hydrologist
So Chanta, Extension
Kong Piseth, Agronomy

Siem Reap

Tat Bun Chhoeurn, Director, Provincial Agricultural Dept.
Sor Sarin, Agronomy
Yin Sovan, Hydrologist
Ouk Hoksy, Livestock Specialist
Im Phouey, Chief, District Agricultural Dept., Pouk
Ong Sun Hourt, Livestock Specialist
Mam Teav, Hydrologist
Luon Soeurn, Chief, District Agricultural Dept., Prasat Bakong
Kong Thean Theavun, Agronomist

Takeo

Sok Salao, Chief, District Agricultural Dept., Samrong
Chan Chourn, Agronomist
Kuy Sokun, Agronomist
Ly Bunthoeurn, Livestock Specialist

H.E. Chap Nhalyvuth, Governor, Siem Reap Province
Ms Pao Sovoeun, Director, Dept. of Women and Veteran's Affairs, Siem Reap Province
Mr. San Kimsear, Director, Dept. of Water Resources and Meteorology, Siem Reap Province
Mr. Ly Teng, Deputy Director, Dept. of Health, Siem Reap Province

